Mathematical Formulations and Multi-Agent Optimization Frameworks for Railway Whole System Life Cycle Cost Minimization

Abstract

Railway networks represent highly interconnected, multi-stakeholder socio-technical systems where operational efficiency, structural safety, commercial profitability, and long-term capital investments interact under severe capacity and budgetary constraints[1]. Traditional railway system optimization frequently focuses on isolated sub-problems, such as localized timetable generation or asset-specific maintenance scheduling, leading to sub-optimal system outcomes and inflated total expenditure[1]. This paper establishes a comprehensive multi-agent mathematical framework designed to minimize the Whole System Life Cycle Cost (LCC) across a discounted multi-decade horizon[1]. By explicitly modeling five core system agents—Passengers, Train Operating Companies (TOCs), Infrastructure Managers (IMs), Network Developers, and Contractors—this research formulates their explicit objective functions, decision variables, physical constraints, and dynamic equilibrium conditions[1]. Furthermore, this paper evaluates computational solution architectures spanning Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP), Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL), and static Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) prototyping to demonstrate how decentralized agent interactions achieve dynamic socio-economic stability[1].

Introduction to System Stakeholders and Multi-Agent Modeling

Modern railway system management operates within an increasingly fragmented structural landscape[1]. Regulatory unbundling and privatization across international rail networks have divided responsibilities among independent commercial entities, state-owned custodians, regulatory bodies, and engineering contractors[1]. While this structural division encourages localized efficiency and accountability, it introduces friction between competing stakeholder objectives[1]. For example, a Train Operating Company attempting to maximize revenue through dense scheduling accelerates track asset degradation, imposing severe maintenance costs on the Infrastructure Manager[1]. Conversely, prolonged maintenance possession windows scheduled by an Infrastructure Manager disrupt train timetables, reducing passenger demand and imposing operational penalties across the network[1].

Capturing these systemic feedback mechanisms requires a multi-agent mathematical paradigm capable of representing heterogeneous decision-makers[1]. Rather than treating the railway network as a single centralized optimization problem, multi-agent modeling constructs explicit

objective functions and constraints for each stakeholder agent, synthesizing them into a master Whole System Life Cycle Cost objective function evaluated over time[1]. Whole System Life Cycle Costing unifies direct capital expenditures (CAPEX), routine operational expenditures (OPEX), non-linear asset maintenance costs, delay disruption penalties, and user costs (monetized travel time and service disruptions) into a single discounted Present Value framework[1].
The framework models five structural agents operating across distinct strategic, tactical, and operational decision horizons[1]:

- **Agent 1: Passengers (Demand & User Cost Agent)**: Evaluates trip utility, mode choice, and travel friction based on service pricing, timetable frequency, and delay risks[1].
- **Agent 2: Train Operating Companies (TOCs - Commercial Agent)**: Optimizes commercial transport operations, rolling stock fleet sizing, service frequency, and ticket pricing to maximize net commercial profit[1].
- **Agent 3: Infrastructure Manager (IM - Asset Integrity Agent)**: Controls asset renewals, routine track maintenance, catenary management, and possession scheduling to minimize long-term infrastructure LCC while guaranteeing safety standards[1].
- **Agent 4: Network Developers & System Planners (Strategic Infrastructure Agent)**: Evaluates multi-decade capital expansion projects, corridor capacity additions, and regional connectivity to maximize long-term social welfare and carbon abatement[1].
- **Agent 5: Contractors & Maintenance Execution Providers (Tactical Delivery Agent)**: Executes physical track renewals, civil works, and maintenance interventions under strict labor, machinery, and possession window constraints to maximize contract profitability[1].

Comprehensive Mathematical Formulations of System Stakeholder Agents

Agent 1: Passengers (Demand and User Cost Agent)

Passengers represent the primary demand generation agent within the railway ecosystem[1]. While passengers do not directly make infrastructure or operational capital allocations, their behavioral reactions to ticket prices, train schedules, and service disruptions govern total revenue generation and social travel utility[1]. Passengers make modal choice decisions by seeking to minimize their Generalized Journey Cost (GJC)[1].

