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#### Abstract

The VRP has been broadly developed with additional feature such as deliveries, selective pickups and time windows. This paper presents the application of an open source spreadsheet solver in single depot routing problem. This study focuses on Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) Company as a case study. The objective of this research is to minimize the distance travel. This research begins by collecting data from a respective FMCG Company. A FMCG company based in Jakarta, Indonesia provides drinking water packaged in gallon. This FMCG Company have two distributions characteristic. Head office distribution was used in this case study due to highest internally rejected by company such as un-routed order, no visit, not enough time to visit and transportation issue. Based on computational results, overall solutions to delivered 214 gallons to 26 customers having total distance travelled 56.76 km , total driving time 2 hour and 49 minutes, total driver working time 7 hours and 57 minutes. Total savings of distances travelled between current route and the proposed solutions using open source spreadsheet solver is 7.25 km . As a result, an open source spreadsheet solver can be implemented in FMCG Company for single depot routing problem.
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## 1. Introduction

Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP) first proposed more than sixty years ago by Dantzig and Ramser [1] then improved by Clarke and Wright using
savings algorithm [2]. The VRP has been broadly developed with additional feature such as deliveries, selective pickups time windows [3]. The VRP is a NP-hard type [4], [5] and formulated under characteristic of the customers, order characteristics and type of vehicles [6]. The VRP plays a major role in area of supply chain management [7] especially in transported of physical goods and services. The VRP is used methods to minimize the cost and duration of transportations through determine the optimal distribution route of products from depot to consumers. The Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP) also has high potential in green logistics by saving environmental costs such as noise, pollution and fuel consumption [8]. But due to complexity to solving a VRP and associated solution algorithms including it large several of constraints, recent development of VRP algorithms are developed in C++ [8], [10], and [11].

There is a need of VRP solver based on Microsoft Excel since it was the common software for quantitative analysis throughout the world, in both scholars and practitioners [12]. Thus, Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) Company possibly can make positive changes in terms of minimizing the logistic costs with creating optimal routing. The VRP spreadsheet solver should be simple in terms of user interface, flexibility, and accessibility to overcome the problems. The VRP spreadsheet solver also have to generate optimal routes and fulfilling all constrains that have been set.

Recently, Erdogan introduced a VRP solver using Microsoft Excel for solving Vehicle Routing Problem [13], [14]. An open source spreadsheet solver is used a unified formulation [13] that
comprises broad variants of VRP. It also presented two case studies of routing problem in healthcare and tourism sectors. Based on the literature reviews cited, this paper motivates the authors to use Open Source Spreadsheet Solver to solve single depot vehicle routing problem in FMCG Company based in Jakarta, Indonesia. The objective of this paper is to minimize the distance travel from the perspective of simple and friendly user interface.

## 2. Literature Review

The field of Vehicle Routing Problem is mature, and many approaches variants have been developed in recent years. A survey has been classified VRP applied methods variants into four categories such as heuristic approaches, meta-heuristics, exact methods and hybrid methods [15]. Categories of VRP applied methods variants are shown in Figure 1.


Figure 1. Vehicle Routing Problem Applied Methods Variants

Some heuristic approaches to solve a VRP are as follows: Gendreau, et al [16] optimized the planned routes real-time using neighborhood search; Nagata, et al [17] using ejection pool, powerful insertion and guided local search to suggest a route minimization; Pang [18] presented an adaptive parallel scheme for route construction and Belfiore, et al [22] propose a scatter search approach.

Many meta-heuristic algorithms are developed in the last decade, the most successful being the Adaptive Large Neighborhood Search [19], Iterated Local Search [20], and Genetic Algorithms [21]. Some of meta-heuristic are as follows: GarciaNajera, et al [23] proposed to solve multi-objective problem using multi-objective evolutionary algorithm. Yu, et al [24] proposes optimization using an improved ant colony. Balseiro, et al [25] presents an Ant Colony System algorithm hybridized of an Ant Colony System algorithm.

