Abstract—In this paper, we investigate the problem of a last-mile delivery service that selects up to \( N \) available vehicles to deliver \( M \) packages from a centralized depot to \( M \) delivery locations. The objective of the last-mile delivery service is to jointly maximize customer satisfaction (minimize delivery time) and minimize operating cost (minimize total travel time) by selecting the optimal number of vehicles to perform the deliveries. We model this as an assignment (vehicles to packages) and path planning (determining the delivery order and route) problem, which is equivalent to the NP-hard multiple traveling salesperson problem. We propose a scalable heuristic algorithm, which sacrifices some optimality to achieve a reasonable computational cost for a high number of packages. The algorithm combines hierarchical clustering with a greedy search. To validate our approach, we compare the results of our simulation to experiments in a physical testing environment, which, to the best of our knowledge, has not yet been addressed in the literature. We seek to fill this gap by validating a heuristic algorithm for last-mile delivery in a physical testbed.

Our first contribution is a fast online algorithm to generate the assignment of vehicles to deliveries as well as the routes of each vehicle. This is based on our previous work, where agents are assigned to goals and generate trajectories to create a desired formation [23], [24]. Our second contribution is the experimental validation of a last-mile delivery algorithm in a physical testing environment, which, to the best of our knowledge, has not yet been addressed in the literature.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we present some mathematical preliminaries on graph theory, and in Section III, we formulate the last-mile delivery service problem along with our modeling framework. In Section IV, we discuss our scalable heuristic solution, and in Section V, we present simulation results alongside the experimental validation in our 1:25 scale robotic testbed. Finally, we draw concluding remarks in Section VI.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we present preliminary mathematical material that describes how we model our urban road network as a mathematical graph.

Definition 1. Our urban roadway network is represented by a directed graph, denoted \( \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) \), which consists of:

- A set of nodes, \( \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \), corresponding to the locations where 1) two road segments join or separate, e.g., merging zones, intersections, roundabouts, entry and exit ramps, and 2) locations where the road network transitions between straight-line and arc segments.
- A set of directed edges, \( \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \), which contains pairs of nodes that are connected by a one-way road segment.
We determine the assignment matrix, and thus the optimal vehicles, which is a function of the assignment matrix, that both \( T \) vehicle to package delivery time, with the cost denoted by \( 0 \) otherwise.

**Definition 2.** For a graph \( \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) \), a path of length \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \) is a sequence of nodes, denoted \( \mathcal{P} = (p_1, \ldots, p_\ell) \), where \( p_1, \ldots, p_\ell \in \mathcal{V} \), and there exists a corresponding edge \( (p_k, p_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{E} \) for all \( k \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\} \). The total cost of a path \( \mathcal{P} \) is equal to the sum of the costs of its edges, i.e., \( c(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} c((p_k, p_{k+1})) \).

In the next section, we formulate our last-mile delivery service, which manages the delivery of packages to customers from a centralized depot. The objective of our delivery service is to jointly minimize cost and maximize customer satisfaction, i.e., jointly minimize the total travel time and average delivery time.

**III. PROBLEM FORMULATION**

Our delivery service consists of \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) vehicles that can be used to deliver \( M \in \mathbb{N} \) packages to nodes located on the urban road network \( \mathcal{U} \). Let \( N' := \{1, \ldots, N\} \) index the available delivery vehicles, and let \( \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{V} \) denote the set of all delivery locations. Finally, let \( \mathcal{G} = \{1, 2, \ldots, M\} \) uniquely index the delivery locations in \( \mathcal{D} \), i.e., there exists a bijective mapping

\[
m : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{G}.
\]

To formulate our delivery service problem, the first step is to partition the delivery locations into, at most, \( N \) disjoint sets that the vehicles can be assigned to. We achieve this by defining an assignment matrix.

**Definition 3.** The assignment matrix, \( \mathbf{A} \), is an \( N \times M \) binary matrix, where element \( a_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \) is 1 if vehicle \( i \in N' \) is assigned to deliver a package to delivery location \( j \in \mathcal{G} \) and 0 otherwise.