Mathematical Formulation

The Generalized Journey Cost $C_{passenger,ij}$ for passenger flow along route i during temporal period j is expressed as:

$$C_{passenger,ij} = p_{ij} + \beta_1 \cdot T_{ivt,ij} + \beta_2 \cdot T_{wait,ij} + \beta_3 \cdot R_{delay,ij} + \beta_4 \cdot A_{access,ij}$$

Where:

- p_{ij} represents the monetary ticket fare set by the Train Operating Company[1].

- $T_{ivt,ij}$ is the in-vehicle travel time, determined by line speed limits and operational dwell times[1].
- $T_{wait,ij}$ is the average station waiting time, modeled as an inverse function of train service frequency f_k on line k (e.g., $T_{wait,ij} \approx \frac{60}{2f_k}$)[1].
- $R_{delay,ij}$ is the monetized risk of trip delay, tied directly to asset failure probabilities and network disruption rates managed by the Infrastructure Manager[1].
- $A_{access,ij}$ captures station access and egress travel friction[1].
- $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ represent Value of Time (VOT) weighting coefficients, where empirically β_2 (waiting time) and β_3 (unplanned delay risk) carry higher penalties than β_1 (in-vehicle time)[1].

The collective passenger objective minimizes total network user journey costs:

$$\min C_{passenger} = \sum_i \sum_j D_{ij}(C_{passenger,ij}) \cdot C_{passenger,ij}$$

Decision Variables

- $D_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^+$: Passenger demand/flow on route i during time period j, derived using an elastic logit modal-split function $D_{ij} = D_{max,ij} \cdot \frac{\exp(-\lambda C_{passenger,ij})}{\sum_{m \in M} \exp(-\lambda C_{m,ij})}$, where M represents competing transport modes[1].

Structural Constraints

- **Budget Limit / Max Willingness to Pay**: Fares cannot exceed passenger affordability bounds:

$$p_{ij} \leq WTP_{max,ij}$$

- **Rolling Stock Capacity Ceiling**: On-board passenger volume cannot exceed maximum seated and standing rolling stock capacity:

$$D_{ij} \leq f_k \cdot CAP_{rolling\_stock}$$

Agent 2: Train Operating Companies (Commercial Viability Agent)

Train Operating Companies (TOCs) operate transport services across designated network lines[1]. The primary commercial objective of the TOC agent is net operational profit maximization, balancing gross ticket revenues against operating expenses, rolling stock leasing costs, and Track Access Charges (TAC) paid to the Infrastructure Manager[1].

Mathematical Formulation

$$\max \Pi_{TOC} = \sum_{k \in K} (p_k \cdot D_k(p_k, f_k)) - \sum_{k \in K} \left(C_{TAC}(f_k) + C_{energy}(f_k) + C_{staff}(f_k) + C_{RS\_LCC}(N_{rs})\right)$$

Where:

- p_k is the ticket price structure applied to service line k [1].
- $D_k(p_k, f_k)$ is realized passenger demand on line k as a function of pricing and service frequency[1].
- $C_{TAC}(f_k)$ represents Track Access Charges paid to the Infrastructure Manager for running f_k train services[1].
- $C_{energy}(f_k)$ is traction energy consumption expenditure[1].
- $C_{staff}(f_k)$ is operational crew labor expenditure[1].
- $C_{RS\_LCC}(N_{rs})$ represents life cycle leasing and operational maintenance expenditures for fleet size N_{rs} [1].

Decision Variables

- $f_k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$: Service frequency (trains per hour) scheduled on line k [1].
- $p_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$: Ticket pricing policy for service line k [1].
- $N_{rs} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$: Total active rolling stock fleet size assigned to operational service[1].

