OPERATIONS RESEARCH CENTER

working paper

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

DECOMPOSITION METHODS FOR
MATHEMATICAL PROGRAMMING/ECONOMIC EQUILIBRIUM
ENERGY PLANNING MODELS

by

J.F. Shapiro

OR 063-77 March 1977

Supported in part by the U.S. Army Research Office (Durham) under contract No. DAAG29-76-C-0064.

ABSTRACT

A number of energy planning models have been proposed for combining econometric submodels which forecast the supply and demand for energy commodities with a linear programming submodel which optimizes the processing and transportation of these commodities. We show how convex analysis can be used to decompose these planning models into their econometric and linear programming components. Various methods are given for optimizing the decomposition, or equivalently, for computing economic equilibria for the planning models.

1. Introduction

A number of energy planning models have recently been implemented or proposed which combine (1) econometric submodels for forecasting supply and demand for energy commodities as functions of the prices on these commodities with (2) a linear programming submodel for optimizing the processing and transportation of the commodities. Specific models include, for example, the FEA Project Independence Evaluation System (Hogan [11]), the world oil market model of Kennedy [15] , and a proposed integration of the Brookhaven Energy System Optimization Model (Hoffman [10]), with econometric models developed by Data Resources, Inc. (Jorgenson [13]). The models are equilibrium models because prices, commodities supplied and demanded, and process and transporation activity levels are all variables to be determined simultaneously in a generic time period in equilibrium. The equilibrium conditions can be interpreted as necessary and sufficient Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions for a related concave programming problem which has its own interpretation.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss how mathematical programming methods can be used to decompose the concave programming problem, and thereby the equilibrium model, into its linear programming and econometric parts. The linear programming submodel communicates with the econometric submodels by passing to them vectors of shadow prices on the energy commodities. The shadow prices are optimal for the linear programming submodel with fixed commodity levels. The econometric submodels compare the shadow prices with the vector of commodity prices required to produce the fixed commodity levels assumed in the linear programming solution. If these two price vectors are equal, then an equilibrium solution has been reached.[1] Equivalently, the equilibrium conditions establish optimality of the prices, commodity levels and processing and distribution levels in the implied concave programming problem.

Although we will focus our attention on the analysis and solution of mathematical programming/economic equilibrium models arising in energy planning, the approach is appropriate to similar models in other areas. Included are agriculture models such as the U.S. agriculture sector model of Hall et. al. [8] , the world wheat market model of Schmitz and Bawden [26] , and the water resources planning model of Flinn and Guise [6] .

The plan of this paper is the following. Section two contains a statement of the basic concave programming problem to be analyzed, plus a discussion of how it has been used in energy modeling. The following section contains the Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions for the mathematical programming problem which we interpret as economic equilibrium conditions. Two of these optimality conditions constitute the interface between econometric forecasting of supply and demand for energy commodities and the optimization of processing and transporting these commodities. Section four discusses decomposition methods, based on the optimality conditions, for computing an optimal solution to the concave programming problem, or equivalently, for computing an economic equilibrium. The final section, section five, discusses a number of future areas of research.

---

[1] Strict equality is not required between the shadow and commodity price for a commodity at a zero level.

2. Mathematical Programming/Economic Equilibrium Models

In its mathematical programming form, the basic problem we wish to analyze and solve is

$$\phi^* = \max\{f(d) - g(s) - cx\} \quad \text{(1a)}$$

$$\text{s.t. } A^1 x - s \leq 0 \quad \text{(1b)}$$

$$A^2 x - d \geq 0 \quad \text{(1c)}$$

$$s \geq 0,\ d \geq 0,\ x \geq 0 \quad \text{(1d)}$$

where f and -g are concave differentiable functions. It is assumed that (1) has an optimal solution. The vector d is the demand for energy commodities and the vector s is the supply of these commodities. For reasons that will become clear later, we assume that the inverse functions ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1} exist on the non-negative orthant. According to the inverse function theorem (e.g. Apostol, [1]; p. 144), ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1} will exist on the non-negative orthant if ∇f and ∇g have continuous first partials and non-vanishing Jacobians on that region. As we shall see in the following section, the econometric specification of f and g will actually be given by ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1}. For the moment, the intuitive justification that f is concave is that the social benefit f(d) due to satisfied demand d increases monotonically, but at a decreasing rate. Conversely, the function g is convex because the cost g(s) of delivering the supply s increases monotonically, but at an increasing rate since the less expensive quantities are supplied first.