The objective of our delivery service is to determine the number of vehicles to send on deliveries such that operating cost and customer satisfaction are jointly optimized. We model customer satisfaction as being inversely proportional to package delivery time, with the cost denoted by \( J_s \), and we denote the total travel cost by \( J_c \), which is proportional to the total round-trip time of all vehicles, i.e.,

\[
J_s(\mathbf{A}) = \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} t_j(\mathbf{A})}{M}, \quad (2)
\]

\[
J_c(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i \in N} T_i(\mathbf{A}), \quad (3)
\]

where \( t_j \) denotes the time taken for package \( j \in \mathcal{G} \) to be delivered, and \( T_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \) is the round-trip travel time for vehicle \( i \) to make its deliveries and return to the depot. Note that both \( T_i \) and \( t_j \) depend on the actual route taken by the vehicles, which is a function of the assignment matrix, \( \mathbf{A} \). We determine the assignment matrix, and thus the optimal number of vehicles to deploy, by solving the following centralized assignment problem.

**Problem 1 (Delivery Assignment).** Assign vehicles to deliver packages such that the average delivery and round-trip travel time are jointly minimized,

\[
\min_{\mathbf{A}} \left\{ \alpha J_s(\mathbf{A}) + (1 - \alpha)J_c(\mathbf{A}) \right\} \quad (4)
\]

subject to:

\[
\sum_{i \in N} a_{ij} = 1 \text{ for all } j \in \mathcal{G},
\]

\[
a_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } i \in N', j \in \mathcal{G},
\]

where \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \) is an intrinsic parameter that balances the tradeoff between minimizing operating cost and maximizing customer satisfaction for a particular delivery service, and \( a_{ij}, i \in N', j \in \mathcal{G} \), are the elements of the assignment matrix \( \mathbf{A} \). Note that the first constraint ensures that each package gets delivered only by one vehicle, and some vehicles may not be assigned to deliver any packages.

In order to deliver the packages, and therefore compute the cost components of Problem 1, we need to determine the route taken by each vehicle given the assignment matrix, \( \mathbf{A} \). We define the delivery route of vehicle \( i \in N' \) as the sequence \( S_i := (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \), where \( n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}} a_{ij} \) (Definition 3) and \( \bigcup_{k \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}} s_k = \{v \in \mathcal{D} \mid j = m(v), a_{ij} = 1\} \), where \( m \) maps delivery locations to indices by (1). To determine the optimal sequence to deliver their assigned packages, each vehicle \( i \) solves the following problem.

**Problem 2.** For each vehicle \( i \in N' \), with a given delivery assignment matrix \( \mathbf{A} \), determine the path \( \mathcal{P}_i \) that minimizes the total travel time such that the vehicle starts and ends at the depot and delivers all assigned packages, i.e.,

\[
\min_{\mathcal{P}_i, S_i} T_i \quad (5)
\]

subject to:

\[
p_1 = d, \quad p_1 \in \mathcal{P}_i, \quad p_t = d, \quad \ell = |\mathcal{P}_i|, \quad p_t \in \mathcal{P}_i,
\]

\[
S_i \text{ is a subsequence of } \mathcal{P}_i,
\]

where \( \mathcal{P}_i = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_\ell) \) is the path taken by vehicle \( i \) (Definition 2), \( S_i = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \) defines the sequence of deliveries, and \( d \in \mathcal{V} \) is the node corresponding to the depot entrance.

Thus, the cost of the optimal assignment in Problem 1 is determined by each vehicle’s solution to Problem 2, which is equivalent to the TSP. In the following section we detail our scalable solution to solve Problems 1 and 2 in simulation, and we verifying this solution experimentally. To this end, we impose the following assumptions.

**Assumption 1.** The delivery vehicles are equipped with connected and automated vehicle technologies that significantly reduces the effects of traffic bottlenecks and delays [25], [26].
Assumption 2. The speed limits on the road network are fixed and known a priori.

Assumptions 1 and 2 ensure that the environment is deterministic when the vehicles plan their routes. These assumptions can be relaxed by including a time-varying term to the edge cost to account for traffic lights, stop signs, and congestion. Assumption 1 can also be relaxed by allowing different delivery modes that bypass congestion, e.g., motorcycle, bicycle, and drone delivery. In the case that Assumption 2 is relaxed, and the traffic information is stochastic, a data-driven approach could be used to calculate the expected delay at each edge.

Assumption 3. The vehicles have sufficient energy to achieve their assigned delivery routes.

Assumption 4. The delivery locations are fixed and known a priori and without constraints on the delivery time.

