Fragile Networks: Identifying Vulnerabilities and Synergies in an Uncertain Age

Anna Nagurney

John F. Smith Memorial Professor Isenberg School of Management University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003

Tutorial



ALIO-INFORMS Joint International Meeting June 6-9, 2010 Buenos Aires, Argentina



ALIO-INFORMS Joint International Meetin

Outline of Tutorial

• Part I: Network Fundamentals, Efficiency Measurement, and Vulnerability Analysis

Part II: Applications and Extensions

• Part III: Mergers and Acquisitions, Network Integration, and Synergies

Part I

Why Study Fragile Networks?

Networks provide the foundations for transportation and logistics, for communication, energy provision, social interactions, financing, and economic trade.

Today, the subject has garnered great interest due to a spectrum of catastrophic events that have drawn attention to network vulnerability and fragility.

Since many networks that underlie our societies and economies are large-scale and complex in nature, they are liable to be faced with disruptions.

Recent disasters demonstrate the importance and the vulnerability of network systems

- 9/11 Terrorist Attacks, September 11, 2001;
- The biggest blackout in North America, August 14, 2003;
- Two significant power outages in September 2003 -- one in the UK and the other in Italy and Switzerland;
- The Indonesian tsunami (and earthquake), December 26, 2004;
- Hurricane Katrina, August 23, 2005;
- The Minneapolis I35 Bridge collapse, August 1, 2007;
- The Mediterranean cable destruction, January 30, 2008;
- The Sichuan earthquake on May 12, 2008;
- The Haiti earthquake that struck on January 12, 2010 and the Chilean one on February 27, 2010.

Earthquake Damage

Tsunami

letthesunshinein.wordpress.com

prcs.org.pk



Storm Damage

www.srh.noaa.gov





Infrastructure Collapse

www.10-7.com





The Haitian and Chilean Earthquakes



Disasters have brought an unprecedented impact on human lives in the 21st century and the number of disasters is growing.



Frequency of disasters [Source: Emergency Events Database (2008)]

Natural Disaster Trend and Number of People Affected (1975 – 2008)



Natural Disaster Trend Source: EM-DAT

Number of People Affected Source: EM-DAT

We are also in a New Era of Decision-Making Characterized by:

- complex interactions among decision-makers in organizations;
- alternative and at times conflicting criteria used in decision-making;
- constraints on resources: natural, human, financial, time, etc.;
- global reach of many decisions;
- high impact of many decisions;
- increasing risk and uncertainty, and
- the *importance of dynamics* and realizing a fast and sound response to evolving events.

This era is ideal for applying the tools of Fragile Networks.

Network problems are their own class of problems and they come in various forms and formulations, i.e., as optimization (linear or nonlinear) problems or as equilibrium problems and even dynamic network problems.

Network problems will be the focus of this tutorial with fragility as the major theme.

In this tutorial we will:

- provide you with rigorous, computer-based tools to identify the importance of nodes and links in network systems (and their rankings) under alternative user behaviors;
- quantify the effects on network robustness when the link capacities are degraded under decentralized decision-making behavior, and
- assess network robustness using total cost as a measure under alternative behaviors.

In this tutorial we will also:

 present a measure to quantify the synergy resulting from the integration of network systems.

The synergy measure may be used to assess *a priori* whether (or not) supply chains should be integrated or not); whether specific mergers and acquisitions should take place, and even to assess the potential benefits of the integration of organizations (and teams) in the case of humanitarian (especially logistics) operations.

This tutorial will emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of Fragile Networks and Networks, in general.

Interdisciplinary Impact of Networks Economics and odels and Algorithm OR/MS and Engineering Interregional Trade Energy General Equilibrium Manufacturing Industrial Organization **Telecommunications Networks** Portfolio Optimization Transportation Flow of Funds Supply Chains Accounting Biology Sociology **DNA Sequencing Computer Science** Social Networks Targeted Cancer **Routing Algorithms** Therapy Organizational Theory Price of Anarchy

Background and Network Fundamentals



Subway Network

Transportation, Communication, and Energy Networks



Railroad Network

Iridium Satellite Constellation Network Satellite and Undersea Cable Networks

Duke Energy Gas Pipeline Network



Components of Common Physical Networks

Network System	Nodes	Links	Flows
Transportation	Intersections, Homes, Workplaces, Airports, Railyards	Roads, Airline Routes, Railroad Track	Automobiles, Trains, and Planes,
Manufacturing and logistics	Workstations, Distribution Points	Processing, Shipment	Components, Finished Goods
Communication	Computers, Satellites, Telephone Exchanges	Fiber Optic Cables Radio Links	Voice, Data, Video
Energy	Pumping Stations, Plants	Pipelines, Transmission Lines	Water, Gas, Oil, Electricity





Internet Traffic

Network



Systems





The study of the efficient operation of transportation networks dates to *ancient Rome* with a classical example being the publicly provided Roman road network and the *time of day chariot policy*, whereby chariots were banned from the ancient city of Rome at particular times of day.



The need to model and solve a spectrum of challenging network problems has given rise to new computational methodologies.