The assumption that ∇f and ∇g are invertible, and particularly that ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1} are integrable are reasonable but controversial according to the economic theory of consumer demand. A great deal of research has been devoted to this question beginning with Samuelson [24] and continuing until the present work of Kihlstrom, Mas-Colell and Sonneschein [16]. We will not enter into a discussion of this controversy here, but assume that problem (1) exists from which the equilibrium problem to be stated below can be derived. The decomposition approach is still valid for the equilibrium problem which can be solved by some of the methods to be discussed. We will indicate when this is the case.

The only distinction made between the treatment of supply and demand in problem (1) is that f is concave and g is convex. The lack of distinction is suitable for the purposes of this paper, but energy supply models can and probably should be more normative than empirical as we assume to be the case here. In other words, we assume here that empirical econometric functions ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1} are given rather than deriving f and g from a normative submodel. Modiano and Shapiro [19] give some related work on the use of decomposition methods to construct and analyze normative supply models in which the supplier attempts to maximize the net present value of his holdings.

The Project Independence Evaluation System Integrating Model (PIES) of the FEA (Hogan [11]) is a U.S. energy sector model very similar to problem (1). The supply commodities in that model are coal, oil, gas, synthetics and imports in different regions of the United States. The commodities demanded are the same physical commodities for industrial, commercial and residential use, again in different regions of the United States. The FEA model also considers, at least implicitly, cross cut constraints of the form $Bx \leq b$ involving scarce national resources such as steel and capital availability. Hogan [11] gives an ad-hoc decomposition scheme for solving PIES which we discuss at the end of section 4 and contrast it with our approach.

The world oil market model of Kennedy [15] is an equilibrium model derived from a problem of the form (1) where the functions f and g are quadratic. The commodities in Kennedy's model are crude and refined petroleum products in different regions of the world and the activities are the transportation of crude from one region to another and the production of refined products from crude in each region. Since f and g are quadratic, the equilibrium problem is linear and can be solved as a linear complementarity problem (Cottle and Dantzig [2]). Actually, Kennedy does not discuss the integrability of his econometric functions of ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1} which depends upon whether or not the corresponding matrices in the linear system are symmetric. In general, the symmetry of the Hessians of f and g in (1), if they exist, is what is required for the integrability of ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1}. Kihlstrom et al [16] in turn show that this symmetry is closely related to the strong axiom of revealed preference of consumer demand theory.

The Brookhaven Energy System Optimization Model (BESOM) of Hoffman [10] of the U.S. energy sector assumes supply and demand in problem (1) are exogeneously set, and the objective is to minimize the cost of processing and transportation. The model is essentially a generalized transportation problem with side constraints for environmental control. An extension of BESOM to include endogenous supplies of coal, gas and oil using simple nonlinear supply functions has been solved using one of the decomposition approaches of section 4 by Shapiro, White and Wood [28].

Jergenson [13] discusses a project to combine BESOM with the interindustry economic model developed by Data Resources, Inc.

3. Optimality/Equilibrium Conditions

The interpretation of the Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions for a variety of economic models as the embodiment of market equilibrium conditions has long been recognized (e.g., see Karlin [14], Intrilligator [12]. These models are generally theoretical and the optimality conditions are used to study existence, uniqueness and stability of the equilibrium solution. The difference with the energy planning models discussed in the previous section is that they are <u>empirical</u> models consisting of two distinctly different types of submodels which need to be hooked together; namely, econometric and linear programming submodels. In this context, the Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions provide a practical mechanism for integrating these diverse models. Moreover, the purpose of an implemented energy model similar to (1) is to provide numerical answers. The optimality conditions are used in the following section to derive decomposition solution methods for numerically optimizing problem (1).

