

Distributionally Robust Airport Ground Holding Problem under Wasserstein Ambiguity Sets

Haochen Wu*, Max Z. Li†

Abstract

The airport ground holding problem seeks to minimize flight delay costs due to reductions in the capacity of airports. However, the critical input of future airport capacities is often difficult to predict, presenting a challenging yet realistic setting. Even when capacity predictions provide a distribution of possible capacity scenarios, such distributions may themselves be uncertain (e.g., distribution shifts). To address the problem of designing airport ground holding policies under *distributional* uncertainty, we formulate and solve the airport ground holding problem using distributionally robust optimization (DRO). We address the uncertainty in the airport capacity distribution by defining ambiguity sets based on the Wasserstein distance metric. We propose reformulations which integrate the ambiguity sets into the airport ground holding problem structure, and discuss discretization properties of the proposed model. We discuss comparisons (via numerical experiments) between ground holding policies and optimized costs derived through the deterministic, stochastic, and distributionally robust airport ground holding problems. Our experiments show that the DRO model outperforms the stochastic models when there is a significant difference between the empirical airport capacity distribution and the realized airport capacity distribution. We note that DRO can be a valuable tool for decision-makers seeking to design airport ground holding policies, particularly when the available data regarding future airport capacities are highly uncertain.

Airport capacity; Airport ground holding problems; Air traffic management; Distributional uncertainty; Distributionally robust optimization; Wasserstein ambiguity set

1 Introduction

Demand-capacity imbalances in the air transportation system is a major problem that has significant negative impacts on airlines, passengers, and the environment. There are a variety of potential bottlenecks within the air transportation system, with airport arrival and departure capacities being major components [1]. Typically, if airport capacity constraints can be identified proactively, air traffic managers prefer to delay flights before they are airborne, as airborne delay costs (e.g., vectoring, holding) typically drastically outweigh delay costs incurred on the ground [2]. As a real-world example, such demand-capacity balancing actions take the form of Traffic Management Initiatives (TMIs) known as Ground Delay Programs (GDPs) within the US National Airspace System (NAS) [3].

Given known parameters such as the airport capacities, nominal flight times between airports, and flight schedule information, the family of optimization models known as *Ground Holding Problems* (GHPs) can be solved to obtain optimal rescheduling decisions to minimize incurred airborne and ground delay costs [2]. GHPs are an effective approach to reduce the impact of congestion, delaying aircraft on the ground to alleviate en route sectors and terminal airspace, and avoid airborne vectoring or holding. Intuitively, the arrival and departure capacities of airports – which are directly influenced by probabilistic factors such as weather – are critical inputs into GHPs. This is true regardless if the scope of the GHP is at a single arrival airport (the Single Airport Ground Holding Problem, or SAGHP [4]), or encompasses a number of different airports (the Multi-Airport Ground Holding Problem, or MAGHP [5]).

*Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, haocwu@umich.edu

†Department of Aerospace Engineering, Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, maxzli@umich.edu

Previous works have addressed the *deterministic* formulation of the SAGHP and MAGHP. In the deterministic SAGHP and MAGHP (d-SAGHP and d-MAGHP, respectively), the airport capacity or capacities are assumed to be known with certainty [2, 5, 6]. However, in practice, airport capacity is often uncertain and can vary significantly over time, indicating that deterministic GHPs may not be representative of realistic operations. Recognizing the role that uncertainty plays in designing realistic ground holding policies, stochastic versions of the SAGHP and MAGHP (s-SAGHP and s-MAGHP, respectively) have also been examined in previous work: techniques such as two-stage stochastic programming [7] and chance-constrained programming [8] have been used to model uncertainty in airport capacities. The results of these models demonstrate that the stochastic models can reach a balance between the robustness and the potential cost of the derived ground holding policy, and provide with a lower airborne cost compared with deterministic ground holding program.

Even though stochastic GHPs represent significant advancements in the modeling and optimization of ground holding policies, a key component to stochastic GHPs is the process through which the probabilistic airport capacities is estimated. Forecasting and prediction models for weather conditions and runway configurations, two critical factors in determining airport capacities [1], are commonly used to extract the probability distribution of possible airport capacity scenarios [9–11]. Focusing on previous work that propose airport capacity prediction models, [9] states that the performance of the model would be impacted by the weather forecast uncertainties. Similarly, prediction models from both [10] and [11] contain model estimation errors. Due to upstream uncertainties in factors such as weather conditions and runway configurations, the predicted airport capacity distributions may not be accurate. Thus, deterministic or stochastic GHPs may produce ground holding policies that are sub-optimal in practice. Moreover, suppose that stochastic GHPs can be accessed by air traffic managers (e.g., perhaps through a decision support system interface): In practice, these decision support systems may only have limited information to arrive at a probabilistic set of scenarios for the airport capacity inputs. Due to both upstream uncertainty and incomplete information, even probabilistic airport capacities have an added layer of uncertainty that should be taken into account.

The goal of this paper is to deal with the uncertainty-of-uncertainties challenges discussed above, formulating and solving a stochastic GHP that is *robust* to inaccuracies in the probabilistic airport capacity scenarios. Specifically, we propose an approach to formulating and solving the GHP via *distributionally robust optimization (DRO)*. In the following sections, we first consider the reformulation of the SAGHP via DRO to illustrate the problem, before extending to the multi-airport case. We conduct several numerical experiments to demonstrate the out-of-sample performance of dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP compared with ground holding policies derived from the analogous d-SAGHP, d-MAGHP, s-SAGHP, and s-MAGHP.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Stochastic Air Traffic Flow Management

Some of the previous works have studied the Stochastic Air Traffic Flow Management (SATFM) [7, 12–14]. [7] considers airport capacity and sector capacity in ATFM as random variables and takes ground holding delay, airborne holding delay and route selection as control variables. The proposed models are formulated as Two-stage stochastic integer programs and solved by a stage-wise Progressive Binary Heuristic algorithm. [12] formulates air traffic flow management problem with rerouting as multi-stage mixed 0-1 problems, assuming uncertainties from airport arrival and departure capacity, the air sector capacity and the flight demand. A deterministic equivalent model is derived from a tree-based schema, which is solved by a branch-and-cut method. [13] applies chance-constrained program to model the SATFM under sever weather conditions. The chance-constraints enforce the probability of each sector capacity being exceeded to be less than or equal to α and the model is solved by polynomial approximation-based approach. Faced with the uncertainty of storm arrival time, duration and its impact on airport capacity and sector capacity, [14] proposes a weather-front based method which introduces a low-dimension ambiguity set to capture the possible dynamics of the weather front and resulting capacity drops. The ambiguity set is later incorporated into the deterministic ATFM model, and the deterministic equivalent formulations of the robust and adaptive optimization model are derived.