We need to capture not only network topology (how nodes are connected with the links) but also

the behavior of users of the networks and the induced flows!

Characteristics of Networks Today

- *large-scale nature* and complexity of network topology;
- congestion (leading to nonlinearities);
- alternative behavior of users of the network, which may lead to *paradoxical phenomena*;
- the *interactions among networks* themselves such as in transportation versus telecommunications;
- policies surrounding networks today may have a major impact not only economically but also socially, politically, and security-wise.

Networks in Action

- Some social network websites, such as facebook.com and myspace.com, have over 300 million users.
- Internet traffic is approximately *doubling* each year.
- In the US, the annual traveler delay per peak period (rush hour) has grown from 16 hours to 47 hours since 1982.
- The total amount of delay reached **3.7** billion hours in 2003.
- The wasted fuel amounted to 2.3 billion gallons due to engines idling in traffic jams (Texas Transportation Institute 2005 Urban Mobility Report).

Hence, many of the network problems today are flow-dependent and increasingly nonlinear, as opposed to linear.

Therefore, the underlying functions must capture, for example, congestion!

TRAFFIC

Capturing Link Congestion



For a typical user link travel time function, where the free flow travel time refers to the travel time to traverse a link when there is zero flow on the link (or zero vehicles). The importance of capturing user behavior on networks will now be illustrated through a famous paradox known as the *Braess paradox* in which travelers are assumed to behave in a *user-optimizing (U-O) manner*, as opposed to a *system-optimizing (S-O) one*.

Under U-O behavior, decision-makers act independently and selfishly with no concern of the impact of their travel choices on others.

Behavior on Congested Networks

Decision-makers select their cost-minimizing routes.



Flows are routed so as to minimize the total cost to society.

The Braess (1968) Paradox

Assume a network with a single O/D pair (1,4). There are 2 paths available to travelers: $p_1=(a,c)$ and $p_2=(b,d)$.

For a travel demand of **6**, the equilibrium path flows are $\mathbf{x}_{p_1}^*$

$$= x_{p_2}^* = 3$$
 and

The equilibrium path travel cost

is

 $C_{p_1} = C_{p_2} = 83.$

 $c_{a}(f_{a}) = 10 f_{a} c_{b}(f_{b}) = f_{b} + 50$ $c_{c}(f_{c}) = f_{c} + 50 c_{d}(f_{d}) = 10 f_{d}$



Adding a Link Increases Travel Cost for All!

- Adding a new link creates a new path $p_3=(a,e,d)$.
- The original flow distribution pattern is no longer an equilibrium pattern, since at this level of flow the cost on path p_3 ,

The new equilibrium flow pattern network is

 $\mathbf{x}_{p_1}^* = \mathbf{x}_{p_2}^* = \mathbf{x}_{p_3}^* = 2.$

The equilibrium path travel costs: $C_{p_4} =$

 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ a \\ c \\ c \\ 4 \end{array}$

 $c_{e}(f_{e}) = f_{e} + 10$

 $C_{p_2} = C_{p_3} = 92$

The 1968 Braess article has been translated from German to English and appears as:

On a Paradox of Traffic Planning

by Braess, Nagurney, Wakolbinger in the November 2005 issue of Transportation Science.

Über ein Paradoxon aus der Verkehrsplanung

Von D. BRAESS, Münster 1)

Eingegangen am 28, Mårz 1968

Zutaussnerfatzung: Für die Straßenverkehrsplanung möchte man den Verkehrsfluß auf den enzelna Staßen des Netzes abschäten, wenn die Zahl der Fahrange bekennt ist, die zwischen dan einschan Punkten des Staßenstess verkehren. Welche Wege am görzigsten sind, hingt num nicht unt von der Bischaftleichst der Straße ab, sondern auch von der Verkehrstleche. Is ergeben sich nicht immer optimale Fahrzeiten, wenn jeder Fahrer nur für sich den glinetigsten Wag haraus-sucht. In einigen Fällen kann sich durch Erweiterung des Netzes der Verkehrsthuß segart so um-lagern, dals gröberre Fahrzeiten erforderlich worden.

Summary: For each point of a weal activates is by given the number of entra starting from it tradits detuntions of the form, Ugget three conditions on which to constants the distribution of the tradit is bound to achieve the starting of the start of tradits of the tradit of the start of tradits do not be adapted of the lines. If every direct back has a physical back mode of the lines of tradits of the start of tradits do not achieve the lines. If every direct back has a physical back mode of the start of tradits do not achieve the lines. If every direct back has a physical back mode of the start of tradits do not achieve the lines of tradits do not achieve the start physical back mode in the start of tradits do not achieve the next physical back mode in the start of the sta

1. Einleitung

Für die Verkehrsphrung und Verkehrsteuerung interessiert, wie sich der Fahrzeugstrom auf die einzelnen Straßen des Verkehrsnetzes verteilt. Bekannt sei dabei die Anzahl der Fahrzeuge für alle Ausgangs- und Zielpunkte. Bei der Berechnung wird davon ausgegangen, daß von den möglichen Wegen jeweils der günstigste gewählt wird. Wie günstig ein Weg ist, richtet sich nach dem Aufwand, der zum Durchfahren nötig ist. Die Grundlage für die Bewertung des Aufwandes bildet die Fahrzeit.