Structural Constraints

- **Fleet Availability Limit**: Deployed operational trains cannot exceed total available leased fleet units:

$$\sum_{k \in K} \text{TurnaroundTime}_k \cdot f_k \leq N_{rs}$$

- **Safety Headway Limit**: Train service headway $h_k = \frac{60}{f_k}$ must exceed minimum allowable signaling safety headway h_{min} :

$$f_k \leq \frac{60}{h_{min}}$$

- **Regulatory Price Cap**: Fares are bounded by regulatory price caps imposed by public transport authorities:

$$p_k \leq p_{max,k}$$

Agent 3: Infrastructure Manager (Asset Integrity Agent)

The Infrastructure Manager (IM) acts as the custodian of physical rail infrastructure, including track ballast, steel rails, switches, overhead line electrification (OLE), and signaling networks[1]. The IM minimizes total infrastructure LCC while maintaining asset integrity above strict regulatory safety standards[1].

Mathematical Formulation

$$\min C_{IM\_LCC} = \sum_{t=0}^{T} \sum_{m \in M} \left(C_{renew,m}(a_{m,t}) + C_{maint,m}(a_{m,t}) + P_{disruption}\left(R_{delay,m}(a_{m,t})\right)\right)$$

Where:

- $m \in M$ denotes asset categories across track geometry, catenary, and signaling[1].
- $a_{m,t}$ defines the maintenance or renewal intervention level selected for asset m at time t [1].
- $C_{renew,m}$ and $C_{maint,m}$ represent direct capital renewal expenditures (CAPEX) and routine operational maintenance expenses (OPEX)[1].
- $P_{disruption}$ represents financial disruption penalties paid to TOCs or monetized user penalties caused by asset failure delays $R_{delay,m}$ [1].

Dynamic Asset Degradation Model

Track degradation is non-linear and governed by Cumulative Gross Tonnage (CGT) imposed by operational train frequencies f_k and axle loads $M_{axle,k}$ [1]. The Track Quality Index (TQI_m) evolves over time as:

$$\mathrm{TQI}_m(t+1) = \mathrm{TQI}_m(t) + \alpha_m \cdot \left(\sum_{k \in K} f_k \cdot M_{axle,k}\right)^{\gamma_m} - \phi_m(a_{m,t})$$

Where α_m represents environmental degradation rates, $\gamma_m > 1$ is an empirical mechanical wear exponent, and $\phi_m(a_{m,t})$ represents the quality restoration achieved by maintenance action $a_{m,t}$ [1].

Decision Variables

- $\tau_{m,t} \in \{0,1\}$: Binary decision to schedule an engineering possession window for asset m during time slot t[1].
- $a_{m,t} \in A$: Discrete maintenance intervention intensity (e.g., $a_0 = \text{Inspection}$, $a_1 = \text{Tamping/Grinding}$, $a_2 = \text{Full Renewal}$)[1].

Structural Constraints

- **Safety Condition Limit**: Track degradation must never breach the safety threshold TQI_{max} :

$$\text{TQI}_m(t) \leq \text{TQI}_{max}, \quad \forall m \in M, \forall t$$

- **Possession Window Allowance**: Maintenance execution must fit within allocated engineering possession windows:

$$\tau_{m,t} \cdot t_{duration} \leq W_{possession,t}$$

- **Budget Expenditure Limit**: Period maintenance expenditures cannot exceed allocated operational funding:

$$\sum_{m \in M} \left(C_{renew,m}\left(a_{m,t}\right) + C_{maint,m}\left(a_{m,t}\right)\right) \leq B_{IM,t}$$

Agent 4: Network Developers and System Planners (Strategic Agent)

The Network Developer acts as a strategic planning authority evaluating long-term capital investments over multi-decade planning horizons (30 to 50 years)[1]. This agent plans new line construction, double-tracking, electrification projects, and major node capacity upgrades[1]. The objective balances capital expenditure against quantified net social benefits, including highway congestion reduction, regional economic productivity, and carbon abatement[1].