Assumptions 3 and 4 ensure that any vehicle can be assigned to any sequence of deliveries, and that a solution is always guaranteed to exists to Problem 1. Assumption 3 can be relaxed by including a total energy cost constraint in Problem 2 and discarding any assignments that impose infeasible delivery routes. Assumption 4 is relevant for last-mile delivery, where the delivery service knows what packages must be shipped out before they arrive. This assumption can be relaxed by adding a delivery time constraint to Problem 2 and discarding any assignments that don’t satisfy the delivery constraints. If either assumption is relaxed, then it is necessary to derive conditions for the existence of a feasible assignment matrix.

IV. Solution Approach

In this section, we describe a scalable method of assigning vehicles to packages, and determining their delivery routes, in order to minimize the joint travel and delivery time costs. In Problem 1, the parameter $\alpha$ describes the structure of a particular company and how the cost of vehicle usage and labor is weighed against the benefits of faster delivery times. A higher $\alpha$ implies that $J_e(A)$ is the dominant term, and this will result in solutions that use more vehicles to decrease average delivery time. In contrast, a small value of $\alpha$ implies that $J_c(A)$ dominates, and this will result in fewer delivery vehicles being assigned to reduce the total amount of time spent traveling across all vehicles.

First, our delivery service receives the number of packages, $M$, and their delivery locations. To solve the assignment of vehicles to packages (Problem 1), we employ complete-linkage clustering [27]. While complete-linkage clustering may not always yield the optimal solution to Problem 1, it is a hierarchical clustering algorithm. Therefore, it is able to generate an approximately optimal assignment of vehicles to packages for every case simultaneously, i.e., assignments for using $1, 2, \ldots, N$ vehicles, in $O(n^2)$. Complete-linkage clustering also ensures that the maximum distance between any two packages in the same cluster is minimized. In contrast, to find the optimal assignment, the Hungarian Algorithm has a computational complexity of $O(n^3)$ for a single scenario, i.e., a fixed number of participating vehicles. This requires significantly more evaluations of Problem 2, thus we selected the complete-linkage clustering algorithm to ensure scalability.

In complete-linkage clustering, the $M$ delivery locations are first clustered into $M$ groups, i.e., each delivery assignment is a singleton. This corresponds to the $M$ leaf nodes in our hierarchical clustering tree. Next, the two packages with the shortest separating distance are combined, resulting in $M - 1$ groups of packages, which adds a branch to our hierarchical clustering tree. This process is repeated until only a single group, containing all $M$ packages, remains; this corresponds to the root node of our hierarchical clustering tree. Finally, we start at the root node and travel along the hierarchical clustering tree to determine the assignment of $1, 2, \ldots, N$ vehicles to the $M$ packages. Thus, we can enumerate all of the resulting $1, 2, \ldots, N$ assignments to determine which one minimizes the total cost.

Problem 2 is a modified TSP, which contains additional nodes that are not associated with a package delivery. These problems are known to be NP-hard, with a computational cost approaching $O(n!)$. Thus, to ensure our approach scales with a large number of vehicles, we solve Problem 2 using a greedy search algorithm. Each vehicle $i \in N$ begins at the depot, and it calculates the shortest path from its current location to each of its assigned delivery locations. The vehicle selects the nearest delivery location as the first element of its delivery sequence $S_i$, and the second element is selected by comparing the distance of all remaining packages to $s_1 \in S_i$. This process is repeated until $S_i$ contains all delivery locations exactly once, and this also yields the path $P_i$ taken by the vehicle. In the case of ties, the package with the lower index is arbitrarily selected.

To demonstrate the scalability of our approach, we compared the computational time required to solve TSP and our greedy algorithm. Specifically, we randomly generated 50 scenarios for different numbers of packages, from $M = 4, 5, \ldots, 20$. Due to the computational cost of TSP, we only computed its solution for up to 9 packages, and the performance of both approaches is demonstrated in Fig. 1. Note that the poor performance of the TSP necessitates a log scale on the computational time axis, and this shows the significant computational benefit of using the greedy search algorithm as the number of packages increase. Even for a small number of packages the TSP solution quickly becomes intractable. This necessitates sacrificing some optimality to guarantee the scalability of our solution.