2.2 Stochastic Airport Ground Holding Problem

In terms of stochastic airport ground holding problem, weather conditions and airport capacity are generally assumed to be the random variables and bad weathers are root causes for airport capacity drop. [15] introduces a perfect match between network-flow model for inventory and stochastic ground holding problem. The formulation of the network-flow model requires the estimations of future demand scenarios with corresponding probabilities and this can be modelled as a stochastic programming model. In stochastic GHP case, [15] is concerned with the probability Airport Acceptance Rates(AAR), which represents for the number of arrival flights an airport is able to receive given a specific period of time. The stochastic GHP is formulated in a network-flow model and solved by linear programming techniques. [16] considers uncertain weather clearance time, where airport capacity is reduced until the time period the weather condition is cleared. A stochastic IP is proposed and solved based on seven possible weather clearance time and different distributions of each scenario. [4] applies a scenario-tree to capture possible scenarios of airport capacity as weather condition changes. The authors represent a dynamic stochastic IP based on the scenario-tree, whose performance is impacted as the size of the tree grows. Similar with [14], [8] applies chance-constrained techniques to stochastic MAGHP with uncertain airport capacity. The chance-constraints make sure the probability of capacity constraints being violated is less a small value α . In terms of the empirical distributions of airports in the metroplex, the authors assume airport landing-capacity distribution follows a log-concave distribution and makes the historical landing-capacity a continuous distribution by using kernel density estimation approach.

2.3 Distributionally Robust Optimization

Compared with previous works in stochastic ATFM and stochastic GHP, the distributionally robust models will consider all distributions within the ambiguity set, instead of only the empirical distribution derived by historical data. This would make DR models more robust when the true distribution of weather condition or airport capacity deviates from the empirical distribution. In terms of previous works of distributionally robust optimization methods, two types of ambiguity sets have commonly used. The first type is moment-based ambiguity set [17], where the mean of the delay distribution falls in an ellipsoid with the size of γ_1 , and the second-moment matrix of ξ lie in a positive semi-definite cone constrained by γ_2 . The mean and the covariance matrix of the predicted distribution would be taken as the nominal value which the moment-based ambiguity would build upon. However, some previous work states that the moment-based ambiguity is too conservative [18]. Comparatively, the second type is distance based ambiguity sets [19,20], which has a powerful out-of-sample performance. One commonly used distance-based ambiguity set is the Wasserstein ambiguity set. The Wasserstein distance $d_p(Q_1, Q_2)$ is used to measure the distance between an arbitrary distribution and the nominal distribution. By assigning a user-defined parameter ϵ , all the distributions satisfying the constraint $d_p(Q_1, Q_2) \leq \epsilon$ would become the ambiguity set. After quantifying the ambiguity set, the original problem can be reformulated into a convex tractable counterpart and thus is able to be solved [19] [21].

For the application side of DRO methods, [20] considers the DR appointment scheduling problem, recasting the non-convex part of the generalized form of Wasserstein ambiguity set based models as co-positive programs. The co-positive program is amount to a tractable semi-definite program and the deterministic equivalent formulation for l_p norms($p = 1$ and $p > 1$) based Wasserstein ambiguity set are also developed. [22] solves the vaccine allocation problem using both SP and moment-based DRO methods. The deterministic equivalent formulation of the proposed DRO model is derived by dual transformation and strong duality, and the experiment results shows that the DRO approach gives the least amount of unsatisfied demand. [23] proposes a general formulation of two-stage distributionally robust mixed-integer programming (DRMIP) problem under the Wasserstein ambiguity set and develops dual-decomposition based solution method. The discretization properties of DRMIP have also been discussed, which proves the existence of the worst-case distribution for DRMIP. In this paper, we assume the airport capacity distribution is under Wasserstein ambiguity set and derive the deterministic equivalent formulation for both dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP.

3 Model Development

DRO is a variation of stochastic optimization techniques that can handle uncertainty-of-uncertainties by defining an ambiguity set that represents a set of possible distributions for stochastic input parameters. Given this ambiguity set, we are able to derive the deterministic equivalent formulation of the distributionally-robust GHP (dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP for the single and multi-airport cases, respectively), which is computationally tractable. In this section, we mainly introduce the reformulation methods that derive the distributionally deterministic equivalent form of the deterministic SAGHP under the Wasserstein ambiguity set, and related properties of the distributionally model. The dr-SAGHP will be considered at first, and the corresponding multi-airport models will be formulated based on the single airport scenario.

3.1 Deterministic formulation of SAGHP

The notations for the proposed models are as follow: Let T be the set of time periods and t be the generic time period, F be the set of arrival flights and f be the generic flight, Z be the set of airport and z be the generic airport, and let $F(z)$ be the set of arrival flights of airport $z \in Z$. \mathcal{C} represents for the set of connecting flights, which includes connecting flight pairs $(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{C}$ where f_1 is the preceding flight and f_2 is the successive flight. r_f denotes the scheduled arrival time and T_f denotes the set of available actual arrival time to be assigned for each flight. Note that the assigned actual arrival time is supposed to be later than scheduled arrival time and no later than the planning horizon, and thus $T_f = \{r_f, \dots, T\}$. $x_{f,t}, y_t$ are the first stage and second stage decision variables, where $x_{f,t}$ is a binary variable indicating whether a flight f will land at time t and $y_t(y_{z,t}$ in multi-airport cases) denotes the number of holding flights at airport z at time t . C_f and C_h are unit ground holding cost and unit airborne cost respectively. S_{f_1, f_2} denotes the maximum delay that f_1 might suffer without causing any delay to successive connected flight f_2 .

We take the deterministic formulation of the single airport ground holding program (SAGHP) proposed in [6] (the P_2 VBO model) as reference, where the assumptions are that the congestion is originated from insufficient arrival capacity and there is infinite departure capacity. The objective function is ground holding delay, and the constraints are capacity constraint, assignment constraint, and coupling constraint.

$$\min_x \sum_{f \in F} C_f \left(\sum_{t \in T_f} t x_{f,t} - r_f \right) \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{f \in F} x_{f,t} \leq K, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad (1b)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_f} x_{f,t} = 1, \quad \forall f \in F, \quad (1c)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_{f_1}} t x_{f_1,t} - r_{f_1} - S_{f_1, f_2} \leq \sum_{t \in T_{f_2}} t x_{f_2,t} - r_{f_2}, \quad f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (1d)$$

$$x_{f,t} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad f \in F, t \in T_f. \quad (1e)$$

The d-SAGHP aims to minimize the ground holding cost for all flights (1a), which is calculated as the unit ground holding cost times the difference between the scheduled arrival time and actual assigned arrival time for each flight. The capacity constraint (1b) ensures that the total number of arrival flights at time t cannot exceed the airport capacity K . The assignment constraint (1c) enforces that for each flight f , there is only one time slot $t \in T_f$ assigned to it. The coupling constraint (1d) makes sure the ground holding delay placed on the preceding flight f_1 will not cause any delay for the successive connected flight f_2 . If the assigned ground holding delay is too long so that the minimum turn around time is violated, then the departure time of the successive flight has to be delayed. The maximum delay is defined by the scheduled departure time of the successive flight minus the sum of the scheduled arrival time and the turnaround time of the preceding flight.