Für die mathematische Behandlung wird das Straßennetz durch einen gerichte ten Graphen beschrieben. Zur Charaktensierung der Bögen gehört die Angabe des Zeitaufwandes. Die Bestimmung der günstigen Stromverteilungen kann als gelöst betrachtet werden, wenn die Bewertung konstant ist, d. h., wenn die Fahrzeiten unabhängig von der Größe des Verkehrsflusses sind. Sie ist dann äquivalent mit der bekannten Aufgabe, den kürzesten Abstand zweier Punkte eines Graphen und den zugehörigen kritischen Pfad zu bestimmen [1], [5], [7].

Will man das Modell aber realistischer gestalten, ist zu berücksichtigen, daß die benötigte Zeit stark von der Stärke des Verkehrs abhängt. Wie die folgenden Untersuchungen zeigen, ergeben sich dann gegenüber dem Modell mit konstanten (belastungsunabhångiger) Bewertung z. T. völlig neue Aspekte. Dabei erweist sich schon eine Präzisierung der Problemstellung als notwendig; denn es ist zwischen dem Strom zu unterscheiden, der für alle am günstigsten ist, und dem, der sich einstellt, wenn jeder Fahrer nur seinen eigenen Weg optimalisiert.

³) Priv.-Doz. Dr. Durmaen BRAESS₂ Institut für numerische und instrumentelle Mathematik, 44 Münster, Hüfferstr. 3 a.



TRANSPORTATION SCIENCE No. 4, November 2005, pp. 446-450 41.1655 (*page 1526-5447 (05) 3904 (044

informs. on 10.1287/tmc.1050.012 #2385_INFORM

On a Paradox of Traffic Planning

Dietrich Braess

Germany: districh brass@mb.ds Anna Nagurney, Tina Wakolbinger

ach point of a road network, lot there be given the number of cars starting from it, and the desite is cars. Under these conductors are statistics to estimate the distribution of stallic flow. Whinther more able to analyze depends not only on the heguidity of the cond, has able on the desitive of the litt and the starting of the more, it is indicated by an example them are exoluted in the conductor that more a estimates that many fractions of the starting of the start of the start of the start of the star

Key averals: statile network planning; parados; equilibrium; critical flows; eptimal flows; existence shaceom History: Baceived: April 2005; revision received. June 2005; accepted: July 2005.

'ranslased from the original German: Braoss, Diosrich. 1968. Über ein Paradoxon aus der Verkehrsplarung. Interseinensjöschotg 12 298–268.

Introduction

The distribution of traffic flow on the roads of a traf-The distribution of traffic flow or the roads of a nuf-ter network of minester to mainly planes and traffic controllers. We assume that the number of validate the second second second second second second second assumption that the most favorable roads are not assumption that the most favorable roads are not depend or one more down from the most and are not assumed by the second second second second for the mathematical measures. A curvely may for the mathematical measures λ (curvely mass associated with another his λ is constant, i.e., of if the time is more than the favorable roads of whether times in more than the measurements of the second second second second second second second second of the times is more than the secondator.

if the invest time for each link is constant, i.e., if the time is independent of the massless of valueds on the link. In this case, it is approximate to comparing the destination of the massless of the second second second destination (the composing extratal three matering shortestry path. See Bollman (1958), you Fallenhausen In more radiate mobile, however, each true to the sound of the second second second second second anomaly despined on the tratific descent more effects around to the material both the static descent and the second second second second second second time with a sequence of the second second second time with a sequence of the second second second time with a sequence of the second second second second time with a sequence of the second time with a sequence of the second time with a sequence of the second seco flow that will be optimal for all vehicles and flow

that is achieved if each user attempts to optimize his

that is addressed if each user attempts to optimica bits. Reference in a supple model network work only four modes, we will discuss typical leastness that contra-dict facts that seems to be plausible-cantil control of taffic and be advantagences scene for these diverse when final, that by will discover more pollabil-ability of the parades, that an extension of the read-schildren of the parades, that an extension of the read-meters by an additional used can cause and entropy the parades, that are set instead tared time is the result.

 Graph and Road Network Directed graphy are used for modeling read maps, and the links, the connectors between the nodes, have an ortscatteric (Berge 1988, vor Fallerhausen 1966). Two links that differ only by their direction are depicted in the figures by one line without an

are depicted in the figures by one line without an arrowhead. In general, the rodes are associated with street interactions. Whenever a more detailed description is modes, with such one corresponding is an adjacent road, as Figure 2 (black and Whetersone 1560). We will use the following rotation for the modes, links, and flower. The indices before the interaction with environment and the strength of correspondent with more variable, we do next with the rome of the indices.

The Braess Paradox Around the World

1969 - Stuggart, Germany - Traffic worsened until a newly built road was closed.