The variants of exact methods are as follows: Azi, et al [26] introduced a branch-and-price approach. Gutiérrez-Jarpa, et al [3] proposed VRP with Deliveries, Selective Pickups and Time Windows solving using a branch-and-price algorithm. Oesterle, et al [27] proposed VRP with Mixed Linehaul and Backhaul Customers, Heterogeneous Fleet, Time Window and Manufacturing Capacity using exact methods. VRP solving with combination of two methods or more are called as hybrid methods such as sweep algorithm plus ant colony system to solve classical VRP [28].

In addition of applied methods variants, VRP also have variants in terms of problem physical characteristics. A brief list of VRP variants in terms of problem physical characteristics are as follows: number of depots [2], [9]; time window type [3], [17], [18], [22] - [27]; number of vehicles [2], [26]; capacity consideration [4], [10], [29]; and travel time [30]. Categories of VRP physical characteristic variants are shown in Figure 2.


Figure 2. Vehicle Routing Problem Physical Characteristics Variants

## 3. Methodology

The main method for this research is using the application of an Open Source Spreadsheet Solver that focused in certain elements which is measured to decrease the distanced travelled by setting up the optimal route although this solver is used a unified formulation that comprise large variants of the VRP [13]. Structure of the open source spreadsheets solver are shown in Figure 3.


Figure 3. Structure of Open Source Spreadsheet Solver

This research begins by collecting data from a respective FMCG Company. A FMCG company based in Jakarta, Indonesia provides drinking water packaged in gallon. This FMCG Company have two distributions characteristic. These two distributions characteristics are head office distribution and modern distribution center. In December 2017, 2.90\% or 1001 delivery orders are rejected for internal reason from total 34469 delivery orders. Company policy to internally reject a delivery orders are as follows: un-routed order; no visit; not enough time to visit; transportation issue; sales quota restriction; and unclear address. Total delivery order rejected because of un-routed order, no visit, not enough time to visit and transportation issue are $88,61 \%$ or 887 delivery orders from 1001 delivery orders rejected for internal reason. This issue mostly happens in head office distribution. This paper proposed to use Open Source Spreadsheet Solver to minimize distance travelled with a test case from head office distribution with 26 customers with total delivered order 214 gallons. The current route of this test case has distance travelled 64 km with two trips.

As the problem of internally rejected are also because of not enough time to visit, we set up this visits as time window specified and all delivery order scheduled on a given day must be visited. The service time per customers are simply adjusted
to quantity number of gallon delivered order. In one up to six gallons delivered, service time needed is 11 minutes and increase one minute in addition of one up to six more gallons. This study is considered to set identical vehicles as operational parameters with capacity 140 gallons for each vehicle. Each driver has a driving time limit of 8 hours as per the general regulations about driving, and a working time limit of 9 hours including the lunch break. All trucks eventually go back to the depots using the exact same route traversed in the reverse direction.

Various parameters of this single depot routing problem are filled in solver console worksheet. The number of depots with one and number of customers with 26 were used in this study. In order to achieve the shortest distance, the constraint of average vehicle speed to fifty kilometers and route type were determined. Next, the number of vehicles type was set to one and every vehicle must return to depot. In addition, time window was set to hard type and no backhauls. CPU time limit to run the solver was set to 60 seconds. A screenshot of the worksheet is presented in Figure 4.

| Sequence | Parameter | Value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0 . O p t i o n a l ~ - ~ G I S ~ L i c e n s e ~}$ | Bing Maps Key | AvJ2YUt24JHXR_6pnqKTxw8myp3MI |
| 1.Locations | Number of depots | 1 |
|  | Number of customers | 26 |
|  | Distance / duration computation | Bing Maps driving distances (km) |
|  | Bing Maps route type | Shortest |
|  | Average vehicle speed | 50 |
|  | Number of vehicle types | 1 |
| 3.Vehicles | Vehicles must return to the depot? | Yes |
| 4.Solution | Time window type | Hard |
|  | Backhauls? | No |
|  | Visualization background | Bing Maps |
| $\mathbf{5 . O p t i o n a l ~ - ~ V i s u a l i z a t i o n ~}$ | Location labels | Location IDs |
| $\mathbf{6 . S o l v e r}$ | Warm start? | No |
|  | Show progress on the status bar? | Yes |
|  | CPU time limit (seconds) | 60 |

