

Process planning with conditional and conflicting advice

András Márkus (2), József Váncza

Computer and Automation Research Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
1518 Budapest, P.O.B. 63, Hungary

Abstract

Due to the vast amount and intricacies of technological knowledge, the process planning problem, even for relatively simple workpieces, can hardly be solved by a straightforward algorithm. The paper shows that this problem is more readily tractable as satisfying constraints that represent pieces of advice taken from experts. We define a generic constraint-based model for process planning that handles precedences and setup formation, as well as the mutual effects of operation sequencing and resource assignment. We demonstrate the use of our model with examples of machining prismatic workpieces and bending sheet metal parts.

Keywords: process planning, sequencing, constraints, optimization

1 INTRODUCTION

Due to the vast amount and the intricate relations of technological knowledge the use of computer-aided methods is quite limited in solving process planning problems. Actually, process planning (PP) has two sides: on one hand, human expertise is indispensable in the interpretation of the product model and in weighing the technical and economical factors relevant in the manufacturing environment. On the other hand, the consolidation of the far-reaching consequences of such concerns is a task far more suitable for computers. In order to find the proper division of work, the computer should offer its best facility with the efficient generation and evaluation of a variety of (partial) solutions. The decision tradeoffs in the practical applicability of such systems are as follows:

- If the model does not capture enough details of the problem, feasible solutions may be missed and the offered solution variants may need manual repair.
- If the model is too fine-grained, computing requirements may be prohibitive. A well-chosen, limited number of alternatives is better tractable.
- If the model applies a general purpose heuristic, its success depends on whether the experts find suitable drivers for the heuristics (e.g., estimates for the cost of the unknown part of the solution).

Taking into account these difficulties, we offer a new model for the consolidation of PP advice, specifiable in a variety of forms, generated either by experts or by program modules. The paper shows how large scale *constraint satisfaction in finite domains*, an artificial intelligence approach matured in these years, has been used in solving representative PP problems.

The paper is organized as follows: Sect. 2 offers an overview of related work and discusses key initiatives of the application of constraints. Sect. 3 outlines the problem setting of our investigations; Sect. 4 gives a detailed account of the new approach. Sect. 5 exposes open problems, and discusses why constraint satisfaction is a promising approach of solving PP problems.

2 RELATED WORK

PP had early been recognized as a hard problem that did not yield to problem decomposition without substantial simplifying assumptions. Computer-aided PP became possible when the informal concept of *engineering features* met the methods of conceptual modeling and knowledge representation. Features divide the problem and make it amenable for efficient, automated problem

solving [3, 4, 6]. However, *dividing* a problem is not enough for *conquering* it. Features do interact, and the pieces of knowledge, consistent if limited to the local context of a particular feature, may contradict each other in the wider context of the workpiece. In addition, planning has to account for overall optimization objectives as well.

In the production engineering research community, constraint based approaches started more than a decade ago. Research focused on variational product design [5], the modeling of part families [7], and on geometrical reasoning. In the context of PP, interest centered around task precedences in assembly [8], and bending of sheet metal parts, [5, 9], with optimization aspects included [1]. Since these works used special-purpose constraint processing modules added to available CAD/CAPP systems, their experience was mostly limited to specific problems. However, they exposed requirements toward constraint-based methods: the need of

- working with disjunctive and conditional constraints;
- coping with constraint sets that may be conflicting;
- linking constraint satisfaction with optimization.

3 PROBLEM SETTING

Since the aim of our research was the definition and experimental verification of a broadly applicable, constraint-based model for PP problems, we did not focus our attention to a single kind of parts or production processes. Problems addressed here belong to two kinds of PP: the machining of prismatic workpieces, and the bending of sheet metal parts. (Inspection planning could be another application of our model.) The problem setting includes operation sequencing, grouping of operations into setups and the assignment of resources. The planning problem is decomposed as follows:

1. The interpretation of the product model yields a set of features, and for each of them a sequence of feature states (FSs). For bending, the FS sequence is just *flat* and *bent*; for prismatic parts the FS sequences consist of elements such as *raw*, *medium* and *fine*.

Since we use the concepts "feature state" and "machining operation to produce the feature state" interchangeably, we suppose that there is a one-to-one correspondence between FS's and these operations (notwithstanding the initial states of the features). In most cases a FS can be made with different resource assignments (e.g., in different part orientations and by using various tools), that specify, for each operation, the set of available *manufacturing alternatives* (MAs) of that FS.




Figure 1: Example of a prismatic workpiece.

2. The exploration of the manufacturing alternatives results in a set of MAs attached to each operation. Depending on the details of the PP model, members of the MA sets may have an internal structure. Typically, the components represent holding and tool; for prismatic parts holding means part orientation and bases, for sheet metal parts it means orientation and gripping. Usually, some combinations of the component values are unfeasible, e.g., assuming a vertical machine tool, in orientations where the u-slot of the part on Figure 1 is accessible from the $+z$ direction of the machine, the slot can be machined by an end-milling tool. However, in orientations where the bottom face (f_{bo}) is parallel with the z axis of the machine, it can be machined by a side-milling tool.