1990 - Earth Day - New York City -42nd Street was closed and traffic flow improved.





2002 - Seoul, Korea - A 6 lane road built over the Cheonggyecheon River that carried 160,000 cars per day and was perpetually jammed was torn down to improve traffic flow.





Other Networks that Behave like Traffic Networks



The Internet

Supply Chain Networks



Electric Power Generation/Distribution Networks

Financial Networks



FRAGILE NETWORKS

Identifying Vulnerabilities and Synergies in an Uncertain World

Anna Nagurney / Qiang Qiang

WILEY
This *paradox is relevant* not only to congested transportation networks but also to the Internet and electric power networks.

Hence, there are *huge implications* also for network design.

There are *two fundamental principles of travel behavior*, due to Wardrop (1952), which are referred to as user-optimal (U-O or network equilibrium) and system-optimal (S-O).

In a *user-optimized (network equilibrium) problem*, each user of a network system seeks to determine his/her costminimizing route of travel between an origin/destination pair, until an equilibrium is reached, in which no user can decrease his/her cost of travel by unilateral action.

In a *system-optimized network problem*, users are allocated among the routes so as to minimize the total cost in the system.

Both classes of problems, under certain imposed assumptions, possess optimization formulations.

Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) Link Cost Function

$$c_{a} = c_{a}^{0} \left[1 + \alpha \left(\frac{f_{a}}{t_{a}^{\prime}} \right)^{\beta} \right],$$

where, c_a and f_a are the travel time and link flow, respectively, on link a, c_a^0 is the free-flow travel time, and t'_a is the "practical capacity" of link a. The quantities α and β are model parameters, for which the values $\alpha = 0.15$ minutes and $\beta = 4$ are typical values. For example, these values imply that the practical capacity of a link is the flow at which the travel time is 15% greater than the free-flow travel time.

The User-Optimization (U-O) Problem Transportation Network Equilibrium

Consider a general network G = [N, L], where N denotes the set of nodes, and L the set of directed links. Let a denote a link of the network connecting a pair of nodes, and let p denote an acyclic path consisting of a sequence of links connecting an origin/destination (O/D) pair of nodes. P_w denotes the set of paths connecting the O/D pair of nodes w and P the set of all paths.

Let x_p represent the flow on path p and let f_a denote the flow on link a. The following conservation of flow equations must hold:

$$f_{a} = \sum_{p \in P} x_{p} \delta_{ap},$$

where $\delta_{ap} = 1$, if link *a* is contained in path *p*, and 0, otherwise. This expression states that the flow on a link *a* is equal to the sum of all the path flows on paths *p* that contain (traverse) link *a*. Moreover, if we let d_w denote the demand associated with O/D pair w, then we must have that

$$d_w = \sum_{p \in P_w} x_p,$$

where $x_p \ge 0$, $\forall p$, that is, the sum of all the path flows between an origin/destination pair w must be equal to the given demand d_w .

Let c_a denote the user cost associated with traversing link a, and C_p the user cost associated with traversing the path p. Then

$$C_p = \sum_{a \in L} c_a \delta_{ap}.$$

In other words, the cost of a path is equal to the sum of the costs on the links comprising the path. In the classical model, $c_a = c_a(f_a), \forall a \in L$. In the most general case, $c_a = c_a(f), \forall a \in L$, where f is the vector of link flows.

Transportation Network Equilibrium Conditions

The network equilibrium conditions are then given by: For each path $p \in P_w$ and every O/D pair w:

$$C_p \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} = \lambda_w, & \text{if} \quad x_p^* > 0\\ \ge \lambda_w, & \text{if} \quad x_p^* = 0 \end{array} \right.$$

where λ_w is an indicator, whose value is not known a priori. The equilibrium conditions state that the user costs on all used paths connecting a given O/D pair will be minimal and equalized. This is Wardrop's first principle of travel behavior. As shown by Beckmann, McGuire, and Winsten (1956) and Dafermos and Sparrow (1969), if the user link cost functions satisfy the symmetry property that $\left[\frac{\partial c_a}{\partial c_b} = \frac{\partial c_b}{\partial c_a}\right]$, for all links a, b in the network then the solution to the above U-O problem can be reformulated as the solution to an associated optimization problem. For example, if we have that $c_a = c_a(f_a)$, for all links $a \in L$, then the solution to the U-O problem can be obtained by solving:

Minimize
$$\sum_{a \in L} \int_0^{f_a} c_a(y) dy$$

subject to:

$$egin{aligned} d_w &= \sum_{eta \in P_w} x_{m{p}}, & orall w \in W, \ f_{m{a}} &= \sum_{eta \in P} x_{m{p}}, & orall a \in L, \ x_{m{p}} \geq 0, & orall p \in P. \end{aligned}$$

The System-Optimization (S-O) Problem

The above discussion focused on the user-optimized (U-O) problem. We now turn to the system-optimized (S-O) problem in which a central controller, say, seeks to minimize the total cost in the network system, where the total cost is expressed as

$$\sum_{a \in L} \hat{c}_a(f_a)$$

where it is assumed that the total cost function on a link *a* is defined as:

$$\hat{c}_a(f_a) \equiv c_a(f_a) \times f_a,$$

subject to the conservation of flow constraints, and the nonnegativity assumption on the path flows. Here separable link costs have been assumed, for simplicity, and other total cost expressions may be used, as mandated by the particular application.