Figure 4. VRP Solver Console Worksheet
The next step is set up the locations worksheet and filled in the details about information location and service time. Latitude and longitude are used to ensure the accurate customer locations. Time windows starts at 07:00 and ends at 16:00. Every customer is set to must be visited, and service time is adjusted with number of gallons to be delivered. A screenshot of locations worksheet is presented in Figure 5.

| Locatio n ID | Name | Latitude (y) | Longitude (x) | Time window start | Time window end | Must be visited? | Service time | Pickup amount | Delivery amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | Depot | -6.18880 | 106.91110 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Starting location | 0:00 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | Customer 1 | -6.23169 | 106.82734 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | Customer 2 | -6.22767 | 106.83348 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | Customer 3 | -6.22422 | 106.84256 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | Customer 4 | -6.23045 | 106.82562 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | Customer 5 | -6.23250 | 106.82920 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:12 | 8 | 8 |
| 6 | Customer 6 | -6.22422 | 106.84256 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:18 | 43 | 43 |
| 7 | Customer 7 | -6.22787 | 106.83315 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | Customer 8 | -6.22396 | 106.84286 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:17 | 42 | 42 |
| 9 | Customer 9 | -6.23169 | 106.82735 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:10 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Customer 10 | -6.22787 | 106.83315 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:10 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Customer 11 | -6.23045 | 106.82562 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | Customer 12 | -6.22750 | 106.83377 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:12 | 7 | 7 |
| 13 | Customer 13 | -6.23045 | 106.82562 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 1 | 1 |
| 14 | Customer 14 | -6.22444 | 106.84229 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:14 | 24 | 24 |
| 15 | Customer 15 | -6.23071 | 106.82736 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 5 | 5 |
| 16 | Customer 16 | -6.23119 | 106.82741 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:13 | 15 | 15 |
| 17 | Customer 17 | -6.22767 | 106.83348 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:12 | 9 | 9 |
| 18 | Customer 18 | -6.23078 | 106.82742 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 4 | 4 |
| 19 | Customer 19 | -6.23045 | 106.82562 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 4 | 4 |
| 20 | Customer 20 | -6.23112 | 106.82719 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:12 | 12 | 12 |
| 21 | Customer 21 | -6.22767 | 106.83348 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 2 | 2 |
| 22 | Customer 22 | -6.23067 | 106.82714 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 1 | 1 |
| 23 | Customer 23 | -6.23200 | 106.82900 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:12 | 9 | 9 |
| 24 | Customer 24 | -6.22785 | 106.83347 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 1 | 1 |
| 25 | Customer 25 | -6.22767 | 106.83355 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:11 | 2 | 2 |
| 26 | Customer 26 | -6.23063 | 106.82745 | 07:00 | 16:00 | Must be visited | 0:12 | 7 | 7 |

Figure 5. Locations Worksheet
After the solver console and locations worksheet filled, set up distances worksheet was determined. In distances worksheet, the distance and duration automatically populate to get shortest route. This worksheet populates all the distances and travel durations between every two points that are specified in the Locations worksheet. A screenshot of sample locations worksheet is presented in

| From | To | Distance | Duration |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Depot | Depot | 0.00 | $0: 00$ |
| Depot | Customer 1 | 13.54 | $0: 38$ |
| Depot | Customer 2 | 12.43 | $0: 39$ |
| Depot | Customer 3 | 10.83 | $0: 31$ |
| Depot | Customer 4 | 13.39 | $0: 37$ |
| Depot | Customer 5 | 13.43 | $0: 35$ |
| Depot | Customer 6 | 10.83 | $0: 31$ |

Figure 6. Detail Distances Worksheet Figure 6 and detail distances for every point is presented in Figure 7.