3.2 Wasserstein Ambiguity Set

In this paper, we consider the Wasserstein distance-based ambiguity set and denote $M(\Xi)$ as the space of all probability distributions \mathbb{Q} with support Ξ . The Wasserstein distance $d_w : M(\Xi) \times M(\Xi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the minimum transportation cost between distributions $\mathbb{Q}_1 \in M(\Xi)$ and $\mathbb{Q}_2 \in M(\Xi)$ [20], and is given explicitly as:

$$d_w(\mathbb{Q}_1, \mathbb{Q}_2) = \inf_{\Pi \in \mathcal{D}_{\Pi}(\xi_1, \xi_2)} \int_{\Xi^2} \|\xi_1 - \xi_2\| \Pi(d\xi_1, d\xi_2), \quad (2)$$

where Π is a joint distribution of probability measures ξ_1 and ξ_2 with marginals \mathbb{Q}_1 and \mathbb{Q}_2 , respectively. Π can also be viewed as a transportation plan for moving mass from \mathbb{Q}_1 to \mathbb{Q}_2 . We denote $\mathcal{D}_{\Pi}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ as the set of all joint distributions on ξ_1 and ξ_2 with marginals \mathbb{Q}_1 and \mathbb{Q}_2 , and $\|\cdot\|$ is an arbitrary norm. In this paper, we use l_2 norm to construct the Wasserstein ambiguity set. Based on the Wasserstein distance, the ambiguity set as defined in [20] centered around an empirical distribution \hat{P} with radius $\epsilon > 0$, denoted as $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{P})$, is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{P}) := \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in M(\Xi) : d_w(\hat{P}, \mathbb{Q}) \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (3)$$

In the dr-SAGHP and the dr-MAGHP, let $\{\hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2, \dots, \hat{\xi}_N\}$ be the set of N airport capacity observations with the corresponding estimated probabilities of occurrence $\{\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, \dots, \hat{p}_N\}$.

Proposition 1. *Based on the empirical airport capacity distribution given by $\{\hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2, \dots, \hat{\xi}_N\}$ and $\{\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, \dots, \hat{p}_N\}$, the Wasserstein ambiguity set can be built via (3) with conditions (4a)-(4d) as follows:*

$$\int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) \|\hat{\xi}_s - \xi\|_2 d\xi \leq \epsilon, \quad \epsilon > 0, \quad (4a)$$

$$\int_{\Xi} u_s(\xi) d\xi = \hat{p}_s, \quad \forall s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (4b)$$

$$\sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) = P(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi, \quad (4c)$$

$$u_s(\xi) \geq 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi, s = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (4d)$$

Proof. According to (2) and (3), the ambiguity set is

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{P}) := \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in M(\Xi) : \int_{\Xi^2} \|\xi - \xi'\|_2 \Pi(d\xi, d\xi') \leq \epsilon \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where ξ and ξ' are probability measures with marginals of \mathbb{Q} and the empirical distribution \hat{P} . Π is assumed to be an optimal joint distribution of \mathbb{Q} and \hat{P} or the optimal transportation plan. In order to deal with the joint distribution $\Pi(d\xi, d\xi')$, we apply a similar approach proposed in [19], introducing \mathbb{Q}_s that represents for the conditional distribution of ξ given that $\xi' = \hat{\xi}_s$. Therefore, we denote the joint distribution of \mathbb{Q} and \hat{P} as $\Pi = \sum_{s=1}^N p(\xi' = \hat{\xi}_s) \mathbb{Q}_s$, with $\mathbb{Q}_s = p(\xi | \xi' = \hat{\xi}_s)$. We then reformulate the ambiguity set as:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{P}) := \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in M(\Xi) : \sum_{s=1}^N p(\xi' = \hat{\xi}_s) \int_{\Xi} \|\xi - \hat{\xi}_s\|_2 \mathbb{Q}_s d\xi \leq \epsilon \right\}, \quad (6)$$

We introduce an auxiliary variable $u_s(\xi) = p(\xi' = \hat{\xi}_s) \mathbb{Q}_s$, and we can derive (4a) by replacing $p(\xi' = \hat{\xi}_s) \mathbb{Q}_s$ with $u_s(\xi)$, where $\int_{\Xi} \|\xi - \hat{\xi}_s\|_2 \sum_{s=1}^N p(\xi' = \hat{\xi}_s) \mathbb{Q}_s = \int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) \|\hat{\xi}_s - \xi\|_2 d\xi$. More-

over, with the introduced variable $u_s(\xi)$, we can derive that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Xi} u_s(\xi) d\xi &= \int_{\Xi} p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) \mathbb{Q}_s d\xi \\
&= \int_{\Xi} p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) p(\xi|\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) d\xi \\
&= p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) \int_{\Xi} p(\xi|\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) d\xi \\
&= p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) \cdot 1 = p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s),
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

and based on the law of total probability we can also derive that:

$$\sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) = \sum_{s=1}^N p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) p(\xi|\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s) = P(\xi) \tag{8}$$

Let $\widehat{p}_s = p(\xi' = \widehat{\xi}_s)$ and $P(\xi)$ be the probability measure of each $\xi \in \Xi$ such that $\int_{\Xi} dP(\xi) = 1$, then we can drive (4b) and (4c) from (7) and (8) respectively. (4d) ensures the introduced variable $u_s(\xi)$ is not negative. \square

3.3 Deterministic Equivalent Reformulation of dr-GHPs

We begin with examining the distributionally-robust formulation for the single-airport case, i.e., dr-SAGHP. First, we assume that the airport capacity K is a non-negative random variable. We can write down the following two-stage formulation of dr-SAGHP as follows:

$$\min_x \left\{ \sum_{f \in F} C_f \left(\sum_{t \in T_f} tx_{ft} - r_f \right) + \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon(\widehat{P})} \mathbb{E}_p [Q(x, \xi)] \right\} \tag{9a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{t \in T_f} x_{ft} = 1, \quad \forall f \in F, \tag{9b}$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_{f_1}} tx_{f_1,t} - r_{f_1} - S_{f_1, f_2} \leq \sum_{t \in T_{f_2}} tx_{f_2,t} - r_{f_2}, \quad x_{ft} \in \{0, 1\}, f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}, \tag{9c}$$

$$\tag{9d}$$

where the value function $Q(x, \xi) = \min_y \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t$ is itself a minimization problem (i.e., the second stage):

$$\min_y \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) \tag{10a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{f \in F} x_{ft} \leq K(\xi) - y_{t-1}(\xi) + y_t(\xi), \quad \forall t \in T, \xi \in \Xi, \tag{10b}$$

$$y_0(\xi) = 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi, \tag{10c}$$

$$y_t(\xi) \geq 0, \quad \forall f \in F, t \in T, \xi \in \Xi. \tag{10d}$$

The objective function for the first stage (9a) is the sum of ground holding delays for all flights. Note that the objective value of the inner maximization problem will be realized in the second stage. The capacity constraint (9b) and coupling constraint (9c) are the same as what we have discussed for d-SAGHP, and they are taken as first stage constraints in the two-stage formulation. This means both assignment constraint and coupling constraint should be satisfied in the first stage even if we have no information about the true airport capacity distribution.