We also conducted 50 simulations where the package locations were determined randomly for $M = 3, 4, 5, 6$ packages. Figure 2 quantifies the optimality gap of our greedy approach compared to TSP, and shows the percent increase in total travel time compared to the TSP solution. For low numbers of vehicles, the median time lost is less than 10%; however, Fig. 2 does demonstrate a consistent growth in the optimality gap. This gap is less relevant at the number of packages increases, as TSP quickly becomes intractable.
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Fig. 1. Computational cost between the TSP and greedy search approaches. The computational time is plotted in a log scale due to computational complexity of TSP.
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Fig. 2. The extra time spent by vehicles to complete their route using the greedy search instead of the TSP solution.

V. SIMULATION AND EXPERIMENT

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, we performed a series of simulations based on the urban network present in the Information and Decision Science Lab’s Scaled Smart City (IDS³C). The IDS³C is a 1:25 scaled testbed spanning over 400 square feet, and it is capable of replicating real-world traffic scenarios using up to 50 ground and 10 aerial vehicles; for an overview of the IDS³C and its capabilities see [28]. IDS³C’s road network consists of straight lines and arc segments. To implement our algorithm, we first constructed a graph to represent the IDS³C’s road network using network analysis library NetworkX in Python. We constructed the graph’s nodes by computing the start and end points of each road segment. To eliminate redundant

nodes, which were generated due to rounding errors, we combined any two points that were separated by one lane width or less. The resulting graph of IDS³C consists of 149 nodes and 220 edges, and is displayed over a diagram of the IDS³C in Fig. 3. For each edge in the graph, we defined the cost as the length of the road segment divided by its speed limit. We considered a speed limit of 50 km/h for straight roads and 25 km/h for arc segments. Figure 3 also shows the node corresponding to the depot (blue) and six package locations (orange) that we used in the physical experiment, which we discuss in the following section.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4x13oODn7Q

NetworkX website: https://networkx.org


Fig. 3. The depot (blue) and package locations (orange) for the 6 package simulation.

A. Simulation Results

To simulate our last-mile delivery service, a user inputs the number of packages, \( M \), and their corresponding delivery locations. We allow any node except the depot to be a delivery location, as the depot is a fixed node that corresponds to the initial and final destination of all vehicles. Next, we apply complete-linkage clustering based on the position of each delivery location in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) using Scikit-Learn’s agglomerative hierarchical clustering package. The clustering yields the assignment matrix for every possible number of vehicles. Then, we iterate through the hierarchy of 1, 2, \ldots, \( N \) clusters and determine the greedy path taken by each vehicle using NetworkX’s A* path finding package.

We used the default setting of no heuristic, thus our solution is equivalent to Dijkstra’s algorithm. Finally, we evaluate the \( N \) costs, corresponding to the 1, 2, \ldots, \( N \) vehicles, and select the optimal number of vehicles such that the total cost is minimized for a given value of \( \alpha \). We compute the cost from the total travel time and average delivery time, which correspond to the sum of all edge weights along a vehicle’s path and the sum of all edge weights from the origin to the
first instant that a vehicle reaches one of its assigned delivery nodes, respectively. Our pseudocode is detailed in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1:** Generate delivery routes for all possible number of vehicles.

**Input:** Delivery locations of $M$ Packages, Number of available vehicles $N$

numVehicles ← 0;
while numVehicles ≤ N do
  Group packages into numVehicles clusters;
  Assign all packages in each cluster to a vehicle;
  for each vehicle do
    while unvisited assigned packages > 0 do
      Calculate cost of paths to each assigned package delivery point;
      Add lowest cost path to the vehicle’s path;
    end
  end
  numVehicles ← numVehicles + 1;
end

To analyze the performance of our last-mile delivery service, we performed 30 simulations by randomly initializing $M = 6$ delivery locations on the network. The cost components, i.e., total travel time and average delivery time, are presented in Figs. 4 and 5, respectively. As expected, Fig. 4 shows that total travel time increases with the number of vehicles, while Fig. 5 demonstrates that the average delivery time decreases as the number of vehicles increases. These competing objectives present a trade-off between the cost of delivering packages and customer satisfaction. The total cost, averaged over 30 random trials, is presented in Fig. 6. The components of the cost are normalized by dividing them by the maximum cost incurred for each component over all trials and all numbers of vehicles.