|  | Depot | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | C7 | C8 | C9 | C10 | C11 | C12 | C13 | C14 | C15 | C16 | C17 | C18 | C19 | C20 | C21 | C22 | C23 | C24 | C25 | C26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depot |  | 13.60 | 13.84 | 10.68 | 13.86 | 13.33 | 10.68 | 13.62 | 10.83 | 13.60 | 13.62 | 13.86 | 13.82 | 13.86 | 10.70 | 13.61 | 13.68 | 13.84 | 13.62 | 13.86 | 13.70 | 13.84 | 13.63 | 13.37 | 13.71 | 13.83 | 13.60 |
| C1 | 13.54 |  | 2.49 | 3.67 | 1.02 | 0.75 | 3.67 | 2.27 | 3.82 | 0.00 | 2.27 | 1.02 | 2.47 | 1.02 | 3.72 | 0.42 | 0.16 | 2.49 | 0.42 | 1.02 | 0.10 | 2.49 | 0.44 | 0.58 | 2.35 | 2.48 | 0.41 |
| C2 | 12.43 | 35 |  | 2.42 | 3.62 | 3.08 | 42 | 3.06 | 2.58 | 3.35 | 3.06 | 3.62 | 0.25 | 3.62 | 2.48 | 3.36 | 3.42 | 0.00 | 3.36 | 3.62 | 3.45 | 0.00 | 3.37 | 3.12 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 3.35 |
| C3 | 10.83 | 3.31 | 3.55 |  | 3.57 | . 04 | 0.00 | 3.33 | 0.15 | 3.31 | 3.33 | 3.57 | 3.53 | 3.57 | 0.05 | 3.32 | 3.38 | 3.55 | 3.32 | 3.57 | 3.41 | 3.55 | 3.33 | 3.08 | 3.42 | 3.54 | 3.31 |
| C4 | 13.39 | 0.79 | 2.52 | 3.52 |  | 0.78 | 3.52 | 2.30 | 3.67 | 0.79 | 2.30 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 3.57 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 2.52 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 2.52 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 2.39 | 2.51 | 0.63 |
| C5 | 13.43 | 0.29 | 2.14 | 3.55 | 0.54 |  | 3.55 | 1.93 | 3.71 | 0.29 | 1.93 | 0.54 | 2.12 | 0.54 | 3.61 | 0.71 | 0.44 | 2.14 | 0.71 | 0.54 | 0.38 | 2.14 | 0.72 | 0.24 | 2.01 | 2.14 | 0.69 |
| C6 | 10.83 | 3.31 | 3.55 | 00 | 57 | 3.04 |  | 3.33 | 0.15 | 3.31 | 3.33 | 3.57 | . 53 | 3.57 | 0.05 | 3.32 | 3.38 | 3.55 | 3.32 | 3.57 | 3.41 | 3.55 | 3.33 | 3.08 | 3.42 | 3.54 | 3.31 |
| C7 | 12.41 | 1.30 | 1.20 | 3.35 | 1.56 | 1.03 | 3.35 |  | 3.50 | 1.30 | 0.00 | 1.56 | 1.18 | 1.56 | 3.40 | 1.31 | 1.37 | 1.20 | 1.31 | 1.56 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.32 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.19 | 1.30 |
| C8 | 11.10 | 3.50 | 3.74 | 0.27 | 3.76 | 3.23 | 0.27 | 3.52 |  | 3.50 | 3.52 | 3.76 | 3.72 | 3.76 | 0.33 | 3.51 | 3.58 | 3.74 | 3.52 | 3.76 | 3.60 | 3.74 | 3.53 | 3.27 | 3.61 | 3.73 | 3.50 |
| C9 | 13.54 | 00 | 2.49 | 67 | . 22 | 0.75 | 67 | 27 | 3.82 |  | 2.27 | 1.02 | 47 | 1.02 | 3.72 | 0.42 | 0.16 | 2.49 | 0.42 | 1.02 | 0.10 | 2.49 | 0.44 | 0.58 | 2.35 | 2.48 | 0.41 |
| C10 | 12.41 | 1.30 | 1.20 | 3.35 | 1.56 | 03 | 3.35 | 0.00 | 3.50 | 1.30 |  | 1.56 | 18 | 1.56 | 3.40 | 1.31 | 1.37 | 1.20 | 1.31 | 1.56 | 1.40 | . 20 | 1.32 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.19 | 1.30 |
| C11 | 13.39 | 0.79 | 2.52 | 3.52 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 3.52 | . 30 | 3.67 | 0.79 | 2.30 |  | 2.50 | 0.00 | 3.57 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 2.52 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 2.52 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 2.39 | 2.51 | 0.63 |
| C12 | 12.41 | 3.33 | 3.26 | 2.41 | 3.60 | 3.06 | 2.41 | 3.04 | 2.56 | 3.33 | 3.04 | 3.60 |  | 3.60 | 2.46 | 3.34 | 3.41 | 3.26 | 3.34 | 3.60 | 3.43 | 3.26 | 3.36 | 3.10 | 3.12 | 3.25 | 3.33 |