In the second stage problem (10a)-(10d), we aim to minimize the airborne delay cost, which is given by the unit airborne holding cost times the total number of flights under airborne holds at time t . As

for the constraints of the second stage problem, (10b) is the second stage capacity constraint which ensures that the total number of arrival flights at time t cannot exceed the realized airport capacity $K(\xi)$ plus the total number of airborne flight at time t , minus the total number of airborne flights at time $t - 1$. Intuitively, in the second stage capacity constraint, all airborne holding flights at time $t - 1$ should land at time t , and the maximum number of allowed arrival flights equals the realized airport capacity, minus the number of airborne flight at $t - 1$, plus the number of airborne flights at t . Constraint (10c) ensures that the number of airborne flights is zero at $t = 0$ for each scenario, and constraint (10d) ensures that the number of airborne flights at each time period cannot be negative.

The second stage decision variable y_t represents the number of arrival flights joining the arrival queue or conducting airborne holding around the terminal area. Note that we assume the magnitude of the unit cost of airborne delays is greater than that for ground delays.

To find out the deterministic equivalent form of dr-SAGHP, we need to deal with the inner maximization problem in (10). We apply Lagrangian dual technique to transform the inner maximization problem of (10) to a minimization problem, which can be integrated into (10) to derive the deterministic equivalent formulation.

Lemma 1. *The inner maximization problem of (10) can be reformulated as a semi-infinite program:*

$$\min_{\alpha, \beta} \quad \epsilon\alpha + \sum_{s=1}^N \widehat{p}_s \beta_s \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \alpha \left\| \widehat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 + \beta_s \geq \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t, \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi, \forall t \in T, s = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (11b)$$

Proof. By integrating all conditions of the Wasserstein ambiguity set $\mathcal{P}_\epsilon(\widehat{P})$ into the inner maximization problem of (10), a semi-infinite linear programming can be represented as follow:

$$\max_{u_s(\xi)} \quad \int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) u_s(\xi) d\xi \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) \left\| \widehat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 d\xi \leq \epsilon, \quad (12b)$$

$$\int_{\Xi} u_s(\xi) d\xi = \widehat{p}_s, \quad \forall s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (12c)$$

$$\int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) d\xi = 1. \quad (12d)$$

The objective function (12a) is derived from

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon(\widehat{P})} \mathbb{E}_p [Q(x, \xi)] &= \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon(\widehat{P})} \int_{\Xi} \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) p d\xi \\ &= \max_{u_s(\xi)} \int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) u_s(\xi) d\xi \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $u_s(\xi)$ is the variable we introduced for constructing the ambiguity set (4a)-(4d). (12b), (12c), (12d) are derived from (4b), (4c), (4d) respectively.

By assigning Lagrangian dual variables α and β_s to (12b) and (12c), respectively, we construct the Lagrangian function $L(u, \alpha, \beta)$. Note that since we can derive (12d) from (12c) $\int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) d\xi = \sum_{s=1}^N \int_{\Xi} u_s(\xi) d\xi = \sum_{s=1}^N \widehat{p}_s = 1$, then (12d) can be eliminated from the Lagrangian function. The Lagrangian function $L(u, \alpha, \beta)$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
L(u, \alpha, \beta) &= \max_{u_s(\xi)} \left\{ \int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) u_s(\xi) d\xi - \alpha \left(\int_{\Xi} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 d\xi - \epsilon \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{s=1}^N \beta_s \left(\int_{\Xi} u_s(\xi) d\xi - \hat{p}_s \right) \right\} \\
&= \alpha \epsilon + \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{p}_s \beta_s + \max_{u_s(\xi)} \int_{\Xi} \left(\sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) u_s(\xi) - \alpha \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 - \sum_{s=1}^N \beta_s u_s(\xi) \right) d\xi.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

For the Lagrangian function $L(u, \alpha, \beta)$, based on the fact that the maximization problem can be decomposed for each $\xi \in \Xi$, we can write down the Lagrangian dual $g(\alpha, \beta)$ as follows:

$$g(\alpha, \beta) = \min_{\alpha, \beta} \left\{ \alpha \epsilon + \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{p}_s \beta_s + \max_{u_s(\xi)} \left\{ u_s(\xi) \left(\sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) - \alpha \sum_{s=1}^N \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 - \sum_{s=1}^N \beta_s \right) \right\} \right\}. \tag{15}$$

The Lagrangian dual $g(\alpha, \beta)$ is a minimization problem with α and β_s as decision variables. To ensure that $g(\alpha, \beta)$ is bounded, the inner maximization problem with the optimal $u_s(\xi)$ needs to be zero, and $\sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi) - \alpha \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 - \sum_{s=1}^N \beta_s$ needs to be negative. Therefore, by introducing $\alpha \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 + \sum_{s=1}^N \beta_s \geq \sum_{s=1}^N \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi), \forall s = 1, 2, \dots, N$ as constraints for $g(\alpha, \beta)$, the Lagrangian dual problem can be written as follows:

$$g(\alpha, \beta) = \min_{\alpha, \beta} \alpha \epsilon + \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{p}_s \beta_s \tag{16a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \alpha \sum_{s=1}^N \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 + \sum_{s=1}^N \beta_s \geq \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi). \tag{16b}$$

Finally, by transforming the summation notation into N scenarios, the Lagrangian dual is the same as in (11). \square

The optimal value of the Lagrangian dual problem is the best lower bound of the primal problem, and thus the optimal we obtain from the dual problem is less than or equal to the optimal value of primal problem. Only when strong duality holds, one can conclude that the optimal value of the dual and primal problems are equivalent to each other. In order to show that the strong duality holds for the dual problem in (11), we need to introduce the definitions of relative interior and Slater's condition.

Definition 1 (Relative interior [24]). *The relative interior of a set C is denoted as*

$$\mathbf{relint}(C) = \{x \in C \mid B(x, r) \cap \mathbf{aff}(C) \subseteq C\}, \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbf{aff}(C)$ is the affine hull of set C and $B(x, r)$ is a ball with radius r centered at x .

Definition 2 (Slater's condition [24]). *Slater's condition states that for a primal problem of the form*

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & f_0(x) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(x) \leq 0, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \\
& Ax = b,
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with the domain \mathcal{D} of $f_i(x)$ given by $\mathcal{D} = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \text{dom}(f_i)$, there exists an $x \in \mathbf{relint}(\mathcal{D})$ such that $f_i(x) < 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and $Ax = b$.

Lemma 2. *Strong duality holds for the semi-infinite program in (10).*

Proof. According to [24], if the primal problem is convex and satisfies Slater's condition, then strong duality holds for the primal problem. Firstly, for (11), the objective function is an affine function of the radius ϵ of the ambiguity set, continuous first stage decision variables α and β , as well as the probability \hat{p}_s for each scenario. The constraints of (11) are also convex, since the term with the norm and the sum of airborne delay cost are convex. Therefore, (11) is a convex optimization problem.