Let p and q be vectors of <u>shadow prices</u> on the constraints (1b) and (1c), respectively. The optimality conditions are: The solution $\bar{s}$, $\bar{d}$, $\bar{x}$ is optimal in problem (1) if and only if there exist shadow prices $\bar{p}$, $\bar{q}$ satisfying

$$\nabla g(\bar{s}) - \bar{p} \geq 0 \quad \text{with equality if } \bar{s}_i > 0 \tag{2a}$$

$$\nabla f(\bar{d}) - \bar{q} \leq 0 \quad \text{with equality if } \bar{d}_j > 0 \tag{2b}$$

$$c + \bar{p}A^1 - \bar{q}A^2 \geq 0 \text{ with equality if } \bar{x}_k > 0 \tag{2c}$$

$$\bar{p}(A^1\bar{x} - \bar{s}) = 0 \quad (3a)$$

$$\bar{q}(A^2\bar{x} - \bar{d}) = 0 \quad (3b)$$

$$A^1\bar{x} - \bar{s} \leq 0 \quad (4a)$$

$$A^2\bar{x} - \bar{d} \geq 0 \quad (4b)$$

$$\bar{s} \geq 0,\ \bar{d} \geq 0,\ \bar{x} \geq 0,\ \bar{p} \geq 0,\ \bar{q} \geq 0 \quad (4c)$$

The connection between the econometric forecasting submodels and the linear programming submodel is effected by the conditions (2a) and (2b). To see this, let $u = \nabla g(s)$ and $v = \nabla f(d)$ denote vectors of commodity prices on supply and demand, respectively. Then if $\bar{s}_i > 0$, condition (2a) states that $\bar{u}_i = \bar{p}_i$; that is, the commodity price for supply commodity i equals the shadow price for that commodity and they are in equilibrium. If $\bar{s}_i = 0$, then we permit $\bar{u}_i \geq \bar{p}_i$ because a further lowering of the supply price on commodity i would not induce the supply to increase from 0. A similar argument holds for the optimality condition (2b) on the equilibrium between prices on demand commodities and the relevant shadow prices. An equilibrium interpretation of the other optimality conditions is well known and straightforward and is therefore omitted. Note, however, that this interpretation does not depend on the sufficiency of the Kuhn-Tucker conditions due to the concavity of f and -g. If for some reason these functions were not concave, then some solutions to the optimality conditions might not be optimal for problem (1) although they could still be interpreted as equilibrium solutions.

Thus far we have not considered the computational and empirical consequences of trying to establish the optimality conditions. Before entering into a discussion about solution methods, it is important to emphasize that typical econometric submodels are designed to compute s from u and d from v, rather than the inverse relation as we have stated it in (2a) and (2b). In other words, the econometric submodels consist of the functions ∇g^{-1} and ∇f^{-1} which are used to compute $s = \nabla g^{-1}(u)$ and $d = \nabla f^{-1}(v)$. This implies that in order to hook up the econometric submodels with the linear programming submodel, we must assume that the econometric mappings $G = \nabla g^{-1}$ and $F = \nabla f^{-1}$ can be inverted at various points to give us the values of $\nabla g = G^{-1}$ and $\nabla f = F^{-1}$ at these points for use in testing the optimality conditions. This might be done functionally, or by some iterative procedure which exploits the monotonicity and continuity of ∇g^{-1} and ∇f^{-1}.

4. Decomposition Methods

In this section, we discuss how problem (1) can be solved by decomposing it into econometric and linear programming submodels using known methods of mathematical programming and decomposition theory. For $s \geq 0$, $d \geq 0$, define the function

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(s,d) = f(d) - g(s) + \max\ & -cx \\ \text{s.t.}\ & A^1x \leq s \\ & A^2x \geq d \\ & x \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

It can easily be shown that $\phi(s,d)$ is a concave function. Moreover, it is continuous, but not everywhere differentiable on the convex subset of the non-negative orthant where it is finite. By linear programming duality (ruling out the case that $\phi(s,d) = +\infty$ since (1) is assumed to have an optimal solution, but permitting $\phi(s,d) = -\infty$),

$$\phi(s,d) = f(d) - g(s) + \min\ ps - qd \quad \text{s.t. } c + pA^1 - qA^2 \geq 0,\quad p \geq 0,\ q \geq 0. \tag{6}$$

