

# Contents

<b>Introduccion</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 ENAP’s optimization system for distributing refined petroleum products by tanker</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	2
1.2 The tankers distribution system at ENAP . . . . .	3
1.3 Description of the two models . . . . .	6
1.4 Formulation of the Nodes Model for tankers scheduling . . . . .	8
1.4.1 Sets definition . . . . .	8
1.4.2 Parameters . . . . .	8
1.4.3 Decision Variables . . . . .	9
1.4.4 Constraints . . . . .	10
1.4.5 Objective function structure . . . . .	12
1.5 Main features of the Route Model for tankers scheduling . . . . .	13
1.6 Interaction of the two models . . . . .	13
1.7 Implementation of the model at ENAP . . . . .	14
1.7.1 Parameters used in the June 2016 run . . . . .	14
1.7.2 Description of the optimal solution for the June 2016 run . . . . .	15
1.8 Implementation of the graphical user interface (GUI) and Impact . . . . .	19
1.9 Conclusion . . . . .	20
<b>2 Optimizing the ENAP’s Pipeline Scheduling System</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	21
2.2 The pipelines system at ENAP and problem description . . . . .	23
2.3 General methodology for addressing the problem . . . . .	25
2.4 The pipeline scheduling optimization model at ENAP . . . . .	28
2.4.1 Set definitions . . . . .	28
2.4.2 Parameters . . . . .	28
2.4.3 Decision variables . . . . .	29
2.4.4 Constraints . . . . .	30
2.4.5 Objective function structure . . . . .	33
2.5 Implementation of the model at ENAP . . . . .	35
2.5.1 Monthly demand of product $k$ at client $i$ ( $dem_{i,k}$ ) . . . . .	35
2.5.2 Capacity of product $k$ at client $i$ ( $Cap_{i,k}$ ) . . . . .	35
2.5.3 Initial inventory level of product $k$ at client $i$ ( $IInv_{i,k}$ ) . . . . .	36
2.5.4 Safety stock of product $k$ at demand point $i$ ( $SS_i^k$ ) . . . . .	36

2.5.5	Optimal Solution: Injections scheduling . . . . .	37
2.5.6	Total volume transported . . . . .	37
2.5.7	Detailed optimal schedule for April 2016 . . . . .	37
2.6	Implementation and graphical user interface (GUI) for ENAP . . . . .	38
2.6.1	Computational times . . . . .	39
2.7	Impact of the model and cost savings . . . . .	39
2.7.1	Savings in reprocessing cost . . . . .	39
2.7.2	Savings in contractual penalties for ENAP . . . . .	39
2.8	Another positive effect . . . . .	39
2.8.1	Use of the model for evaluating a new way of supplying jet fuel to Maipu . . . . .	40
2.9	Conclusions . . . . .	41
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>43</b>