Mathematical Formulation

$$\min C_{Network} = \sum_{e \in E} X_e \cdot \text{CAPEX}_e(T_e) - \sum_{t=0}^{T} \frac{1}{(1+r)^t} \left(B_{congestion,t}\left(X_e\right) + B_{carbon,t}\left(X_e\right) + B_{economy,t}\left(X_e\right)\right)$$

Where:

- $X_e \in \{0,1\}$ indicates the binary construction decision for expansion project e[1].
- $\text{CAPEX}_e(T_e)$ represents capital construction cost given execution schedule T_e[1].

- $B_{congestion}, B_{carbon}, B_{economy}$ represent monetized societal benefits resulting from modal shift off road networks and onto rail[1].
- r is the social discount rate[1].

Decision Variables

- $X_e \in \{0,1\}$: Binary selection variable for project candidate e [1].
- $T_e \in \mathbb{Z}^+$: Strategic timeline phasing and completion date for project e [1].

Structural Constraints

- **Strategic Capital Envelope**: Total capital construction costs cannot exceed long-term public funding allowances:

$$\sum_{e \in E} X_e \cdot \mathrm{CAPEX}_e \leq B_{Capital\_Limit}$$

- **Network Capacity Feasibility**: Infrastructure additions must eliminate critical bottleneck junctions without exceeding signaling capacity limits[1].

Agent 5: Contractors and Maintenance Execution Providers (Tactical Agent)

Contractors are specialized entities engaged by Infrastructure Managers or Network Developers to perform physical renewals, track tamping, rail grinding, and construction[1]. Contractors seek to maximize project profitability by optimizing machine utilization, labor crew scheduling, and material procurement, subject to strict delivery deadlines and severe delay overrun penalties[1].

Mathematical Formulation

$$\max \Pi_{Contractor} = V_{contract} - \left(C_{material}(t_{work}) + C_{labor}(R_{labor}) + C_{equipment}(R_{machinery}) + P_{overrun}(\Delta t_{overrun})\right)$$

Where:

- $V_{contract}$ is the fixed or index-linked contract value[1].
- $C_{material}, C_{labor}, C_{equipment}$ represent direct resource operational expenditures[1].
- $P_{overrun}$ represents non-linear delay penalties incurred if engineering possessions overrun agreed time limits ($\Delta t_{overrun} = \max(0, t_{completion} - W_{possession})$), forcing cancellations of scheduled passenger train services[1].

Decision Variables

- $R_{resource} = \{R_{labor}, R_{machinery}\}$: Allocation vectors for labor shifts and heavy rail machinery (e.g., ballast cleaning trains, tamping vehicles)[1].

- $t_{completion} \in \mathbb{R}^+$: Planned task completion duration[1].

Structural Constraints

- **Possession Handover Deadline**: Engineering interventions must terminate before scheduled operational passenger train service windows resume:

$$t_{completion} \leq W_{possession}$$

- **Heavy Machinery Availability**: Equipment deployment cannot exceed specialized machinery fleet availability:

$$R_{machinery} \leq R_{machinery,available}$$

Whole System Synthesis and Master Optimization Objective

Master System-Level Objective Function

To achieve Whole System Life Cycle Cost minimization across the network, individual agent objectives are synthesized into a master socio-economic Net Present Value (NPV) objective function evaluated over horizon T [1]:

$$\min \text{System LCC} = \sum_{t=0}^{T} \frac{1}{(1+r)^t} \left[C_{IM\_CAPEX}(t) + C_{IM\_OPEX}(t) + C_{TOC\_OPEX}(t) + C_{Passenger\_GJC}(t) + C_{Disruption\_Penalty}(t)\right]$$

$$\text{Subject to:}$$

- Demand-Price Modal Equilibrium: $D_{ij}(t) = \mathcal{F}\left(p_k(t), f_k(t), R_{delay}(t)\right)$ [1].
- Structural Degradation Kinematics: $\text{TQI}(t+1) = g\left(\text{TQI}(t), f_k(t), M_{axle,k}, a_{m,t}\right)$ [1].
- Network Timetable & Capacity Bounds: $\sum_{k \in K} f_k \cdot h_{safe} + W_{possession,t} \leq 24 \text{ Hours}$ [1].

