

# Finding Optimal Sharing Point in Shared Delivery Services Using Google OR-Tools

Peyman Hashemi Baragoori<sup>1</sup>, Bekir Bartin<sup>2</sup>

| Notation         | Description   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| V                | The set of all nodes  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| СИ               | The set of customers' nodes (i.e., delivery points)                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH               | The set of sharing nodes  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square_k$      | The set of origin of two drivers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <i>i, j</i>      | The indices of all nodes  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| k                | The indices of drivers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ď                | The index of the virtual depot  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| V <sub>ijk</sub> | Binary variable if driver <i>k</i> goes from point <i>i</i> to <i>j</i> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $EN_{j}$         | Number of entering edges to node <i>j</i>                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $EX_j$           | Number of leaving edges from node <i>j</i>                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ц <sub>j</sub>   | Number of nodes visited at node <i>j</i>                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Z <sub>j</sub>   | Binary variable if node / selected as a sharing point                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| С <sub>ј</sub>   | Considered traveling cost from node /to /                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\int_{j}$       | Considered cumulative cost for node <i>j</i>                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| М                | A big integer number  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $DT_k$           | Driving Time of driver k  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $WT_k$           | Waiting Time of driver k at OSP   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DET              | Delivery Completion Time  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Stages of a hypothetical shared delivery process

Customer

OSP

Driver 1

Driver 2

DUMLUPINAR

ERYOLU

- The case study area, covers two neighborhoods, namely Umraniye and Atasehir, located in the Asian side of Istanbul, Turkey, spanning approximately 21.8 square kilometers.
- A total of 30 customers were selected for the analysis.
- 🗖 In order to encompass the area, 60 points for sharing have been chosen strategically based on isochrone maps, ensuring coverage within a two-minute travel time threshold.

## Two scenarios were examined to analyze the model's outcomes. Scenario I focused on prioritizing the model's emphasis on optimizing the minimization of the duration of the longest route, while in Scenario II, the goal was to minimize the total time of two drivers' paths.

Ümraniye

Driver 2

KÜCÜKBAKKAL

© Mapbox © OpenStreetMa



In Scenario I, the total delivery time for all parcels, amounted to 6,704 seconds, with 3,368 seconds for driver 1 and 3,336 seconds for driver 2, respectively. The delivery time difference of 32 seconds between the two drivers is negligible in practice, and the delivery task was completed at DCT=3,368.

- In Scenario II, the total delivery time for all parcels amounted to 6,694 seconds, with 2,167 seconds for driver 1 and 4,527 seconds for driver 2. Comparatively, the summation of DT and WT decreased by 10 seconds compared to Scenario I.
- $\Box$  However, the delivery time difference between the two drivers is 2,360 seconds, and clearly, a balance in driving time was not achieved, as was the case in Scenario I

## This paper addressed the finding of OSP for two delivery drivers, modeling it as a multi-depot open-VRP and solving it with the Google OR-Tools routing solver. Our approach addressed these key objectives:

- Minimizing DCT to prioritize timely services.
- Implementing a simultaneous sharing process without the need for physical transfer nodes.
- Incorporating actual network topology and traffic considerations.
- Adding flexibility to the sharing process by considering customer nodes as additional potential sharing points. IV. The model's flexibility enables users to customize parameters and coefficients for diverse objectives, whether prioritizing total delivery time or minimizing driving time for drivers in different scenarios.

Conclusions









TRBAM-24-04470

Details of costs for each considered plan (all units are in seconds)

| Ontimization Seconania | Driver 1        |                 |       | Driver 2 |                 |       | Total |     |         |       |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|----------|-----------------|-------|-------|-----|---------|-------|
|                        | DT <sub>1</sub> | WT <sub>1</sub> | Total | $DT_2$   | WT <sub>2</sub> | Total | DT    | WT  | DT + WT | DCT   |
| Scenario I             | 3,270           | 98              | 3,368 | 3,336    | 0               | 3,336 | 6,606 | 98  | 6,704   | 3,368 |
| Scenario II            | 2,051           | 116             | 2,167 | 4,527    | 0               | 4,527 | 6,578 | 116 | 6,694   | 4,527 |