We assume the convex polyhedral set

$$\Pi = \{(p,q) \mid c + pA^1 - qA^2 \geq 0,\quad p \geq 0,\ q \geq 0\} \tag{7}$$

is nonempty. In general, Π will be unbounded because we expect there to be s,d combinations in (5) which do not admit feasible linear programming solutions. The issue of infeasible s,d combinations could and probably should be handled directly in our subsequent development by the generation and use of constraints of the form $p^r s - q^r d \geq 0$ for rays (p^r, q^r) of the polyhedron Π. For expositional reasons, however, we choose to eliminate the possibility that Π is unbounded by assuming that we know a value $M > 0$ such that all p,q satisfying the optimality conditions (2), (3), (4) also satisfy

$$\sum_i p_i + \sum_j q_j \leq M. \tag{8}$$

The addition of the constraint (8) to (7) bounds the dual feasible region and implies that for all $s \geq 0$, $d \geq 0$,

$$\phi(s,d) = f(d) - g(s) + \min_{t=1,\ldots,T} p^t s - q^t d \tag{9}$$

where the (p^t, q^t) are the dual extreme points. Of course, the addition of the contraint (8) to (6) is equivalent to the addition of an activity in (5) that permits a feasible linear programming solution to always be found, but possibly at a very high cost.

The original mathematical programming problem (1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^* &= \max\ \phi(s,d) \\ &\text{s.t. } s \geq 0,\ d \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\phi(s,d)$ is given by (9). The solution of (1) by solving (10) is a decomposition approach which is illustrated schematically in figure 1. The computation alternates between the linear programming submodel and the supply and demand submodels. A feasible solution s,d,x, to (1) is generated each time the LP submodel is solved. As mentioned above, the manner of computing σ and γ in the supply and demand submodels, repectively, depends upon their structure. If (σ, γ) does not satisfy the optimality conditions for problem (1) (equivalent to and derivable from the optimality conditions (2), (3), (4)), the s and d in the LP submodel are changed. The nature of this change depends on the decomposition method. This algorithmic approach to decomposing nonlinear programming problems is not new. What is new is its application to energy planning models where f and g are not explicitly given and where the econometric and linear programming submodels and their realizations as computer systems are not compatible.

Decomposition methods for nondifferentiable optimization problems such as (10) use concepts of convex analysis which we briefly review.


Fix initial values
s ≥ 0, d ≥ 0
s,d
LP submodel
s,d, fixed
compute p,q,x
p,s
q,d
supply submodel
p,s fixed
compute σ = p-∇g(s)
demand submodel
q,d fixed
compute γ = ∇f(d)-q
σ
γ
σ,γ satisfy
optimality
conditions?
Yes — terminate with
optimal s,d,x
No
change step
use σ,γ to
change s,d
s,d

Figure 1

Rockafellar [23] gives a thorough mathematical treatment of convex analysis. Its relation to decomposition methods is developed in detail in Shapiro [29]. A <u>subgradient</u> (σ, γ) of ϕ at (s, d) is a vector satisfying

$$\phi(\bar{s},\bar{d}) \leq \phi(s,d) + \sigma(\bar{s}-s) + \gamma(\bar{d}-d) \quad \text{for all } \bar{s},\bar{d} \tag{11}$$

If there is a unique subgradient of ϕ at s,d, then it is the gradient of ϕ. Any subgradient at (s,d) can be tried as a direction of ascent in maximizing $\phi(s,d)$ because it points into the half space containing all optimal solutions. The difficulty with this approach is that ϕ may not acutally increase in a subgradient direction from (s,d) although (s,d) is not optimal and the function does increase in another subgradient direction.