Moreover, Slater's condition requires a strictly feasible $x \in \mathbf{relint}(\mathcal{D})$. In (11), $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta_s \in \mathbb{R}$ for all scenarios $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Therefore, there exist large enough $\alpha, \beta_s \in \mathbf{relint}\mathcal{D}, \forall s = 1, 2, \dots, N$ such that $\alpha \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 + \beta_s > f(\xi), \forall s = 1, 2, \dots, N$, and thus Slater's condition holds for (11). Since this problem is convex and Slater's condition holds, strong duality follows for (11). \square

Since the strong duality holds for the inner maximization problem, we can then incorporate the dual problem, which is a minimization problem, into the two stage model of dr-SAGHP.

Proposition 2. *The deterministic equivalent form of (10) with the Wasserstein ambiguity set (1) can be reformulated as follows:*

$$\min_{x, y, \alpha, \beta} \sum_{f \in F} \left(C_f \sum_{t \in T_f} (tx_{ft} - r_f) \right) + \epsilon \alpha + \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{p}_s \beta_s \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha \left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 + \beta_s \geq \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi, s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (19b)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_f} x_{ft} = 1, \quad \forall f \in F, \quad (19c)$$

$$\sum_{f \in F} x_{ft} \leq K(\xi) - y_{t-1}(\xi) + y_t(\xi), \quad \forall t \in T, \xi \in \Xi, \quad (19d)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_{f_1}} tx_{f_1,t} - r_{f_1} - s_{f_1, f_2} \leq \sum_{t \in T_{f_2}} tx_{f_2,t} - r_{f_2}, \quad x_{ft} \in \{0, 1\}, f \in F, t \in T_f, \quad (19e)$$

$$y_0(\xi) = 0, y_t(\xi) \geq 0, \alpha \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in T, \xi \in \Xi. \quad (19f)$$

Proof. The semi-infinite program 11 could be formulated with the epigraph θ as:

$$\min_{x, y, \theta \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{f \in F} \left(C_f \sum_{t \in T_f} (tx_{ft} - r_f) \right) + \theta \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \theta \geq \max_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} [Q(x, \xi)], \quad (20b)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_f} x_{ft} = 1, \quad \forall f \in F, \quad (20c)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_{f_1}} x_{f_1,t} - r_{f_1} - s_{f_1, f_2} \leq \sum_{t \in T_{f_2}} tx_{f_2,t} - r_{f_2}, \quad \forall t \in T_f, \quad (20d)$$

$$x_{ft} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall f \in F, t \in T_f. \quad (20e)$$

$$(20f)$$

According to Lemmas 1 and 2, constraint (20b) is equivalent to:

$$\theta \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} [Q(x, \xi)], \quad \forall \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon}(\hat{P}) \quad (21a)$$

$$\left\| \hat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 \alpha + \beta_s \geq \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t, \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi \quad (21b)$$

$$(21c)$$

By integrating (21a) and (21b) into (20b), the derived deterministic equivalent formulation matches (19). \square

Note that since the equivalent form (19) is a semi-infinite program, it is very difficult to solve due to the fact that there is a large amount of constraints resulting from the generic support Ξ (the infinite support). However, specific to the airport ground holding problem, the support would be all possible values that the airport capacity could attain. Typically in real-world operations, these capacity values are non-negative integers representing the total number of flights allowed to land during a given time. In terms of the optimization model, this allows us to discretize the support, and reduce the amount of constraints, thus resulting in a tractable DR model. Therefore, being able to reduce and discretize the deterministic equivalent formulation is important to solving the dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP problems.

3.4 Discretization Properties of dr-GHPs

The tricky part of deterministic equivalent formulations of dr-GHPs is the infinite support Ξ , which can cause infinite constraints and thus make dr-GHPs intractable. Therefore, we need to discretize and reduce the infinite support at first, and then derive the optimal ground holding policy. The deterministic equivalent formulation of dr-SAGHP is a semi-infinite program, hence we can determine the discretization properties of the deterministic equivalent formulation of dr-SAGHP with approaches for semi-infinite programs. To show the discretization properties of dr-SAGHP, we need to introduce finite reducibility and weak discretization of semi-infinite programs at first.

Definition 3 (Finite reducibility). *Denote by Ξ_k a finite subset of support Ξ . A semi-infinite program is said to be finitely reducible if $v(\Xi_k) = v(\Xi)$, where $v(\Xi)$ is the optimal value of the semi-infinite program with support Ξ .*

Definition 4 (Weak discretization). *A semi-infinite program is said to be weakly discretizable if there exists a sequence of Ξ_k 's such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v(\Xi_k) = v(\Xi)$.*

Definition 5 (Solvability). *An optimization problem \mathcal{S} is said to be solvable if \mathcal{S} is feasible and bounded (i.e. \mathcal{S} has a finite optimal solution).*

Then, before showing that (19) is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable, we need to demonstrate these properties of (11) at first.

Lemma 3. (11) *is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable.*

Proof. From Theorem 7 in [25], for a semi-infinite program \mathcal{S} with optimal value \mathcal{S}^* and its dual problem \mathcal{D} with optimal value \mathcal{D}^* , the following statements are equivalent:

- \mathcal{S} is finitely reducible;
- \mathcal{D} is solvable and $\mathcal{D}^* = \mathcal{S}^*$;
- \mathcal{D} is solvable and \mathcal{S} is weakly discretizable.

For (11), as discussed in Lemma 2, there exist α and β_s for all $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$ such that (11) is strictly feasible. This means that the feasible region of (11) is non-empty and the objective value is bounded. Based on the duality theorem, the dual of (11) is feasible. Therefore, applying Theorem 7 from [25], we conclude that (11) is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable. \square

The discretization properties of (19) is not obvious. In order to show (19) is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable, we need to first re-construct the discretized Wasserstein ambiguity set based on the fact that (11) is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable. Then, we could derive the discretized deterministic equivalent formulation of the two stage dr-SAGHP based on the discretized ambiguity set, and then show that (19) is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable.

Proposition 3. (19) *is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable.*

Proof. We showed through Lemma 3 that (19) is finitely reducible. Based on Definition 3, there exists a subset $\Xi_k \subset \Xi$ such that $v(\Xi_k) = v(\Xi)$. Therefore, the Wasserstein ambiguity set can be discretized

as:

$$\sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) \left\| \widehat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \quad \epsilon > 0, \quad (22a)$$

$$\sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} u_s(\xi) = \widehat{p}_s, \quad \forall s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (22b)$$

$$\sum_{s=1}^N u_s(\xi) = P(\xi_k), \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi_k, \quad (22c)$$

$$u_s(\xi) \geq 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi_k, s = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (22d)$$