Finally, we performed 40 randomized simulations with $M = 6$ packages to generate a Pareto frontier (Fig. 7). We note that the cases $N = 1$ and $N = 6$ are only Pareto-efficient when the value of $\alpha$ is very close to 0 or 1, respectively. The Pareto Frontier shows that the vehicle solutions corresponding to $N = 2, 3, 4$ are the most efficient, with the best Pareto-optimal outcome occurring at approximately $(32, 6)$ for $N = 2$ vehicles.

**B. Experimental Results**

To validate our simulation-based approach to selecting the number of vehicles, we performed an experiment in the IDS$^3$C using the $M = 6$ package locations presented in Fig. 3. We applied Algorithm 1 to solve Problems 1 and 2, and used the resulting paths as input for the vehicles in the IDS$^3$C. Finally, relaxing Assumption 1, we determined the control input of each vehicle $i \in \mathcal{N}$ using the Intelligent Driver Model [29],

$$a_i = a_{\text{max}} \left(1 - \frac{v_i}{v_0}\right)^\delta - \frac{s^*}{s_i}^2,$$

$$s^* = s_0 + v_i \theta + \frac{v_i \delta s_i}{2 \sqrt{a_{\text{max}} a_{\text{min}}}},$$

where $a_i$, $v_i$, and $s_i$ are the the acceleration, speed, and headway distance of vehicle $i$, respectively, $v_0$ is the speed
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In addition, the vehicles each stop for 3 seconds at
each delivery node along their route. The parameters used in
the experiment are presented in Table I.

TABLE I
PARAMETERS USED FOR THE INTELLIGENT DRIVER MODEL FOR THE
PHYSICAL EXPERIMENTS.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\theta (s) & \delta (m) & a_{\text{max}} (\text{m/s}^2) & a_{\text{min}} (\text{m/s}^2) & v_s (\text{m/s}) & v_a (\text{m/s}) \\
1.0 & 0.06 & 5.0 & 25.0 & 0.5 & 0.25 \\
\end{array}
\]

We performed six experiments, one for each number of
vehicles, and computed the customer satisfaction cost (2)
and total travel time (3) for each case. In order to compare
the simulation and experimental results, we normalized the
resulting costs by their maximum value, i.e., we divided
each component of the cost by the maximum value that
it took in all cases. The resulting comparison is presented
in Fig. 8 for \(\alpha = 0.5\). This shows that while the cost of
the simulation and experiment differs by at most 10%, the
simulation correctly predicts \(N = 3\) as the optimal number
of vehicles for this particular scenario. This is consistent
with the Pareto front in Fig. 7. The simulation consistently
under-predicts the total cost of the experiment for \(N < 6\),
and this is due to the fact that each vehicle stops for 3
seconds to make a delivery, which increases both the total
travel time and subsequent delivery times. In cases where

\(N = 1, N = 2,\) and \(N = 3\), a single vehicle delivers at
least 3 packages, and this results in an average increase of 3
seconds (10%) per package for that vehicle. Similarly, when
\(N = 5\) the vehicle that delivers 2 packages is also assigned
to the longest path, which further increases the delivery
time. Finally, for \(N = 4\), the packages are distributed
more evenly between all available vehicles, and in the 6
vehicle case the delay caused by delivering packages does not
affect customer satisfaction. Experimental results and other
supplementary material are available on the paper’s website:
https://sites.google.com/view/ud-ids-lab/lmds.

![Fig. 7. Pareto frontier for 40 randomized trials with \(M = 6\) packages and varying the number of vehicles from 1 to 6 for each trial.](image)

![Fig. 8. The simulated and actual cost incurred for different numbers of vehicles in the 6 package delivery scenario with \(\alpha = 0.5\).](image)

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed and experimentally validated a
heuristic clustering and greedy search algorithm to solve the
last-mile delivery problem. Our approach trades optimality to
escape the computational intractability of the TSP coupled to
the multi-assignment problem. We quantified the optimality
gap in our approach through random sampling, and develop-
op a fast simulation environment to determine the optimal
number of vehicles for our delivery service to use. Finally,
we demonstrated the performance of our delivery service in
a scaled testbed using 6 different experiments. Future
work includes capturing the effect of delays and disturbances
in the testbed and simulation, embedding total energy and
delivery time constraints in the path generation problem,
and enhancing our clustering approach to account for the
underlying directed graph that represents the transportation
network.
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