The difficulty due to multiple subgradients can be overcome by procedures capable of generating, if necessary, the set $\partial\phi(s,d)$ of all subgradients, called the <u>subdifferential</u>. Define the index set

$$T(s,d) = \{t \mid \phi(s,d) = f(d) - g(s) + p^t s - q^t d\}.$$

Then it can be shown that $\partial\phi(s,d)$ is a bounded convex polyhedron with extreme points $(\sigma^t,\gamma^t) = (-\nabla g(s) + p^t, \nabla f(d) - q^t)$ for some of the $t \in T(s,d)$ (see Grinold [7]). The Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions (2), (3), (4) can be restated as follows: The solution $(\bar{s}, \bar{d}) \geq 0$ is optimal in (10) if and only if there exists λ_t, $t \in T(\bar{s}, \bar{d})$ (equivalently $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma}) \in \partial\phi(\bar{s}, \bar{d})$) satisfying

$$\bar{\sigma}_i = -\frac{\partial g(\bar{s})}{\partial s_i} + \sum_{t \in T(\bar{s},\bar{d})} p_i^t \lambda_t \quad \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } \bar{s}_i > 0 \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } \bar{s}_i = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\bar{\gamma}_j = \frac{\partial f_j(\bar{d})}{\partial dj} - \sum_{t \in \Gamma(\bar{s},\bar{d})} q_j^t \lambda_t \quad \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } \bar{d}_j > 0 \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } \bar{d}_j = 0 \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_{t \in T(\bar{s},\bar{d})} \lambda_t = 1$$

$$\lambda_t \geq 0, \ t \in T(\bar{s},\bar{d})$$

The optimality conditions (12) for problem (10) are the basis for solution methods including

(a) subgradient optimization

(b) primal-dual ascent algorithm

(c) simplicial approximation.

(d) generalized linear programming

These methods are not mutually exclusive but complementary, and they could be integrated, at least conceptually, into a hybrid algorithm. Space does not permit us to give a great deal of detail about the application of these methods to (10). Reference is given to more detailed treatments of the methods.

(a) subgradient optimization

This is the simplest to implement but it can require considerable experimentation with parameter settings and could require knowledge about (10) which we do not have. It has worked well for nondifferentiable concave programming problems closely related to the traveling salesman problem (Held and Karp [9]) and machine scheduling problems (Fisher [5]).

The idea is to generate a sequence of non-negative solutions $\{(s^{\ell},d^{\ell})\}_{\ell=1}^{\infty}$ to (10) by the rule

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_i^{\ell+1} &= \max\{s_i^{\ell} + \theta^{\ell}\sigma_i^{\ell},\ 0\} \quad \text{for all } i \\
d_j^{\ell+1} &= \max\{d_j^{\ell} + \theta^{\ell}\gamma_j^{\ell},\ 0\} \quad \text{for all } j
\end{aligned}
\tag{13}
$$

where $(\sigma^{\ell},\gamma^{\ell})$ is any subgradient and the scalars θ^{ℓ} satisfy $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \theta^{\ell} = +\infty$ but $\theta^{\ell} \to 0$. Note that no attempt is made to guarantee that the function ϕ actually increases from point to point. Polyak [21] shows that if $\nabla g(s^{\ell})$ and $\nabla f(d^{\ell})$ are uniformly bounded, then the (s^{ℓ},d^{ℓ}) given by (13) will converge to an optimal solution to (10). Note also that subgradient optimization in the form above can be applied without knowledge of f and g. Moreover, the integrability of ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1} is not invoked indicating that the method might be applicable to the equilibrium problem (2) in the general case when it is not necessarily derived from (1). This is an area of future research.

The theoretical and practical rates of convergence of subgradient optimization as described above may be slow. Thus, Polyak [22] suggests the rule

$$\theta^{\ell} = \rho^{\ell} \frac{(\phi^* - \phi(s^{\ell},d^{\ell}))}{||(\sigma^{\ell},\gamma^{\ell})||^2}, \tag{14}$$

where $0 < \varepsilon_1 < 2 - \varepsilon_2 < 2$ which has proven superior. Note that the formula (14) involves knowledge of the maximal value ϕ^*, which we do not know, and the functional value $\phi(s^\ell, d^\ell)$ (i.e., $f(d^\ell)$ and $g(s^\ell)$), which we do not know explicitly but may be able to compute. Figure 1 is an accurate description of how subgradient optimization would work on problem (10) where the change step is an approximate ascent step in the direction of an optimal solution to (10). ||