According to Proposition 2, the deterministic equivalent form based on the discretized ambiguity set can be derived as follows:

$$\min_{x, y, \alpha, \beta} \sum_{f \in F} \left(C_f \sum_{t \in T_f} (tx_{tf} - r_f) \right) + \epsilon \alpha + \sum_{s=1}^N \widehat{p}_s \beta_s \quad (23a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha \left\| \widehat{\xi}_s - \xi \right\|_2 + \beta_s \geq \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_t(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi_k, s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (23b)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_f} x_{ft} = 1, \quad \forall f \in F, \quad (23c)$$

$$\sum_{f \in F} x_{f,t} \leq K(\xi) - y_{t-1}(\xi) + y_t(\xi), \quad \forall t \in T, \xi \in \Xi_k, \quad (23d)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_{f_1}} tx_{f_1,t} - r_{f_1} - s_{f_1, f_2} \leq \sum_{t \in T_{f_2}} tx_{f_2,t} - r_{f_2}, \quad \forall f \in F, \forall t \in T_f, x_{ft} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (23e)$$

$$y_0(\xi) = 0, \quad \forall t \in T, \forall \xi \in \Xi_k, y_t(\xi) \geq 0, \alpha \geq 0. \quad (23f)$$

Since the deterministic equivalent form (19) shares the same objective value as its discretized counterpart (23) based on the fact that (11) is finitely reducible and weakly discretizable, we conclude that 19 is also finitely reducible and thus weakly discretizable. \square

Proposition 3 showed that for the deterministic equivalent formulation, there exists a subset Ξ_k of Ξ such that the objective value under the discretized ambiguity set would be the same as (23). We can now show, via Corollary 1, the existence of a “worst-case” scenario (i.e., airport capacity distribution) for dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP.

Corollary 1. *Given an arbitrary subset of the infinite support $\Xi_m \subset \Xi$, let $z(\Xi_m)$ be the objective value of the discretized dr-SAGHP and $z(\Xi_k)$ be the objective value of the dr-SAGHP with finitely reduced support $\Xi_k \subset \Xi$. Then, $z(\Xi_m) \leq z(\Xi_k)$.*

Proof. Suppose that Ξ_k is the subset of the infinite support that gives the same objective value as Ξ . Then, based on Proposition 3, we have that $z(\Xi_k) = z(\Xi)$. For $z(\Xi_m)$, there are three cases:

- Case 1: $\Xi_k \subset \Xi_m$;
- Case 2: $\Xi_m \subset \Xi_k$;
- Case 3: $\Xi_m \not\subset \Xi_k$ and $\Xi_k \not\subset \Xi_m$.

For Case 1, since the dr-SAGHP is weakly discretizable, then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} z(\Xi_m) = z(\Xi) = z(\Xi_k)$, i.e., for any superset Ξ_m of Ξ_k , we have that $z(\Xi_m) = z(\Xi_k)$. For Case 2, since $\Xi_m \subset \Xi_k$, the dr-SAGHP with Ξ_m is a relaxation problem of dr-SAGHP with Ξ_k . For the relaxation of a minimization problem, the objective value will be less than or equal to the original problem, and thus $z(\Xi_m) \leq z(\Xi_k)$. Finally, for Case 3, the dr-SAGHP with Ξ_m is also a relaxation of the dr-SAGHP with Ξ , then $z(\Xi_m) \leq z(\Xi) = z(\Xi_k)$. Therefore, given the arbitrary subset support Ξ_m , we have that $z(\Xi_m) \leq z(\Xi_k)$, as desired. \square

Practically, we note that it is probably difficult to locate the perfect subset support which gives the same objective value as the generic support. Hence, following from Corollary 1, if the chosen discretized support Ξ_m is a subset of Ξ_k , then a lower objective value will be acquired, and the objective value will decrease as the subset Ξ_m shrinks in size. When Ξ_m is large, the objective value of dr-SAGHP with Ξ_m would be close to the dr-SAGHP with infinite support, but at the cost of introducing more constraints. When a smaller subset support Ξ_m is chosen, although the model will be computationally easier to solve (due to the reduced number of constraints), the derived ground holding policy may not be robust, i.e., if the realized airport capacity does not belong in the chosen subset. This provides an interesting trade-off which hinges on the choice of Ξ_m for dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP: There is a trade-off between the complexity and the robustness of the distributionally-robust versions of the ground holding problem. An open question, to be explored in future work, revolves around the selection of an appropriate support for airport capacity distributions. Such a selection heuristic will likely be data-driven, based on historical observations of, e.g., airport capacity profile evolution, dynamics, and trends (see, e.g., [26]) or factors that directly impact airport capacities, such as the airport runway configuration (see, e.g., [27]).

3.5 Multi-Airport Ground Holding Problem

We now expand the problem to include the case with multiple airports. In order to extend the dr-SAGHP to the dr-MAGHP, we assume that for each airport $z \in Z$ within a network of airports, the airport capacity distribution is contained within a Wasserstein ambiguity set. Note that this does not change the reformulation methods from Proposition 2; the implementable version of the dr-MAGHP can be derived analogously, as had been done for the dr-SAGHP. To simplify the multiple airport case, we also assume that the airport capacity distributions are independent from each other: We anticipate relaxing this assumption in future work through, e.g., estimating joint distributions through copula distributions which account for heterogeneous marginal airport distributions and non-linear correlation structures. Under these assumptions, each airport capacity distribution will have a corresponding discretized Wasserstein ambiguity set based on its empirical capacity distribution. The deterministic equivalent formulation of the dr-MAGHP is given as follow:

$$\min_{x,y,\alpha,\beta} \sum_{z \in Z} \sum_{f \in F(z)} C_f \left(\sum_{t \in T_f(z)} tx_{tf} - r_f \right) + \epsilon \sum_{z \in Z} \alpha_z + \sum_{z \in Z} \sum_{s=1}^N \hat{p}_{z,s} \beta_{z,s} \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha_z \left\| \hat{\xi}_{z,s} - \xi \right\|_2 + \beta_{z,s} \geq \sum_{t \in T} C_h y_{s,t}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi_k, \forall z \in Z, s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (24b)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_f(z)} x_{ft} = 1, \quad \forall f \in F, z \in Z, \quad (24c)$$

$$\sum_{f \in F(z)} x_{f,t} \leq K_z(\xi) - y_{z,t-1}(\xi) + y_{z,t}(\xi), \quad \forall t \in T, \xi \in \Xi_k, z \in Z, \quad (24d)$$

$$\sum_{t \in T_{f_1}} tx_{f_1,t} - r_{f_1} - s_{f_1,f_2} \leq \sum_{t \in T_{f_2}} tx_{f_2,t} - r_{f_2}, \quad x_{ft} \in \{0, 1\}, f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (24e)$$

$$y_{z,0}(\xi) = 0, y_{z,t}(\xi) \geq 0, \alpha_z \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in T, \xi \in \Xi_k, z \in Z. \quad (24f)$$

The objective function (24a) is the sum of ground holding delay for all airports and the objective function of the dual of the inner maximization problem of the two stage dr-MAGHP. α_z and $\beta_{z,s}$ are dual variables for the ambiguity set of each airport. Similar as what we showed in Lemma1, (24b) ensures the Lagrangian functions of the inner maximization problems for each airport are bounded. (24c) makes sure for each flight at each airport, there is only one time slot for arrival being assigned. (24d) is the second stage airborne constraint, which means for each airport the number of arrival flights should be less than or equal to the realized airport capacity at time t plus the number of airborne flight at time t and then minus the number of airborne flight at time $t - 1$. (24e) is the coupling constraint, ensuring that for each connected flight pair \mathcal{C} , the ground holding policy placed on preceding flight f_1 will not cause any delay for the successive flight f_2 . (24f) requires that the number of airborne flight

at time t_0 at each airport is zero, and that the number of airborne flight for each time period and the dual variable α_z for each airport are not negative.