| C13 | 13.39 | . 79 | 2.52 | 3.52 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 3.52 | 2.30 | 3.67 | 79 | 2.30 | 0.00 | 50 |  | 3.57 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 2.5 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 2.52 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 2.39 | 2.51 | 0.63 |
| C14 | 10.77 | 3.26 | 3.49 | 47 | . 51 | 2.98 | 1.47 | 3.28 | 1.62 | 3.26 | 3.28 | 3.51 | 3.47 | 51 |  | 3.27 | 3.33 | 3.49 | 3.27 | 3.51 | 3.36 | 3.49 | 3.28 | 3.02 | 3.36 | 3.49 | 3.25 |
| C15 | 13.44 | 0.25 | 2.39 | 3.57 | 0.92 | 0.66 | 3.57 | 2.17 | 3.73 | 0.25 | 2.17 | 0.92 | 2.37 | 0.92 | 3.63 |  | 0.06 | 2.39 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.35 | 2.39 | 0.01 | 0.49 | 2.26 | 2.38 | 0.31 |
| C16 | 13.38 | 0.19 | 2.33 | 3.51 | 0.86 | 0.59 | 3.51 | 2.11 | 3.66 | 0.19 | 2.11 | 0.86 | 2.31 | 0.86 | 3.56 | 0.26 |  | 2.33 | 0.26 | 0.86 | 0.29 | 2.33 | 0.28 | 0.42 | 2.20 | 2.32 | 0.25 |
| C17 | 12.43 | 3.35 | 0.00 | 2.42 | 3.62 | 3.08 | 42 | 3.06 | 2.58 | 3.35 | 3.06 | 3.62 | 0.25 | 3.62 | 48 | 3.36 | 42 |  | 3.36 | 3.62 | 3.45 | 0.00 | 3.37 | 3.12 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 3.35 |
| C18 | 13.44 | 0.25 | 2.39 | 57 | 0.92 | 0.65 | 57 | 2.17 | 3.72 | 25 | 2.17 | 0.92 | 2.37 | 0.92 | . 63 | 33 | . 06 | 2.39 |  | 0.92 | 0.35 | 2.39 | 0.01 | 0.48 | 2.26 | 2.38 | 0.31 |
| C19 | 13.39 | 0.79 | 2.52 | 3.52 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 3.52 | 2.30 | 3.67 | 0.79 | 2.30 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 3.57 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 2.52 | 0.64 |  | 0.89 | 2.52 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 2.39 | 2.51 | 0.63 |
| C20 | 13.44 | 0.25 | 2.39 | 3.57 | 92 | 0.65 | 3.57 | 2.17 | 3.72 | 0.25 | 2.17 | . 92 | 37 | 0.92 | 3.62 | . 32 | 0.06 | 2.39 | 0.32 | 0.92 |  | 2.39 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 2.25 | 2.38 | 0.31 |
| C21 | 12.43 | 3.35 | 0.00 | 2.42 | 3.6 | 3.08 | 2.42 | 3.06 | 2.58 | 3.35 | 3.06 | 3.62 | . 25 | 3.62 | 2.48 | 3.36 | 3.42 | 0.00 | 3.36 | 3.62 | 3.45 |  | 3.3 | 3.12 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 3.35 |
| C22 | 3.43 | 0.24 | 2.38 | 3.56 | 0.91 | . 64 | 36 | 2.16 | 3.71 | 0.24 | 2.16 | 0.91 | 2.36 | 0.91 | 3.61 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 2.38 | 0.31 | 0.91 | 0.34 | 2.38 |  | 0.47 | 2.25 | 2.37 | 0.30 |
| C23 | 13.19 | 0.46 | 1.91 | 3.31 | 0.71 | 0.17 | 3.31 | 1.69 | 3.47 | 0.46 | 1.69 | 0.71 | 1.88 | 0.71 | 3.37 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 1.91 | 0.24 | 0.71 | 0.55 | 1.91 | 0.26 |  | 1.77 | 1.90 | 0.23 |
| C24 | 12.56 | 3.48 | 0.13 | 2.56 | 3.75 | 3.21 | 2.56 | 3.19 | 2.71 | 3.48 | 3.19 | 3.75 | 0.39 | 3.75 | 2.61 | 3.49 | 3.56 | 0.13 | 3.49 | 3.75 | 3.58 | 0.13 | 3.51 | 3.25 |  | 0.13 | 3.48 |
| C25 | 12.43 | 3.36 | 0.01 | 2.43 | 3.63 | 3.08 | 2.43 | 3.06 | 2.58 | 3.36 | 3.06 | 3.63 | 0.26 | 3.63 | 2.49 | 3.37 | 3.43 | 0.01 | 3.37 | 3.63 | 3.45 | 0.01 | 3.38 | 3.12 | 0.08 |  | 3.35 |
| C26 | 13.46 | 0.27 | 2.41 | 3.59 | 0.94 | 0.67 | 3.59 | 2.19 | 3.74 | 0.27 | 2.19 | 0.94 | 2.38 | 0.94 | 3.64 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 2.41 | 0.01 | 0.94 | 0.36 | 2.41 | 0.03 | 0.50 | 2.27 | 2.40 |  |