(b) primal-dual ascent algorithm

This algorithm is given for the piecewise linear case by Fisher and Shapiro [4] and Fisher, Northup and Shapiro [5], and in the general case by Lemarechal [18]. In order to construct a convergent algorithm, we must settle for an ε-optimal solution ($\varepsilon > 0$) which is any $(\bar{s},\bar{d}) \geq 0$ such that $\phi^* \leq \phi(\bar{s},\bar{d}) + \varepsilon$. The algorithm of Lemarechal (1974) about to be described converges finitely, and ε can be successively reduced if necessary. The algorithm works with ε-subgradients of ϕ which are any vectors (σ,γ) at (s,d) satisfying

$$\phi(\bar{s},\bar{d}) \leq \phi(s,d) + \sigma(\bar{s}-s) + \gamma(\bar{d}-d) + \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \bar{s},\bar{d}.$$

The set of all ε-subgradients is denoted by $\partial\phi_\varepsilon(s,d)$ and it is a convex polyhedron. If we let $T_\varepsilon(s,d) = \{t \mid f(d) - g(s) + p^t s - q^t d \leq \phi(s,d) + \varepsilon\}$, then the extreme points of $\partial\phi_\varepsilon(s,d)$ are included among the points $(\sigma^t,\gamma^t) = (-\nabla g(s) + p^t, \nabla f(d) - q^t)$ for $t \in T_\varepsilon(s,d)$. The conditions (12) with $T(\bar{s},\bar{d})$ replaced by $T_\varepsilon(\bar{s},\bar{d})$ are necessary and sufficient for ε-optimality.

The idea of the algorithm is to try at each point (s,d) to establish the ε-optimality conditions by solving a phase one linear programming problem. Since the set $T_\varepsilon(s,d)$ can be quite large, the procedure begins with a small subset. If the ε-optimality conditions are not established, then a direction of possible ascent is indicated. If this direction contains a solution (s',d') such that $\phi(s',d') > \phi(s,d) + \varepsilon$, then a step is taken. Otherwise, the subset of $T_\varepsilon(s,d)$ is augmented by an ε-subgradient and the phase one linear programming is reoptimized.

The primal-dual ascent algorithm has the advantages over subgradient optimization that it does not require knowledge of ϕ^*, and the sequential values of $\phi(s, d)$ increase by at least ε at each step. It has the disadvantages that it does more work at each point (s, d), requires knowledge of the functional values of $\phi(s, d)$ and it is more complex to program. In terms of figure 1, if the ε-subgradient (σ, γ) does not satisfy the optimality conditions, then the LP submodel may be resolved, perhaps several times, before a change step in an ascent direction is taken. ||

(c) simplicial approximation

This method has been applied to related types of economic equilibrium problems by Scarf and Hansen [25]. In effect, the method performs a very special type of search over a compact set of non-negative (s, d) known to contain an optimal solution to (10). It does not require knowledge of the functional values of $\phi(s, d)$ and it is applicable for solution of the equilibrium problem (2) in the form (12) without the existence of problem (1). The idea is to approximate (12) by subgradients calculated at distinct, but close together points (s, d). Space does not permit a fuller development of this method. Complete details are given by Fisher, Northup, and Shapiro [4] for a mathematical programming problem that is sufficiently similar to (10) for the approach there to be applicable here. In terms of figure 1, the simplicial approximation test for termination is the indicated approximation of the optimality conditions. If these conditions are not satisfied, then instead of the ascent step, we have the exchange of one of the current points in the approximating set for a new point (s, d) for which a subgradient (σ, γ) is calculated as shown. The number of commodities which can be efficiently handled by simplicial approximation is not yet known. For the moment, this number appears to be less than 100, perhaps substantially so. ||