4 Computational Experiments and Results

In this section, several experiments are implemented to demonstrate the performance of the dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP when the distribution of airport capacities are different from empirical distributions, which in other words the out-of-sample performance of DR models.

4.1 Experiment setup

The flight schedule arrival and actual arrival time are collected from Bureau of Transportation Statistics(BTS). When testing the performance of dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP, historical data of Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport(ATL) has been taken for dr-SAGHP and data of 30 airports from "FAA core 30" have been collected for testing dr-MAGHP. To derive the empirical distribution and realized distribution of airport capacity, we take the actual throughput as an approximation of airport capacity and let $\{\widehat{\xi}_1, \widehat{\xi}_2, \dots, \widehat{\xi}_N\}$ be all the possible throughput of a single time slot obtained from operational data and $\{\widehat{p}_1, \widehat{p}_2, \dots, \widehat{p}_N\}$ be the corresponding probability for each throughput. Moreover, the empirical airport distribution is built based on the operational data of a single day, and the realized capacity distribution is from a whole month operational data. By doing so, we could train DR models with smaller data sets and inspect their out-of-sample performance on the testing data sets, which is aligned with practical airport operation where limited amount data can be utilized by traffic manager to make a decision. To calibrate the size of the Wasserstein ambiguity set, a discrete set of Ω has been constructed for candidate radius of the ambiguity set. For each $\epsilon \in \Omega$, samples with different sizes are generated to test the performance of the ground holding policy derived by the deterministic GHP, stochastic GHP and DR GHP.

4.2 Results for dr-SAGHP




Figure 1: Performance of SAGHP models on empirical distribution

Based on the theory of stochastic programming, under the empirical distribution the SP model will generate the best solution. Also, when ϵ is given a relatively small value, the radius of the Wasserstein ball is small so that the family of distribution in the ambiguity set are very close to the empirical distribution. When evaluating the total cost of the ground holding policy derived by d-SAGHP, we

consider the average airport capacity as the deterministic model for d-SAGHP. Also, the discretized support we take is an increasing array from the minimum capacity to the maximum capacity with the step of one flight. According to 1, the figure shows that when ϵ is less than 0.75, dr-SAGHP would generate the same ground holding policy as the s-SAGHP. As epsilon increases, the total cost of dr-SAGHP is larger than that of s-SAGHP and s-SAGHP, and SP-SAGHP has the lowest cost on empirical distribution. The results are aligned with the theory and reasonable for the empirical distribution. When evaluating the out-of-sample performance of dr-SAGHP on the test set, evaluation functions are built to calculate the total cost for ground holding policies provided by each model. We take samples with sample size $N = \{50, 100, 500, 100\}$ to observe the performance of each model.




Figure 2: Performance of SAGHP models on testing set

Table 1. Standard deviation of SAGHP models with different sample size

N	SP	det	DR _{0.01}	DR _{0.1}	DR _{0.7}	DR _{0.74}	DR _{0.75}	DR _{0.80}	DR ₁	DR ₁₀	DR ₁₀₀
50	2001.04	1468.99	2001.04	2001.04	2001.04	2001.04	1619.93	1525.38	1523.88	1522.00	1522.00
100	871.45	973.45	871.45	871.45	871.45	871.45	412.81	318.25	317.15	315.97	315.97
500	1339.26	939.52	1339.26	1339.26	1339.26	1339.26	959.15	882.95	881.89	880.69	880.69
1000	1629.02	890.80	1629.02	1629.02	1629.02	1629.02	1269.35	1190.55	1189.36	1187.98	1187.98

According to 2 and 1, when ϵ is small, the total cost and standard deviation of dr-SAGHP and SP-SAGHP are the same. When ϵ is larger than 0.04, the total cost of dr-SAGHP decreases dramatically and is lower than that of SP-SAGHP and the det-SAGHP. Also, when $N = 50, 100, 500, 1000$, the average cost of det-SAGHP is lower than that of SP-SAGHP. This means, for SAGHP, if there is a significant difference between the empirical distribution and the true of airport capacity, then the ground holding policy derived by the deterministic model might cause lower cost than the SP model.

4.3 Results for dr-MAGHP

Similar with experiments for SAGHP, we take average airport capacity of each airport in the network as the deterministic capacity, and take the increasing array from the minimum capacity to the maximum capacity as the support for each airport.




Figure 3: Performance of MAGHP models on empirical distribution

3 shows that, compared with dr-SAGHP, dr-MAGHP is more sensitive to the selection of ϵ . On the empirical distribution, the total cost of dr-MAGHP equals to s-MAGHP when $\epsilon = 0$, and the total cost keeps growing as ϵ increases. The performance of dr-MAGHP on empirical distribution is aligned with the result of dr-SAGHP and stochastic programming theory.




Figure 4: dr-MAGHP performance on two sets of 100 samples

The performance of dr-MAGHP on testing distributions is not the same as that of dr-SAGHP, where after a specific ϵ the total cost will remain the same. For dr-MAGHP as shown 4, as ϵ grows, the performance of dr-MAGHP will decrease at first and keep increasing again when the radius of the Wasserstein ball is larger than a specific value. We take two sets of airport capacity samples with size of 100, and for both cases the dr-MAGHP has the lowest cost when $\epsilon = 0.5$. Compared with standard deviation of dr-MAGHP shown in 2, the standard deviation of s-MAGHP in the two samples are 29580.37 and 25010, and that of d-MAGHP are 26312.05 and 23301.61.

Table 2. Standard deviation of dr-MAGHP on two sets of samples

Set index	Standard deviation for each epsilon					
	DR ₀	DR _{0.1}	DR _{0.2}	DR _{0.3}	DR _{0.4}	DR _{0.5}
S ₁	24976.56	29572.49	29162.73	28858.97	28303.93	27667.48
	DR _{0.6}	DR _{0.7}	DR _{0.8}	DR _{0.9}	DR ₁	DR ₁₀
	27011.48	26494.82	26083.70	25650.71	25168.81	24401.52
S ₂	DR ₀	DR _{0.1}	DR _{0.2}	DR _{0.3}	DR _{0.4}	DR _{0.5}
	27596.16	27117.81	26693.23	25980.10	25291.16	24666.62
	DR _{0.6}	DR _{0.7}	DR _{0.8}	DR _{0.9}	DR ₁	DR ₁₀
	24172.64	23790.80	23387.06	22927.96	22533.81	22194.32