The S-O Optimality Conditions

Under the assumption of strictly increasing user link cost functions, the optimality conditions are: For each path $p \in P_w$, and every O/D pair w:

$$\hat{C}'_{p} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} = \mu_{w}, & \text{if} \quad x_{p} > 0\\ \geq \mu_{w}, & \text{if} \quad x_{p} = 0, \end{array} \right.$$

where \hat{C}'_p denotes the marginal total cost on path p, given by:

$$\hat{C}'_{p} = \sum_{a \in L} \frac{\partial \hat{c}_{a}(f_{a})}{\partial f_{a}} \delta_{ap}.$$

The above conditions correspond to Wardrop's second principle of travel behavior. What is the S-O solution for the two Braess networks (before and after the addition of a new link e)?

Before the addition of the link e, we may write:

$$\hat{c}_a'=20f_a,\quad \hat{c}_b'=2f_b+50,$$

$$\hat{c}_{c}' = 2f_{c} + 50, \quad \hat{c}_{d}' = 20f_{d}.$$

It is easy to see that, in this case, the S-O solution is identical to the U-O solution with $x_{p_1} = x_{p_2} = 3$ and $\hat{C}'_{p_1} = \hat{C}'_{p_2} = 116$. Furthermore, after the addition of link e, we have that $\hat{c}'_e = 2f_e + 10$. The new path p_3 is not used in the S-O solution, since with zero flow on path p_3 , we have that $\hat{C}'_{p_3} = 170$ and $\hat{C}'_{p_1} = \hat{C}'_{p_2}$ remains at 116.

Another Example

Assume a network with a single O/D pair (1,2). There are 2 paths available to travelers: $p_1 = a$ and $p_2 = b$.

For a travel demand of 1, the U-O path flows are: $\mathbf{x}_{p_1}^* = 1$; $\mathbf{x}_{p_2}^* = 0$ and

the total cost under U-O behavior is $TC_{u-0} = 1$.

The S-O path flows are: $\mathbf{x}_{p_1} = \frac{3}{4}$; $\mathbf{x}_{p_2} = \frac{1}{4}$ and the total cost under S-O behavior is $TC_{s_{-0}} = \frac{7}{8}$.

b a $C_a(f_a) = f_a$ $C_b(f_b) = f_b + 1$

The Price of Anarchy

The price of anarchy is defined as the ratio of the TC under U-O behavior to the TC under S-O behavior:

 $\rho = TC_{U-O} / TC_{S-O}$

See Roughgarden (2005), *Selfish Routing and the Price of Anarchy*.

Question: When does the U-O solution coincide with the S-O solution?

Answer: In a general network, with user link cost functions given by: $c_a(f_a) = c_a^0 f_a^\beta$ for all links, with $c_a^0 \ge 0$ and $\beta \ge 0$.

Note that for $c_a(f_a)=c_a^o$, that is, in the case of uncongested networks, this result always holds.

Recall again the Braess Network where we add the link e.



What happens if the demand varies over time?

The U-O Solution of the Braess Network with Added Link (Path) and Time-Varying Demands



In Demand Regime I, only the new path is used. In Demand Regime II, the Addition of a New Link (Path) Makes Everyone Worse Off! In Demand Regime III, only the original paths are used.



Network 1 is the Original Braess Network - Network 2 has the added link.

The new link is NEVER used after a certain demand is reached even if the demand approaches infinity.

Hence, in general, except for a limited range of demand, building the new link is a complete waste!

If the symmetry assumption does not hold for the user link costs functions, which is always satisfied by separable user link cost functions, then the (U-O) equilibrium conditions can *no longer* be reformulated as an associated optimization problem and the equilibrium conditions are formulated and solved as a *variational inequality (VI)* problem!

Smith (1979), Dafermos (1980)

VI Formulation of Transportation Network Equilibrium (Dafermos (1980), Smith (1979))

A traffic path flow pattern satisfies the above equilibrium conditions if and only if it satisfies the variational inequility problem: determine $x^* \in K$, such that

$$\sum_{p} C_p(x^*) \times (x_p - x_p^*) \ge 0, \quad \forall x \in K.$$

Finite-dimensional variational inequality theory has been applied to-date to the wide range of equilibrium problems noted above.

In particular, the finite-dimensional variational inequality problem is to determine $x^* \in K \subset R^n$ such that

$$\langle F(x^*), x - x^* \rangle \ge 0, \quad \forall x \in K,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denoted the inner product in \mathbb{R}^n and K is closed and convex.

A Geometric Interpretation of a Variational Inequality



The variational inequality problem, contains, as special cases, such classical problems as:

- systems of equations
- optimization problems
- complementarity problems and is also closely related to fixed point problems.

Hence, it is a unifying mathematical formulation for a variety of mathematical programming problems.

