

OPTIMAL FEED-BACK CONTROL OF A STOCHASTIC SERVICE SYSTEM: A MARTINGALE APPROACH

Åke KNUTSSON

LM ERICSSON
 Stockholm, Sweden

During an overload, the queue is long, and impatient customers drop out. That is a waste of customer time, of service-system resources, and of service-provider goodwill. Before the queue will be too long, it may be better to throttle the input. Then the queue will decrease; but on the other hand, the risk of running empty of customers will increase. That is the dilemma. How to resolve it is outlined in this condensed paper.

1 THE SYSTEM DYNAMICS

The system, assumed to be Markovian, has one server, and the buffer has a limit, $N-1$. Let Q_t be the number of customers in the system at time t , $Q_t \in [0, N]$; let A_t be the number of arrivals during $(0, t]$; let I_t be the number of impatient dropping out during $(0, t]$; and let D_t be the number of served departures during $(0, t]$. Then

$$Q_t = Q_0 + A_t - I_t - D_t \quad t \geq 0 \quad (1a)$$

or in the form of a stochastic differential equation

$$dQ_t = dA_t - dI_t - dD_t \quad (1b)$$

Let λ be the arrival intensity, let γ be a customer's drop-out intensity, and let μ be the server's capacity. Also, let $1(\cdot)$ denote the indicator function, which is unity when the argument is true, otherwise zero. Then the driving processes in (1b) have the following semi-martingale representations:

$$dA_t = \lambda u_t 1(Q_{t-} < N) dt + dM_t^A \quad (2a)$$

$$dI_t = \gamma Q_{t-} dt + dM_t^I \quad (2b)$$

$$dD_t = \mu 1(Q_{t-} > 0) dt + dM_t^D \quad (2c)$$

where u_t is the feed-back control variable, the "throttle valve", $u_t \in [0, 1]$. Let u_t depend on the present queue length only, $u_t = u(Q_{t-})$, then the Markov property is preserved. M_t^A , M_t^I , and M_t^D are martingales relative to the σ -field generated by Q_s , $0 \leq s \leq t$.

2 THE SYSTEM ECONOMY

Assume a dropped-out customer will cost c_1 units, while a served customer will result in a gain of c_2 units. Then, at the final time, T , the expected total cost for control policy u is $C(u)$:

$$\begin{aligned} C(u) &= E_u(c_1 I_T - c_2 D_T) = \\ &= E_u \int_0^T (c_1 \gamma Q_{s-} - c_2 \mu 1(Q_{s-} > 0)) ds \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The problem is to find a u that minimizes the cost function, $C(\cdot)$. The optimal control policy is denoted u^* .

3 THE OPTIMAL CONTROL POLICY

Guided by Brémaud, ref [1], p 202pp, we now apply a dynamic-programming procedure. Let $V(t, Q_t)$ denote the optimal cost-to-go from time t to the final time point, T , conditioned on the state of the Q -process at time t . Then

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, Q_t) &= E_{u^*} \left\{ \int_t^T (c_1 \gamma Q_{s-} + c_2 \mu 1(Q_{s-} = 0)) ds + \right. \\ &\left. + V(T, Q_T) \mid Q_t \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

"Itô-calculus" on the V -process results in

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, Q_t) &= V(0, Q_0) + \int_0^t \left[\frac{\delta V(s, Q_s)}{\delta s} + \right. \\ &+ (V(s, Q_{s-} + 1) - V(s, Q_{s-})) \lambda 1(Q_{s-} < N) u_s + \\ &+ (V(s, Q_{s-} - 1) - V(s, Q_{s-})) (\gamma Q_{s-} + \\ &\left. + \mu 1(Q_{s-} > 0)) \right] ds + \text{martingale} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The Bellman-Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the problem are the following $N+1$ equations, where $q=0, 1, 2, \dots, N$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta V(t, q)}{\delta t} + \inf_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \left\{ (V(t, q+1) - V(t, q)) \lambda 1(q < N) u \right\} + \\ + (V(t, q-1) - V(t, q)) (\gamma q + \mu 1(q > 0)) + \\ + c_1 \gamma q + c_2 \mu 1(q = 0) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It is sufficient for optimality, if there exists V and u such that (6) is satisfied. Using a conjecture by Högfeldt, ref [2], we nominate the following candidate:

$$V(t, q) = F(q) + (T-t) \text{const} \quad (7)$$

We substitute (7) into (6), and eureka...., we find an optimal solution:

$$u_q = 1(F(q) > F(q+1)) \quad (8)$$

The optimal control policy is stationary and has infinite horizon, as it depends neither on t nor on T . Also, it is of type 'bang-bang', the valve turns out to be an on/off switch.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Brémaud, 'Point Processes and Queues: Martingale Dynamics', Springer-Verlag: New York, 1981.
- [2] P. Högfeldt, personal communication, 1984.