(d) generalized linear programming

This well known decomposition method (e.g., see Lasdon [17]), works with trial solutions s^ℓ, d^ℓ, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$, in a Master linear programming problem which permits all convex combinations of s^ℓ and d^ℓ to be used with convex combinations of the objective function values $f(d^\ell)$ and $-g(s^\ell)$. The Master LP shadow prices are passed to the supply and demand submodels as indicated in figure 1. If the optimality test fails, then new vectors s^{L+1} and/or d^{L+1} are generated and passed to the Master which is resolved. The change steps for this method is actually the addition of points to improve the approximation of f and -g in the Master. The method has been applied to some simple extensions of BESOM with nonlinear supply functions by Shapiro, White and Wood [28]. Convergence to an optimal solution to (10) was quite rapid. Generalized linear programming has the same disadvantage as the primal-dual ascent algorithm that it requires explicit knowledge of functional values of f and g. Moreover, it has proven computationally erratic when applied to other classes of problems. ||

The mathematical programming/economic equilibrium model (1) involves two equivalent sets of variables, the commodity vectors (s, d) and their price vectors (u, v) linked uniquely by the mappings $(\nabla g^{-1}, \nabla f^{-1})$ in one direction and $(\nabla g, \nabla f)$ in the other. The decomposition proposed above searches systematically through commodity space using price information to change commodity levels until an optimal solution is obtained. It appears possible to also construct decomposition schemes which search systematically over price space using commodity information to change the prices until optimal prices are obtained to solve the PIES model. The convergence of such a decomposition method depends on calculating the subgradients of the function $\beta(u, v)$ analogous to $\phi(s, d)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(u, v) = f(d(v)) - g(s(u)) + \max\ & -cx \\ \text{s.t. } & A^1x \leq s(u) \\ & A^2x \geq d(v) \\ & x \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

To do this, we must calculate the Jacobians of the partials of s with respect to u and d with respect to v. The exact nature of the decomposition schemes in this case, and their comparison with the ones above remains to be investigated.

5. Conclusions and Areas for Future Research

The proposed decomposition scheme for mathematical programming/ economic equilibrium energy planning models is conceptual but fully implementable. At the M.I.T. Energy Lab, we are currently considering further integration of the Brookhaven Energy System Optimization Model with some of the econometric models developed at M.I.T. This integration should provide the ideas given above with a rigorous test.

On the other hand, there remain a number of conceptual questions to be studied in greater detail, particularly, the question of the integrability of the functions ∇f^{-1} and ∇g^{-1}. A possibly related construct which might provide some insight is the Legendre transform (Rockafellar [23]) which relates convex properties of a function to the inverse of its gradient.

An important area of future research is the identification, analysis and solution of dynamic models derived from (1) whose solutions converge to an optimal solution to (1). The econometric supply and demand models are naturally dynamic, and dynamic mathematical programming submodels can also be constructed (see Shapiro [27] for some ideas about how to do this). In terms of the decomposition approach, Grinold [7] gives an ascent algorithm for solving dynamic linear programming problems as they would arise in this context. The idea would be to fix supply and demand levels over the planning horizon, solve the dynamic linear programming problem, and then adjust the supply and demand levels in the same spirit as given above. The dynamic linear programming energy model of Nordhaus [20] which has fixed supply and demand levels could be a candidate for this type of extension.

A final area of future research is the extension of the decomposition methods to perform sensitivity analyses of the equilibrium solutions. This is important because of the uncertainties in the supply and demand relationships as well as many technological and cost coefficients. The econometric forecasts are statistical rather than deterministic in nature, but this fact has not been incorporated into the analysis and use of the equilibrium models.

References

1. Apostol, T.M., Mathematical Analysis, Addison-Wesley, (1957).

2. Cottle, R.W. and G.B. Dantzig, "Complementary Pivot Theory of Mathematical Programming," Linear Algebra and Its Applications, Vol. 1, pp. 103-125, (1968).

3. Fisher, M.L. and J.F. Shapiro, "Constructive Duality in Integer Programming," SIAM J. for Applied Math., Vol. 27, pp. 31-52, (1974).

4. Fisher, M.L., W.D. Northup and J.F. Shapiro, "Using Duality to Solve Discrete Optimization Problems: Theory and Computational Experience," Mathematical Programming Study 3, North-Holland, pp. 56-94, (1975).