Inter-Agent Trade-off Mechanisms

The integration of these mathematical agent formulations highlights critical system-level trade-offs that drive whole-system cost minimization[1]:

- **Operations-Degradation Feedback Loop**: Elevating service frequency (f_k) improves passenger utility by reducing station wait times (T_{wait})[1]. However, increased train frequencies escalate tonnage, accelerating track degradation (TQI) non-linearly[1]. This requires more frequent possession windows (τ_m), inflating Infrastructure Manager maintenance OPEX (C_{IM_OPEX})[1].

- **Possession-Disruption Feedback Loop**: Restricting IM maintenance expenditure (C_{IM_OPEX}) delays necessary renewals, causing track degradation to approach safety limits[1]. This necessitates temporary speed restrictions or leads to unexpected failure, escalating operational delays (R_{delay})[1]. These delays increase passenger generalized costs ($C_{Passenger\_GJC}$) and trigger performance penalties ($P_{disruption}$) that exceed the original maintenance savings[1].
- **Commercial-Regulatory Equilibrium**: Unregulated fare increases (p_k) set by TOCs to maximize commercial profit (Π_{TOC}) drive passengers toward highway transport[1]. This reduces overall rail system revenue, increases highway congestion externalities ($B_{congestion}$), and undermines the societal return on capital expansion projects ($C_{Network}$)[1].

Methodological Implementation and Solution Architectures

Solving the multi-agent Whole System LCC optimization model requires robust computational architectures capable of processing discrete capital decisions, continuous operational variables, and complex multi-agent interactions[1].

Analytical Dimension	**Excel + Solver / OpenSolver (DCF Prototyping)**	**Python Optimization Engines (Pyomo / Gurobi / SciPy)**	**Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (Python Mesa / MARL)**
Primary Scope	Static multi-year financial modeling & NPV cash flow prototyping[1].	High-dimensional Mixed-Integer Linear Program (MILP) solving[1].	Dynamic dynamic interaction, adaptive behaviors, & dynamic learning[1].
Mathematical Structure	Spreadsheet cell linkage & deterministic cash	Explicit algebraic constraint matrices & linear bounds[1].	Stochastic MDP / Markov Game (S, A, P, R, γ)[1].

	flows[1].		
Handling Non-Linearities	Local GRG Non-Linear solvers[1].	Piecewise linear approximations or MIQCP solvers[1].	Deep neural network policy approximations (QMIX, MAPPO)[4].
Scalability & Speed	Suitable for small networks; limited scaling[1].	Highly scalable using parallel C++ optimization engines[1].	Computationally intensive simulation training episodes[4].
Optimal Application Phase	Early-stage financial screening & static DCF baseline modeling[1].	Precise mathematical optimization of schedules & maintenance[1].	Simulating decentralized stakeholder negotiations & feedback[1].

Computational Solution Paradigms

Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP Formulation)

When formulated as a global optimization problem in Python using Pyomo with underlying solvers like Gurobi or CPLEX, non-linear track degradation curves are converted into piecewise linear segments across discrete time steps $t \in T$ and asset states $s \in S$ [1]:

$$\min \text{System LCC} = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{k \in K} (c_k^{op} f_{k,t}) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{m \in M} (c_m^{renew} y_{m,t} + c_m^{maint} w_{m,t}) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i,j} \left(\beta_1 D_{ij,t} T_{ivt} + \beta_2 D_{ij,t} \frac{60}{2 f_{k,t}} \right)$$

Subject to:

$$\text{TQI}_{m,t+1} = \text{TQI}_{m,t} + \Delta\text{TQI}_{m,t} - \mu \cdot w_{m,t} - M_{big} \cdot y_{m,t}$$

$$w_{m,t} \in \{0,1\}, \quad y_{m,t} \in \{0,1\}$$

Where $w_{m,t}$ models routine maintenance actions (e.g., tamping) and $y_{m,t}$ represents complete capital replacement decisions[1].

Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning Architecture (MARL)

When decentralized decision-making and adaptive behaviors are prioritized, the system is structured as a Markov Game defined by joint state space S, action spaces $A_1 \dots A_5$, transition probabilities P, and agent reward functions $R_1 \dots R_5$ [4]. Utilizing Centralized Training with Decentralized Execution (CTDE) paradigms, such as Multi-Agent Proximal Policy Optimization (MAPPO) or QMIX value factorization[4]:

- **State Vector (S)**: Comprises track quality metrics (TQI), fleet availability, historical disruption rates, and available capital budgets[1].
- **Action Spaces (A_n)**:
  - Passenger Agent ($A_{Passenger}$): Route and modal choice selection[1].
  - TOC Agent (A_{TOC}): Dynamic pricing p_k and frequency adjustments f_k [1].
  - IM Agent (A_{IM}): Possession timing τ_m and maintenance intensity a_m [1].
  - Strategic Planner ($A_{Planner}$): Binary project initiation X_e [1].
  - Contractor Agent ($A_{Contractor}$): Labor shift and machinery allocation $R_{resource}$ [1].
- **Global Shared Reward (R_{global})**: Guides agent cooperation by assigning negative total discounted Whole System LCC[1]:

$$R_{global}(t) = -\left(C_{IM\_CAPEX}(t) + C_{IM\_OPEX}(t) + C_{TOC\_OPEX}(t) + C_{Passenger\_GJC}(t) + P_{disruption}(t)\right)$$

Strategic Policy Implications and Conclusions

Optimizing Whole System Life Cycle Cost yields important policy insights for modern railway asset management and regulatory design[1]:

- **Dynamic Track Access Pricing**: Standard flat-rate Track Access Charges fail to reflect the non-linear wear damage imposed by heavy axle loads[1]. Replacing flat fees with dynamic, axle-load-dependent pricing structures aligns TOC fleet investment decisions with long-term IM asset preservation[1].
- **Integrated Possession Window Optimization**: Contracting strategies focused solely on minimizing immediate engineering labor expenses often mandate long work possessions[1]. When passenger delay costs ($C_{Passenger\_GJC}$) are fully monetized in the objective function, high-intensity, automated maintenance executed within compressed overnight possession windows becomes the system-optimal strategy[1].
- **Coordinated Multi-Decade Expansion**: Network expansions planned by System Developers must synchronize with TOC fleet renewal cycles and IM preventive maintenance schedules to eliminate capacity bottlenecks without inducing localized maintenance backlogs[1].

Implementing this multi-agent framework requires a structured, two-phase approach[1]. Phase 1 focuses on static Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) prototyping in Excel to establish baseline financial balances, quantify unit cost functions, and evaluate static scenarios across stakeholders[1]. Phase 2 translates these parameters into Python-based optimization environments (Pyomo/Gurobi) and Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning platforms (Mesa/MARL) to capture non-linear degradation dynamics, timetable scheduling, and dynamic stakeholder negotiations[1]. This integrated methodology provides rail authorities with a rigorous mathematical foundation to minimize Whole System Life Cycle Cost while maintaining high service quality and structural safety[1].

Works cited

1. SystemStakeholdersMathmaticallModelling.docx
2. Multi Agent Based Railway Scheduling and Optimization - James Arambam, https://jamesarambam.github.io/files/tencon14.pdf
3. Multi-Agent Optimization for Railway Network Scheduling and Coordination | Request PDF, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/410488569_Multi-Agent_Optimization_for_Railway_Network_Scheduling_and_Coordination
4. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning in Intelligent Transportation Systems: A Comprehensive Survey - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2508.20315v2
5. Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning Optimization for Virtual Coupled Train Set Problem in CBTC Systems - SciOpen, https://www.sciopen.com/article/10.26599/TST.2025.9010067?issn=1007-0214