Transportation and Other Network Systems

The TNE Paradigm is the Unifying Paradigm for a Variety of Network Systems:

Transportation Networks

- the Internet
- Financial Networks
- Supply Chains
- Electric Power Networks

Other Related Applications

- Telecommuting/Commuting Decision-Making
- Teleshopping/Shopping Decision-Making
- Supply Chain Networks with Electronic Commerce
- Financial Networks with Electronic Transactions
- Reverse Supply Chains with E-Cycling
- Knowledge Networks
- Social Networks integrated with Economic Networks (Supply Chains and Financial Networks)

The Equivalence of Supply Chains and Transportation Networks



Nagurney, Transportation Research E 42 (2006), pp 293-316.

Supply Chain - Transportation Supernetwork Representation



Nagurney, Ke, Cruz, Hancock, Southworth, *Environment and Planning B* 29 (2002), 795-818.

The fifth chapter of Beckmann, McGuire, and Winsten's book, *Studies in the Economics of Transportation* (1956) describes some *unsolved problems* including a single commodity network equilibrium problem that the authors imply could be generalized to capture electric power networks.

Specifically, they asked whether electric power generation and distribution networks can be reformulated as transportation network equilibrium problems.

Electric Power Supply Chains



The Electric Power Supply Chain Network



Nagurney and Matsypura, Proceedings of the CCCT (2004).

The Transportation Network Equilibrium Reformulation of Electric Power Supply Chain Networks



Electric Power Supply Network

Transportation Chain Network

Nagurney, Liu, Cojocaru, and Daniele, *Transportation Research E* 43 (2007).

In 1952, Copeland wondered whether money flows like water or electricity.

The Transportation Network Equilibrium Reformulation of the Financial Network Equilibrium Model with Intermediation



Liu and Nagurney, Computational Management Science 4 (2007), pp 243-281.

We have shown that *money* as well as *electricity* flow like *transportation* and have answered questions posed fifty years ago by Copeland and by Beckmann, McGuire, and Winsten!

Recent Literature on Network Vulnerability

- Latora and Marchiori (2001, 2002, 2004)
- Holme, Kim, Yoon and Han (2002)
- Taylor and D'este (2004)
- Murray-Tuite and Mahmassani (2004)
- Chassin and Posse (2005)
- Barrat, Barthélemy and Vespignani (2005)
- Sheffi (2005)
- Dall'Asta, Barrat, Barthélemy and Vespignani (2006)
- Jenelius, Petersen and Mattson (2006)
- Taylor and D'Este (2007)

Network Centrality Measures

- Barrat et al. (2004, pp. 3748), *The identification of the most central nodes in the system is a major issue in network characterization.*
- Centrality Measures for Non-weighted Networks
 - Degree, betweenness (node and edge), closeness (Freeman (1979), Girvan and Newman (2002))
 - Eigenvector centrality (Bonacich (1972))
 - Flow centrality (Freeman, Borgatti and White (1991))
 - Betweenness centrality using flow (Izquierdo and Hanneman (2006))
 - Random-work betweenness, Current-flow betweenness (Newman and Girvan (2004))
- Centrality Measures for Weighted Networks (Very Few)
 Weighted betweenness centrality (Dall'Asta et al. (2006))
 Network efficiency measure (Latora-Marchiori (2001))

Some of Our Research on Network Efficiency, Vulnerability, and Robustness

A Network Efficiency Measure for Congested Networks, Nagurney and Qiang, *Europhysics Letters* **79**, August (2007), p1-p5.

A Transportation Network Efficiency Measure that Captures Flows, Behavior, and Costs with Applications to Network Component Importance Identification and Vulnerability, Nagurney and Qiang, *Proceedings of the POMS 18th Annual Conference*, Dallas, Texas (2007).

A Network Efficiency Measure with Application to Critical Infrastructure Networks, Nagurney and Qiang, *Journal of Global Optimization* **40** (2008), pp 261-275.

Robustness of Transportation Networks Subject to Degradable Links, Nagurney and Qiang, *Europhysics Letters* **80**, December (2007).

A Unified Network Performance Measure with Importance Identification and the Ranking of Network Components, Qiang and Nagurney, *Optimization Letters* **2** (2008), pp 127-142.
Which Nodes and Links Really Matter?

A New Network Performance/Efficiency Measure with Applications to a Variety of Network Systems

The Nagurney and Qiang (N-Q) Network Efficiency Measure

The network performance/efficiency measure $\overline{\mathcal{E}(G,d)}$, for a given network topology *G* and demand vector *d*, is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}(G,d) = \frac{\sum_{w \in W} \frac{d_w}{\lambda_w}}{n_W},$$

where n_w is the number of O/D pairs in the network and λ_w is the equilibrium disutility/price for O/D pair *w*.

Nagurney and Qiang, Europhysics Letters 79 (2007).

Importance of a Network Component

Definition:

The importance, I(g), of a network component $g \in G$ is measured by the relative network efficiency drop after g is removed from the network:

$$I(g) = \frac{\triangle \mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{\mathcal{E}(G, d) - \mathcal{E}(G - g, d)}{\mathcal{E}(G, d)},$$

where *G-g* is the resulting network after component g is removed.