5. Fisher, M.L., A Dual Algorithm for One Machine Scheduling Problems," to appear in Mathematical Programming.

6. Flinn, J.C. and J.W.B. Guise, "An Application of Spatial Equilibrium Analysis to Water Resource Allocation," Water Resources Research, Vol. 6, pp. 398-409, (1970).

7. Grinold, R.C., "Steepest Ascent for Large Scale Linear Programs," SIAM Review, Vol. 14, pp. 447-464, (1972).

8. Hall, H.H., E.O. Heady, A. Stoecker and V.A. Sposito, "Spatial Equilibrium in U.S. Agriculture: A Quadratic Programming Analysis," SIAM Review, Vol. 17, pp. 323-338, (1975).

9. Held, M. and R.M. Karp, "The Traveling Salesman Problem and Minimum Spanning Trees: Part II," Math. Prog., Vol. 1, pp. 6-25,(1971).

10. Hoffman, K.C., "A Unified Framework for Energy System Planning," in Searl, Energy Modeling, Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C., pp. 110-143, (1973).

11. Hogan, W.W., "Project Independence Evaluation System Integrating Model," Office of Quantitative Methods, Federal Energy Administration, (1974).

12. Intrilligator, M.D., Mathematical Optimization and Economic Theory, Prentice-Hall, (1971).

13. Jorgenson, D., "An Integrated Reference Energy System and Interindustry Model for the U.S. Economy," in Notes on a Workshop on Energy Systems Modelling, Technical Report SOL 75-6, Systems Optimization Laboratory, Stanford University, pp. 211-221, (1975).

14. Karlin, S., Mathematical Methods and Theory in Games, Programming and Economics, Vol. 1, Addison-Wesley, (1959).

15. Kennedy, M., "An Economic Model of the World Oil Market," Bell J. of Econ. and Man. Sci., Vol. 5, pp. 540-577, (1974).

16. Kihlstrom, R., A. Mas-Colell and H. Sonnerschein, "The Demand Theory of the Weak Axiom of Revealed Preference," Econometrica, Vol. 44, pp. 971-978, (1976).

17. Lasdon, L.S., Optimization Theory for Large Systems, The MacMillan Company, (1970).

18. Lemarechal, C., "An Algorithm for Minimizing Convex Functions," Proceedings IFIP Congress, North Holland, pp. 552-556, (1974).

19. Modiano, E. and J.F. Shapiro, "Linear Programming Models of Depletable Resources," paper presented at the TIMS/ORSA Conference, San Francisco, May 1977.

20. Nordhaus, W., "The Allocation of Energy Resources," prepared for the Brookings Panel, November 1973.

21. Polyak, B.T., "A General Method for Solving Extremal Problems," Soviet Mathematics Doklady, Vol. 8, pp. 593-597, (1967).

22. Polyak, B.T., "Minimization of Unsmooth Functionals," USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, Vol. 9, pp. 509-521, (1969).

23. Rockafellar, T.R., Convex Analysis, Princeton University Press, (1970).

24. Samuelson, P., "The Problem of Integrability in Utility Theory," Economica, Vol. 17, pp. 355-385, (1950).

25. Scarf, H.E. and T. Hansen, Computation and Economic Equilibria, (1973).

26. Schmitz, A. and D.L. Bawden, "A Spatial Price Analysis of the World Wheat Economy: Some Long-Run Predictions," chapter 25 in G.G. Judge and T. Takayama, Studies in Economic Planning Over Space and Time, North Holland, (1973).

27. Shapiro, J.F., "OR Models for Energy Planning," Computers and Operations Research, Vol. 2, pp. 145-152, (1975).

28. Shapiro, J.F., D.E. White and D.O. Wood, "Sensitivity Analysis of the Brookhaven Energy System Optimization Model," M.I.T. Operations Research Center Working Paper OR 060-77, January 1977.

29. Shapiro, J.F., Fundamental Structures of Mathematical Programming, in preparation for Wiley and Sons, (1977).