Figure 7. Detail Distances Worksheet

The vehicle data including starting point, driving time limit, and the distance limit of the vehicle capacity are filled in vehicles worksheet. The fixed cost per trip and costs per unit distance are set to
zero. This study also set the number of vehicles with two vehicles because the total delivered order is exceeded the capacity of vehicle. A screenshot of the vehicles worksheet is shown in Figure 8.

| Starting depot | Vehicle type | Capacity | Fixed cost per trip | Cost per unit distance | Distance limit | Work start time | Driving time limit | Working time limit | Return depot | Number of vehicles |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depot | T1 | 140 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 200.00 | 07:00 | 8:00 | 9:00 | Depot | 2 |

Figure 8. Vehicles worksheet

## 4. Results

Before continuing to the solver process, a brief of the specification of computer was used to generate the solutions such as Intel i3 CPU running at 3.3 GHz with 4 GB of RAM. All applications are closed except the open source spreadsheet solver.

The solution algorithms of VRP Spreadsheet Solver started with a feasibility check and searches reasons for infeasibility. The search involves customer's data and all constrains that has been set up. If any of the issues are found, the user is alerted with a message, and given a choice to stop or proceed. If the user decides to proceed, the resulting solution will certainly be infeasible but may still be useful. In this trial, the result shows no infeasible alert message. Thus, the solutions generate are feasible and satisfying all the constrains. Proposed route are generate in solutions worksheet including the list of stops for each trip depot to customer to depot, distance travelled, driving time, working time, and maximal load of trucks.

Since the total delivered order is exceeded the truck capacity there will be two solutions generated by spreadsheet solver. Screenshots of solutions worksheet is presented in Figure 9 and Figure 10.