The Latora and Marchiori (L-M) Network Efficiency Measure

Definition:

The network performance/efficiency measure, E(G) for a given network topology, G, is defined as:

$$E(G) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j \in G} \frac{1}{d_{ij}}$$

where *n* is the number of nodes in the network and d_{ij} is the shortest path length between node *i* and node *j*.

The L-M Measure vs. the N-Q Measure

Theorem: Equivalence in a Special Case

If positive demands exist for all pairs of nodes in the network, *G*, and each of demands is equal to 1, and if d_{ij} is set equal to λ_w , where w=(i,j), for all $w \in W$, then the N-Q and L-M network efficiency measures are one and the same.

The Approach to Identifying the Importance of Network Components

The elimination of a link is treated in the N-Q network efficiency measure by removing that link while the removal of a node is managed by removing the links entering and exiting that node.

In the case that the removal results in no path connecting an O/D pair, we simply assign the demand for that O/D pair to an abstract path with a cost of infinity.

The N-Q measure is well-defined even in the case of disconnected networks.

According to the European Environment Agency (2004), since 1990, the *annual number of extreme weather and climate related events has doubled*, in comparison to the previous decade. These events account for approximately 80% of all economic losses caused by catastrophic events. In the course of climate change, catastrophic events are projected to occur more frequently (see Schulz (2007)).

Schulz (2007) applied the Nagurney and Qiang (2007) network efficiency measure to a German highway system in order to identify the critical road elements and found that this measure provided more reasonable results than the measure of Taylor and D'Este (2007).

The N-Q measure can also be used to asses which links should be added to improve efficiency. It was used for the evaluation of the proposed North Dublin (Ireland) Metro system (October 2009 Issue of ERCIM News).

Example 1

Assume a network with two O/D pairs: $w_1 = (1,2)$ and $w_2 = (1,3)$ with demands: $d_{w_1} = 100$ and $d_{w_2} = 20$.

The paths are: for w_1 , $p_1 = a$; for w_2 , $p_2 = b$.

The U-O equilibrium path flows are: $x_{p_1}^* = 100, x_{p_2}^* = 20.$



 $c_a(f_a) = 0.01 f_a + 19$ $c_b(f_b) = 0.05 f_b + 19$

The (U-O) equilibrium path costs are: $C_{p_1} = C_{p_2} = 20$.

The Importance and Ranking of Links and Nodes for Example 1

Link	Importance Value from Our Measure	Importance Ranking from Our Measure	Importance Value from the L-M Measure	Importance Ranking from the L-M Measure
а	0.8333	1	0.5000	1
Node	Importance Value from Our Measure	Importance Ranking from Our Measure	Importance Value from the L-M Measure	Importance Ranking from the L-M Measure
1	1.0000	1	1.0000	1
2	0.8333	2	0.5000	2

Example 2 – The Braess Network



The Importance and Ranking of Links and Nodes for Example 2

Link	Importance Value from Our Measure	Importance Ranking from Our Measure	Importance Value from the L-M Measure	Importance Ranking from the L-M Measure
а	0.2096	1	0.1056	3
b	0.1794	2	0.2153	2
Node	Importance Value from Our Measure	Importance Ranking from Our Measure	Importance Value from the L-M Measure	Importance Ranking from the L-M Measure
1	1.0000	1	N/A	N/A
2	0.2096	2	0.7635	1

Example 3

The network is given by:



 $w_1 = (1,20)$ $w_2 = (1,19)$ $d_{w_1} = 100$ $d_{w_2} = 100$

Nagurney, Transportation Research B (1984)

Example 3: Link Cost Functions

Link a	Link Cost Function $c_a(f_a)$	Link a	Link Cost Function $c_a(f_a)$
1	$.00005f_1^4 + 5f_1 + 500$	15	$.00003f_{15}^4 + 9f_{15} + 200$
2	$.00003f_2^4 + 4f_2 + 200$	16	$8f_{16} + 300$
3	$.00005f_3^4 + 3f_3 + 350$	17	$.00003f_{17}^4 + 7f_{17} + 450$
4	$.00003f_4^4 + 6f_4 + 400$	18	$5f_{18} + 300$
5	$.00006f_5^4 + 6f_5 + 600$	19	$8f_{19} + 600$
6	$7f_6 + 500$	20	$.00003f_{20}^4 + 6f_{20} + 300$
7	$.00008f_7^4 + 8f_7 + 400$	21	$.00004f_{21}^4 + 4f_{21} + 400$
8	$.00004f_8^4 + 5f_8 + 650$	22	$.00002f_{22}^4 + 6f_{22} + 500$
9	$.00001f_9^4 + 6f_9 + 700$	23	$.00003f_{23}^4 + 9f_{23} + 350$
10	$4f_{10} + 800$	24	$.00002f_{24}^4 + 8f_{24} + 400$
11	$.00007f_{11}^4 + 7f_{11} + 650$	25	$.00003f_{25}^4 + 9f_{25} + 450$
12	$8f_{12} + 700$	26	$.00006f_{26}^4 + 7f_{26} + 300$
13	$.00001f_{13}^4 + 7f_{13} + 600$	27	$.00003f_{27}^4 + 8f_{27} + 500$
14	$8f_{14} + 500$	28	$.00003f_{28}^4 + 7f_{28} + 650$

Algorithms for Solution

The projection method (cf. Dafermos (1980) and Nagurney (1999)) embedded with the equilibration algorithm of Dafermos and Sparrow (1969) was used for the computations.