Figure 5: Performance of three models when $\epsilon = 0.5$

In order to inspect the performance of dr-MAGHP when $\epsilon = 0.5$, we take 10 samples with size ranging from 1 to 10 and apply the first quartile and the third quartile to demonstrate variance in total cost. 5 displays that, when $\epsilon = 0.5$, the overall performance of dr-MAGHP on testing distribution is better than s-MAGHP, and d-MAGHP has the highest total cost on testing set. Also, for each sample size of the dr-MAGHP with $\epsilon = 0.5$, dr-MAGHP has the lowest variance. This means if a appropriate ϵ is selected for dr-MAGHP and the realized distribution is different from the empirical distribution, dr-MAGHP can give decision makers a more robust ground holding policy that reduces the total cost.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a novel approach for optimizing airport ground holding policies using distributionally robust optimization (DRO). Our work builds on previous works in ground holding problem and stochastic ground holding problem, which have shown that stochastic programming (SP) can provide effective solutions for airport ground holding problems but requires detailed and accurate

knowledge of the underlying distribution of airport capacity. In contrast, DRO can handle situations where this distribution is uncertain or rapidly changing by defining an ambiguity set of probability distributions and optimizing for the worst-case scenario within this set. We use the Wasserstein ball ambiguity set to define the set of probability distributions that we consider plausible. By using this metric, we can construct a distributionally robust optimization problem that accounts for the uncertainty in the airport capacity. The Lagrangian dual transformation is used to convert the DR-GHP under the Wasserstein set into an equivalent deterministic formulation. The discretization properties of semi-infinite programs make sure the existence of the worst-case distribution and enable us to solve the deterministic equivalent form of dr-SAGHP with discretized support. The experiment results of both dr-SAGHP and dr-MAGHP demonstrate that when epsilon is very small the performance of DR models are very close to or even the same as SP models. Also, the out-of-sample performance of DR models outperform SP models and deterministic models when specific values of Wasserstein radius ϵ are selected, which is shown by sampling airport capacities from the testing set. Our findings have important implications for airport ground holding policies in practice. In real-world operations, the true distribution of airport capacity is often unknown or rapidly changing, making it difficult to apply the SP model. Our work shows that the DRO model can be more robust in these situations and can help to reduce the total cost induced by ground holding delay and airborne delay. For future works, instead of approximating airport capacity only based on historical airport throughput, we would apply machine learning based methods to predict airport capacity distributions. Based upon the predicted distribution, we will be able to construct a ambiguity set around it and implement dr-MAGHP to found out the performance of it under practical airport operations and seek out the importance of distribution robust models in air transportation systems.

References

- [1] Richard de Neufville, Amedeo R. Odoni, Peter P. Belobaba, and Tom G.s Reynolds. Airport systems: Planning, design, and management. 2013.
- [2] A.R.Odoni P.B Vranas, D.J.Bertsimas. The multi-airport ground-holding problem in air traffic control. *Operations Research*, 42(2):249–261, 1994.
- [3] Air Traffic Organization FAA. Traffic flow management in the national airspace system. 2009.
- [4] Mark Hansen. Mukherjee Avijit. Dynamic stochastic optimization model for air traffic flow management with en route and airport capacity constraints. *Proc. 6th USA/Eur. Air Traffic Manage. R&D Seminar.*, 2005.
- [5] G. Andreatta and G. Tidona. A new formulation for the multi-airport ground holding problem. *University of Padova, Tech. Rep.*, 1994.
- [6] G. Andreatta and L. Brunetta. Multiairport ground holding problem:a computational evaluation of exact algorithms. *Operations Research*, 46(1):57–64, 1998.
- [7] Luca Corolli, Guglielmo Lulli, Lewis Ntaimo, and Saravanan Venkatachalam. A two-stage stochastic integer programming model for air traffic flow management. *IMA Journal of Management Mathematics*, 28(1):19–40, 2017.
- [8] Dengfeng Sun Chen, Jun. Stochastic ground-delay-program planning in a metroplex. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, 41(1):231–239, 2018.
- [9] Sun Choi and Young Jin Kim. Artificial neural network models for airport capacity prediction. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 2021.
- [10] Rafal Kicinger, Jit-Tat Chen, Matthias Steiner, and James Pinto. Airport capacity prediction with explicit consideration of weather forecast uncertainty. *Journal of Air Transportation*, 24(1):18–28, 2016.

- [11] Xu Hang Wang Ziming, Chaochao Liao, Daniel Delahaye Lishuai Li, and Mark Hansen. Distribution prediction of strategic flight delays via machine learning methods. *Sustainability* 14, 14(22):15186, 2022.
- [12] A. Agustı, Laureano F. Escudero Antonio Alonso-Ayuso, and Celeste Pizarro. On air traffic flow management with rerouting. part ii: Stochastic case. *European Journal of Operational Research*, (1), 2012.
- [13] Shubham Gupta and Dimitris J. Bertsimas. Multistage air traffic flow management under capacity uncertainty: a robust and adaptive optimization approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2011.
- [14] J. Chen, L. Chen, and D. Sun. Air traffic flow management under uncertainty using chance-constrained optimization. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 102:124–141, 2017.
- [15] Michael O. Ball, Amedeo R. Odoni Robert Hoffman, and Ryan Rifkin. A stochastic integer program with dual network structure and its application to the ground-holding problem. *Operations research*, 51(1):167–171, 2003.
- [16] Charles N. Glover and Michael O. Ball. Stochastic optimization models for ground delay program planning with equity–efficiency tradeoffs. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, pages 196–202, 2013.
- [17] Yinyu Ye Delage, Erick. Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations research*, 58(3):595–612, 2010.
- [18] Ioannis Ch Paschalidis Chen, Ruidi. Distributionally robust learning. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, 4(1-2):1–243, 2020.
- [19] Daniel Kuhn Mohajerin Esfahani, Peyman. Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1-2):115–166, 2018.
- [20] Ruiwei C Jiang and Guanglin Xu Minseok Ryu. Data-driven distributionally robust appointment scheduling over wasserstein ball. *arXiv preprint*, 2019.
- [21] Daniel Kuhn Zhen, Jianzhe and Wolfram Wiesemann. Mathematical foundations of robust and distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.00760*, 2021.
- [22] Xian Yu Basciftci, Beste and Siqian Shen. Resource distribution under spatiotemporal uncertainty of disease spread: stochastic versus robust approaches. *Computers & Operations Research*, (149):106028, 2023.
- [23] Kibaek Kim. Dual decomposition of two-stage distributionally robust mixed-integer programming under the wasserstein ambiguity set. *Preprint manuscript (2020)*, 2020.
- [24] Lieven Vandenberghe Boyd Stephen P. Convex optimization. *Cambridge university press*, 2004.
- [25] Georg Still López, Marco. Semi-infinite programming. *European journal of operational research*, (2):491–518, 2007.
- [26] Gurkaran Buxi and Mark Hansen. Generating day-of-operation probabilistic capacity scenarios from weather forecasts. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 33:153–166, 2013.
- [27] Jacob Avery and Hamsa Balakrishnan. Data-driven modeling and prediction of the process for selecting runway configurations. *Transportation Research Record*, 2600(1):1–11, 2016.