| Vehicle: | V1 |  | Stops: | 13 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stop count |  | Location name | Distance travelled | Driving time | Working time | Lo: |
|  | 0 | Depot | 0.00 | 0:00 | 0:00 | 1 |
|  | 1 | Customer 12 | 12.41 | 0:38 | 0:50 | 1 |
|  | 2 | Customer 21 | 12.66 | 0:39 | 1:02 | 1 |
|  | 3 | Customer 17 | 12.66 | 0:39 | 1:14 | 1 |
|  | 4 | Customer 2 | 12.66 | 0:39 | 1:25 | 1 |
|  | 5 | Customer 25 | 12.67 | 0:39 | 1:36 | 1 |
|  | 6 | Customer 24 | 12.80 | 0:39 | 1:47 | 1 |
|  | 7 | Customer 10 | 13.86 | 0:42 | 2:00 | 1 |
|  | 8 | Customer 7 | 13.86 | 0:42 | 2:11 | 1 |
|  | 9 | Customer 14 | 17.14 | 0:50 | 2:33 | 1 |
|  | 10 | Customer 6 | 17.19 | 0:50 | 2:51 | 1 |
|  | 11 | Customer 8 | 17.46 | 0:51 | 3:09 | 1 |
|  | 12 | Customer 3 | 17.61 | 0:52 | 3:21 | 1 |
|  | 13 | Depot | 28.29 | 1:23 | 3:52 | 1 |

Figure 9. Solutions worksheet of $1^{\text {st }}$ trip

| Vehicle: | V2 | Stops: | 15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stop count | Location name | Distance travelled | Driving time | Working time | Load |
| 0 | Depot | 0.00 | 0:00 | 0:00 | 74 |
| 1 | Customer 19 | 13.39 | 0:37 | 0:48 | 74 |
| 2 | Customer 13 | 13.39 | 0:37 | 0:59 | 74 |
| 3 | Customer 11 | 13.39 | 0:37 | 1:10 | 74 |
| 4 | Customer 4 | 13.39 | 0:37 | 1:21 | 74 |
| 5 | Customer 20 | 14.31 | 0:41 | 1:37 | 74 |
| 6 | Customer 9 | 14.41 | 0:41 | 1:47 | 74 |
| 7 | Customer 1 | 14.41 | 0:41 | 1:58 | 74 |
| 8 | Customer 16 | 14.59 | 0:42 | 2:12 | 74 |
| 9 | Customer 22 | 14.64 | 0:42 | 2:23 | 74 |
| 10 | Customer 18 | 14.65 | 0:42 | 2:34 | 74 |
| 11 | Customer 15 | 14.65 | 0:42 | 2:45 | 74 |
| 12 | Customer 26 | 14.67 | 0:42 | 2:57 | 74 |
| 13 | Customer 23 | 14.90 | 0:43 | 3:10 | 74 |
| 14 | Customer 5 | 15.13 | 0:44 | 3:23 | 74 |
| 15 | Depot | 28.46 | 1:26 | 4:05 | 74 |

Figure 10. Solutions worksheet of $2^{\text {nd }}$ trip
Based on computational results, solutions to delivered 214 gallons to 26 customers in Single Depot Routing Problem using Open Source Spreadsheet Solver are as follows:
a) First trip has optimal route with 13 stops, maximal load 140; distance travelled 28.29 km; driving time 1 hours and 23 minutes; and working time 3 hours and 52 minutes.
b) Second trip has optimal route with 15 stops, maximal load 74 gallons; distance travelled 28.46 km ; driving time 1 hours and 26 minutes; and working time 4 hours and 5 minutes.

Overall solution of this routing problem are 56.76 km total distances travelled; 2 hour and 49 minutes total driving time; 7 hours and 57 minutes total driving working time. These solutions satisfy all constrains that has been set. Total savings of distances travelled between current route and propose solutions using open source spreadsheet solver is $11.32 \%$ ( 7.25 km ) and shown in Figure 11.


Figure 11. Distances Travelled

## 5. Conclusions

This research proposed to solve single depot routing problem using open source spreadsheet solver and shows the spreadsheet solver was able to generate optimal route to minimize the distances travelled and satisfying all constraints that have been set. The current condition using the existing methods in the company have distances travelled 64.00 km to deliver 214 gallons to 26 customers. By using open source spreadsheet solver eventually distances travelled are 56.76 km and saving 11.32 \% (7.25 km).

It is agreed that VRP Spreadsheet Solver has high potential tool to be implemented due to its simplicity, flexibility, accurate estimation and accessibility. For further work, VRP Spreadsheet Solver need to automatically calculate the number of trip and vehicle needed if delivered order exceeded the capacity of vehicle.
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