In addition, the column generation method of Leventhal, Nemhauser, and Trotter (1973) was implemented to generate paths, as needed, in the case of the largescale Sioux Falls network example.

Example 3: The Importance and Ranking of Links

$\operatorname{Link} a$	Importance Value	Importance Ranking	Link a	Importance Value	Importance Ranking
1	0.9086	3	15	0.0000	22
2	0.8984	4	16	0.0001	21
3	0.8791	6	17	0.0000	22
4	0.8672	7	18	0.0175	18
5	0.8430	9	19	0.0362	17
6	0.8226	11	20	0.6641	14
7	0.7750	12	21	0.7537	13
8	0.5483	15	22	0.8333	10
9	0.0362	17	23	0.8598	8
10	0.6641	14	24	0.8939	5
11	0.0000	22	25	0.4162	16
12	0.0006	20	26	0.9203	2
13	0.0000	22	27	0.9213	1
14	0.0000	22	28	0.0155	19

Example 3: Link Importance Rankings



Example 4 - Sioux Falls Network

The network data are from LeBlanc, Morlok, and Pierskalla (1975).

The network has 528 O/D pairs, 24 nodes, and 76 links.

The user link cost functions are of BPR form.



Example 4 - Sioux Falls Network Link Importance Rankings



The Network Efficiency Measure for Dynamic Networks

A network like the Internet is volatile. Its traffic patterns can change quickly and dramatically... The assumption of a static model is therefore particularly suspect in such networks. (Roughgarden (2005)).

An Efficiency Measure for Dynamic Networks with Application to the Internet and Vulnerability Analysis (Nagurney and Qiang), *Netnomics* 9 (2008), pp 1-20.

The Network Efficiency Measure for Dynamic Networks – Continuous Time

The network efficiency for the network G with time-varying demand d for $t \in [0, T]$, denoted by $\mathcal{E}(G, d, T)$, is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}(G,d,T) = \frac{\int_0^T \left[\sum_{w \in W} \frac{d_w(t)}{\lambda_w(t)}\right]/n_W dt}{T}$$

Note that the above measure is the average network performance over time of the dynamic network.

The Network Efficiency Measure for Dynamic Networks – Discrete Time

Let d_w^1 , d_w^2 , ..., d_w^H denote demands for O/D pair w in H discrete time intervals, given, respectively, by: $[t_0, t_1], (t_1, t_2], ..., (t_{H-1}, t_H]$, where $t_H \equiv T$. Assume that the demand is constant in each such time interval for each O/D pair. Denote the corresponding minimal costs for each O/D pair w at the H different time intervals by: $\lambda_w^1, \lambda_w^2, ..., \lambda_w^H$. The demand vector d, in this special discrete case, is a vector in $R^{n_W \times H}$.

Dynamic Network Efficiency: Discrete Time Version

The network efficiency for the network (G, d) over H discrete time intervals: $[t_0, t_1], (t_1, t_2], ..., (t_{H-1}, t_H]$, where $t_H \equiv T$, and with the respective constant demands: $d_w^1, d_w^2, ..., d_w^H$ for all $w \in W$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}(G, d, t_H = T) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{H} [(\sum_{w \in W} \frac{d_w^i}{\lambda_w^i})(t_i - t_{i-1})/n_W]}{t_H}$$

Importance of Nodes and Links in the Dynamic Braess Network Using the N-Q Measure when T=10

Link	Importance Value	Importance Ranking
а	0.2604	1
b	0.1784	2
С	0.1784	2
d	0.2604	1
е	-0.1341	3

Link *e* is never used after t = 8.89 and in the range $t \in [2.58, 8.89]$, it increases the cost, so the fact that link e has a negative importance value makes sense; over ne, its removal ould, on the erage, improve e network ficiency!

Node	Importance Value	Importance Ranking	tii
1	1.0000	1	W
2	0.2604	2	a١
3	0.2604	2	th
4	1.0000	1	ef

The Advantages of the N-Q Network Efficiency Measure

- The measure captures demands, flows, costs, and behavior of users, in addition to network topology.
- The resulting importance definition of network components is applicable and well-defined even in the case of disconnected networks.
- It can be used to identify the importance (and ranking) of either nodes, or links, or both.
- It can be applied to assess the efficiency/performance of a wide range of network systems.
- It is applicable also to elastic demand networks (Qiang and Nagurney, *Optimization Letters* (2008)).
- It is applicable to dynamic networks (Nagurney and Qiang, Netnomics (2008)).