3. Manufacturing constraints (MCs) are the results of technological and economical considerations: they are related to operation precedence and grouping, and point out the available manufacturing alternatives (MAs) and their relations to operation sequencing. Sect. 3.1 gives further details.

Some of the manufacturing constraints are considered *hard*, i.e., the plans must always satisfy them. The other, so called *soft* constraints represent advice with *weights* attached to them: the planner's aim is to obey the soft constraints as far as possible (i.e., to collect a high sum of the weights of fulfilled constraints). While the sum should be *as high as required* in planning with an *aspiration level*, it should be *as high as possible* when both plan *correctness* and *cost* are considered in a multi-objective setting. In addition, soft MCs help us to follow more detailed, perhaps conflicting, technological and economical advice, and to relax the over-constrained formulations. (N.B., the weights are attached to constraint *instances*, not to constraint *types*.) Finally, there are introduced *conditional* constraints: these are hard constraints with relevance limited by specific conditions on the sequencing and resource assignment details of the plan.

4. Plan generation and evaluation makes *acceptable plans*, i.e., sequences of operations, together with the selected manufacturing alternatives, so that all hard constraints are satisfied; considering the role of soft constraints, see the description above. Finally, we determine the cost of executing the process plan with the manufacturing alternatives actually chosen; this opens up the way toward optimization.

Concerning tasks **1**, **2** and **3**, we suppose that the available PP tools (and, as the last resort, user interaction) generate a constraint-based description of the planning problem at hand, *if the underlying, constraint-based PP model is expressive enough*.

3.1 The representation of the PP problem

Since each operation has to be executed once, the plan contains a permutation of the operations; for each operation, a set of the available manufacturing alternatives are given.

Operation	Orientation	Tool
f_{to}	$-x - y + z$	face_mill
f_{fr}	$-x - y + z$	end_mill
f_{ri}	$-x - y + z$	end_mill
f_{bo}	$+y + x - z$	face_mill
f_{ba}	$+y + x - z$	end_mill
f_{le}	$+y + x - z$	end_mill
h_{cen}	$+y + x - z$	center_drill
h_{drl}	$+y + x - z$	twist_drill
$uslot$	$+y + x - z$	end_mill
slope	$+x + y + z$	face_mill
pockt	$+x + y + z$	end_mill
csink	$+x + y + z$	countersink
h_{thr}	$+x + y + z$	thread_mill

Figure 2: Plan generated for the prismatic workpiece, optimized for the number of setups. Operations h_{cen} , h_{drl} and h_{thr} belong to the feature *thole*.

In order to balance the expressiveness of the MCs with the efficiency of the constraint satisfaction mechanism, we do not support a free, unlimited variety of constraints: instead, all the MCs have to be expressed by using some predefined forms. Below we list those kinds of MCs that are supported by our model. The central claim of the paper is that they are really sufficient and enough for representing the manufacturing constraints found in the literature or met in our PP praxis:

(A) Precedence type constraints:

- *Operation precedence*: $op1$ has to be made before $op2$.
- *Immediate operation precedence*: $op1$ has to be made immediately before $op2$.
- *Operation combination*: $op1$ and $op2$ have to be neighbors, so as to allow their combination.

(B) Grouping (setup) type constraints:

- *Shared manufacturing alternative of two operations*: no matter where the operations $op1$ and $op2$ are in the plan, they must have the same MA attached. (An example: centering and twist drilling of a through hole have to be made from the same direction.)
- *Shared manufacturing alternative within a plan segment*: $op1$ and $op2$ must have the same MA value, and, in addition, all the operations that fall in-between $op1$ and $op2$ must have the same MA value, too. (An example: neither re-fixturing nor tool change are allowed in-between the centering operations of strictly tolerated holes.)

(C) Constraints on the machining alternatives:

- *The list of alternatives allowed as components of the MAs for an operation*.
- *The list of alternatives conditioned by other components of the MA*: Given a single value of one of the components of the MAs for an operation, the constraint specifies the list of allowed values of the other components. (An example: for each tool allowed at an operation, the constraint specifies the list of feasible part orientations.)

(D) Conditional constraints for precedences and machining alternatives:

- *Operation precedence conditioned by MAs*: If the selected MA of $op1$ belongs to the set of alternatives given in the constraint, then $op2$ has to precede $op3$. (An example: if the hole on Figure 1 is drilled from the top face, then this operation has to be executed before making the slope.)
- *MAs conditioned by operation precedence*: If $op1$ precedes $op2$, then the MA of $op3$ has to belong to the set of alternatives given in the constraint.

متن کامل مقاله

دریافت فوری ←

ISIArticles

مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات