



Opinion Makers Section

THE ART AND SCIENCE OF PROBLEM SOLVING

René Victor Valqui Vidal

Informatics and Mathematical Modelling
Technical University of Denmark
2800 Lyngby
Denmark

yvv@imm.dtu.dk
www.imm.dtu.dk/~yvv

*Study the science of art
and the art of science.*
- Leonardo da Vinci

1. Introduction

In our educational institutions and in our culture in general, there is a split between art and science. It is believed that these two ways of working and thinking, the artistic attitude and the scientific attitude are two very different worlds, they are like oil and water. Although the link between art and science has historically been very close, exemplified by Leonardo da Vinci, the ideal that Leonardo represents is really not agreed upon by the art and science communities. It is the opinion of the author of this paper that this distinction between and separation of art and science is artificial and increasingly anachronistic. Fortunately things are changing; new fields arise from the synthesis of other fields. For instance, scientists are relying more and more on visual communication, and artists are working increasingly with computers. There is a

common place to transfer information, ideas and knowledge. Visual problems are ultimately the same across disciplines.

The main purpose of this note is to reflect, elaborate and document about how the concept of "the art and science of problem solving" can be used in the real world to deal with important and complex problematic situations in Society. Here, the OR worker is both the artist and scientist supporting a group to deal with a mess. As a scientist, he will be using when needed scientific approaches, experimentation, simulation, mathematical modelling and soft approaches in the problem solving process. As an artist, he will metaphorically speaking be like a painter who combines colours and shapes (the participants in the process) to create an art work (the problem solving process). Or, he is the director of a theatre group performing a piece of art. For the sake of concreteness let us first discuss a real-life case study.

2. Case Study: Planning of High School Examinations in Denmark

This is a real-life and large scale logistic problem where a computer based support system has been developed and implemented. The system has been running at the Danish Ministry of Education since 1992.

2.1 Background

In Denmark, all planning of the official examinations at high school level is centralized at the Danish Ministry of Education. Denmark is the only country where such planning activities are centralised nationally. This cumbersome task had become increasingly difficult and time consuming due to educational reforms in 1998.

The Danish academic school system is divided into primary school (grade 1 through 9/10), high school (grade 10/11 through 12) and university/college, where primary school is the only compulsory school. High school, in the broad sense, has several channels, the academics as opposed to the technical or commercial high schools being the most attended ones. Approximately one half of all primary school graduates continue onto an academic high school.

The academic high school system has two major channels: The Gymnasium which is a 2 or 3 years package, 3 years being the most common, and higher preparatory school (HF), a two years package. Through a system of merits, it is also possible to obtain an equivalent qualification through individual study-plans over several years (VUC). Denmark has 77 Gymnasiums, 25 HF-schools, 77 VUC-schools and 69 schools with both Gymnasium and HF curricula. This amounts to approximately 115,000 students and 12,000 teachers.

The students of the Gymnasium and HF are evaluated at the end of each school year. This evaluation includes oral and written examinations in certain courses. The planning of written examinations is much simpler since the days of examination are given before the start of the school year. This is necessary since all students answer the same examination questions and obviously they must do this at the same time. In what follows *examination* means oral examination. A *censor* is an eligible and ministerial appointed person - usually a high school teacher from another school - and an *examiner* is the person who conducts the examination - usually the teacher of the course.

An examination is carried out in the following way: A censor arrives at the school to observe the examination of each student conducted by the examiner for a fixed amount of time. After each student examination, the censor and the examiner agree on a grade for the student and then continue with the next student on the course, if any.

To encourage students to exhibit "good student behaviour", i.e. not miss classes, deliver term papers on time, etc., a bonus is granted in terms of a reduced number of examinations. Almost 95 percent of all students achieve this bonus. While a final year student could be examined in 7 subjects, "good students" will only have to attend 3 or 4 examinations. The decision of which 3 or 4 subjects the student is to be examined in is drawn in private for each student and is not revealed until the last school day. Consequently, the student must prepare himself for all 7 subjects during the regular school year.

The examinations are gathered in a reserved 5 week period at the end of the school year from mid May to mid June. The Gymnasium only uses the last 3 weeks, except for final year students who also use the second week. First year HF-students use the last 4 weeks and VU-students and final year HF-students use all 5 weeks. Except for national holidays (which

have a maximum of three whole days), the examination are placed Monday-Friday.

Previously, the examination planning was carried out by examination planners at the Ministry of Education using pencil and, especially eraser. Data was reported from each school on paper and sent by snail mail. In 1990, it was decided at the Ministry to develop an information system containing all relevant school data. The basic system is now an Oracle database with applications developed using Oracle tools and C-programming. Different systems are attached to the database, the examination system being the largest and most complex. A communication system handles the input of new data which is submitted from the schools to the ministry on floppy disks.

2.2 The problem and the approach

Summarizing, we can state that the task is to design and implement a computer based decision support system to plan and schedule the annual oral examinations for secondary education in the whole Denmark. For each student, it has to be decided:

- The number of oral examinations
- The subjects to be examined on
- The day, hour and room number for the examination
- The examiner, and
- The censor.

In practice, there are two main interrelated factors that determine the process of the solution of the above mentioned problem. The *technical approach*, i.e. the suitability of the techniques, methods, software, procedures, and so on, included in the whole decision support system, and the suitability of the *social process* related to the problem solving process itself. In Hansen and Vidal (1995), the technical approach has been described. The second factor demands close interaction and collaboration between the group work, decision makers, experts, consultants and facilitators. In this paper, we will primarily be focusing on the social processes though some aspect of the first factor will be shortly mentioned.

The planning problem described above is a complex and quite difficult combinatorial problem. It contains many decision variables; it has a variety of criteria and many feasible and satisfying solutions. We shall now elaborate on these observations.

Real life planning situations are usually complex. The examination planner has to comply with national laws and customs and must assist schools with their specific problems, making the

examination period as smooth as possible. Obviously, a computer system should support him in this task, rather than introduce additional limitations.

The examination timetabling problem is well known for its mathematical difficulty. This is also true for the assignment problems related to our planning problem. Since a student will normally take more than one examination, a school may have as many as 1500 student examinations. Each student examination is to be scheduled on a specific day, which produces very many decision variables. This assignment problem will contain more than 100 million binary decision variables if formulated as a traditional 0-1 optimization problem.

Having multiple criteria is an ingrained feature of real life problems. These criteria involve a good spread of student examinations so as to provide good premises for each student, minimising the costs for the schools, the counties, and the Ministry, and sharing pedagogical benefits equally among the schools, subjects and geographical areas.

After experimenting with prototypes containing preliminary algorithms, it was concluded that finding feasible solutions did not present major difficulties. Finding satisfying solutions was more difficult but was still consider being attainable within reasonable amount of algorithm construction, system implementation effort and computational time. No demands for achieving optimal solutions were given whereas robustness and consistency were considered to be more important. This is in line with the following heuristic principle: Managerial decisions might be improved more by making them more consistent from one time to another than by approaches seeking optimality to explicit cost models; especially for situations where intangibles must otherwise be estimated or assumed. These observations led to the conclusion that the final planning system should provide the examination planner with suitable information and optimising tools based in heuristic methods, which could be used interactively and that could be stopped at the users command yielding satisfying solutions.

To cope with the complexity of the problem at hand, it was decomposed into four interrelated phases, each dealing with separate tasks and having well-defined goals following well-known heuristic principles (Silver et al, 1980). This decomposition approach follows to a certain extent the traditional approach (pencil and eraser) at the Ministry; this makes easier the final implementation process. This traditional approach was very time consuming for

two planners with a lot of helpers. These four phases are:

- Subject draft
- Examination Chain
- Examination Scheduling
- Assignment of Censorships.

2.3 The work group and the stakeholders

The decision maker was the chief of the Examination Department at the Ministry. He is responsible that all the processes run smoothly. He played no major role in the development of the decision support system. He gave his full support to the work group. The work group was composed of three planners from the Examination Department at the Ministry. Their experiences from many years of work at the Department were extremely useful while testing the different programmes solving each sub-problem. The leader of this group has a central position in the development of the decision support system because as a previous teacher in informatics, he has sufficient background to understand also the technical aspects of the problem and to contribute to its solution. He was at the same the leader, a user and a developer.

Stakeholders were of course the directors and teachers from the different schools that were involved in the discussions about the purpose of the new system, the first tests and the final implementation. The feedbacks from the stakeholders were important during the tuning of the whole system.

The facilitator was my previous student who had developed the technical approach in his MSc thesis; afterwards he was hired as a consultant for the Ministry. He was the facilitator of the whole development and implementation processes. As we will see below other experts were involved. He will seek for the collaboration of the users, the stakeholders, and the experts at the different stages of the development and implementation of the system. Other experts were: One system's designer from a consulting firm and three programmers hired at the Ministry.

2.4 The facilitation process

In this case study the facilitator has two main tasks:

- First, to design, develop and implement a computerized decision support system in close cooperation with the users and other experts. As described above a satisfying system was developed by decomposing the complex problem in a series of interrelated optimization sub-problems each of them

being solved using simple, fast, and reliable heuristic methods. Here the facilitator is working as a scientist using rational approaches, mathematical modelling and algorithms to find satisfying solutions and using the scientific approach to manage the problem solving process.

- Secondly, the facilitation of the work group and the work of the experts in the development and implementation stages of the problem solving process. This was a long process, it started in 1991; the system was used for the first time in 1992, and has been running every year since 1993. The task of the facilitator was to develop an efficient and innovative form of work, a common culture, a positive way of solving conflicts and a creative manner of finding new ideas. Here, the facilitator is working as an artist, he is instructing, directing, and coaching people to be participative, collaborative and creative in the problem solving process. He is like an instructor of a play in a theatre, supporting the different artists to perform their best to create synergetic processes. Or, more metaphorically, he is like a painter where all the participants are his colours to be combined in shapes, shadows and forms to be able to create a master piece.

The technical approaches needed to deal with the above described complex situation are relatively easy to develop. Similar complex logistic problems have been previously solved using mathematical models and heuristics and special dedicated computerized systems.

The real complexity of the problematic situation in question is the social complexity related to the development and implementation of the system by the actors in a participative and collaborative way. It is very complex the management of these social processes. Here the manager, that is the facilitator, is not only a rational and intelligent decision-maker, but also a creative and artistic designer. This managing attitude, managing as designing, is found in architecture, art and design professions.

Of course as with any practical project there have been conflicts, delays, and other problems related to negativity of some of the users or programmers leaving the Ministry; but in the spite of the facilitator's lack of practical experience, he and the leader of the working group believed that it could be done and were highly motivated to do the task.

The system has now been used for 14 years in practice. This has been a great success. For the Ministry, the examination system is the most prestigious system since the examinations have intensive attention from the schools, the public and the politicians; if things go wrong, from the press! Fortunately most people, including many students and teachers, are not aware of the existence of such a decision support system.

3. Art and Science

What is art? The answer to this question is conditioned by the fact that a definition of art has changed due to cultural and historical reasons. The boundaries of art have experienced a radical change over the last century. Previously, art was created in historically validated media and presented in a limited set of contexts for a limited set of objectives, such as search of beauty, religious glorification, or the depiction of persons and places. However, this century has produced new ways of experimentation, breaking and testing of boundaries. Artists have introduced new media, new contexts, new materials and new purposes. This expansion in art activities causes a difficulty in achieving consensus on definitions of art. The following very general definition can be easily accepted:

Making art may be depicted as the process of responding to perceptions, feelings, ideas, dreams, and other experiences by creating innovative works of art through the skilful, thoughtful, and imaginative application of tools and techniques to various media and materials. The "objects" of art that result of encounters between artists and their intentions, their interventions, their concepts and attitudes, their cultural and social realities, and the materials or media in which they choose to work.

Modern artists use unorthodox materials, tools, techniques and ideas inspired by the worlds of science, technology, humanities, economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc. Some are present in non-art contexts, such as factories, laboratories, trade shows, the Internet, schools, and the street. Social interventions are manifold. The process of creating art is filled up of problems related to design and decision-making. The design attitude is related to the creative and innovative process in problem solving, while the decision attitude is related to the scientific approach to problem solving. In this sense, science can support art both providing

materials and the media, and rational approaches to problem solving.

What is Science? Researchers and philosophers on science suggest several defining elements. This set of core ideas, *the scientific approach*, includes the following:

- An essay to understand how and why phenomena occur
- Focus on the real (natural, social, human) world
- Focus on empirical information
- Seeking objectivity
- Use of a rational or logical approach
- Knowledge codify into laws and principles, and
- The continuous testing and refinement of hypotheses.

The crucial assumptions of the scientific approach are that the observed world is essentially orderly, and objectivity can be achieved through self-discipline and the reliance on methods such as the calibration of instruments, repeatability and multi-observed verification. There are of course variations in emphasis. That is, empiricists focus primarily on the role of observations, while rationalists emphasizes on the logical processes of theory construction and derivation. Some enhance induction built from observation; others focus on deduction drawn from theory.

Critical scientists see science as a modern delusion, challenging mainly the possibility of objectivity, noting the decisive influences of gender, social position, culture and history. Critical science is focusing in issues such as the interactions of the observer and the observed phenomena; the role of socially constructed frameworks at all stages; and the social forces and meta-narratives that form the questions and paradigms used in the research process.

Several researchers have contributed to the critique of science. One describes the way dominant paradigms shape the questions that get acceptance and support. Another critiques assumptions of scientific rationality, remarking that nature gives different answers when approached differently. Others analyze the metaphoric language of science, its authoritative voice, and its unacknowledged patriarchal under-life.

In social sciences and the humanities, this kind of critique predominates. Scientists and technological innovators, however, believe in the ability to discover universal truths and assert that

reform can overcome those places where scientific process falls short of its aspirations to universality and objectivity. As validity, it is usually referred to the accomplishments of the rational approach in building robust theoretical structures, and in predicting and controlling the material, organic and social world.

There are some differences and similarities in the practice of Art and Science. In Table 1 the differences are presented while in Table 2 the similarities are enhanced.

Differences:

Art	Science
• Aesthetic, reflective	• Know, understand
• Emotion, intuition	• Reason, logic
• Idiosyncratic, personal	• Normative, principles
• Visual, sonic	• Narrative, textual
• Evocative, subjective	• Explanatory, objective
• Radical change	• Improve, optimise

Table 1. Art vs. Science: Differences

Art vs. Science: similarities

- Observation, experimentation, sensual
- Creativity
- Change, innovation, improvement
- Models, symbols, abstraction
- Universality

Table 2. Art vs. Science: Similarities

4. The Art and Science of Facilitation

The success of the problem solving process is determined by the effectiveness and creativity of the work group. Since the participants are invited or appointed, it is recommended to use some selection criteria. Some of these criteria could be: Representability, goal compatibility, process compatibility, deliberation abilities, positivism, communication abilities, and focus abilities. Obviously, the quality of performance or the piece of art created depends of the raw material you are

using. It is clear that selecting the participants is a very important task, which has to be solved seriously in order to develop effective work group and high quality results. A person, with knowledge and experience with working collaboratively with people, from the organisations involved should undertake this task.

In connection with the work group, there are two social processes to be managed by the facilitator: the problem solving process and the group process. The problem solving process is the way the group act to solve the task supported by the facilitators and some experts. This is the rational and logical process. The group process is related to the manner in which the individuals in the group work together, how they learn, how they communicate, their social and power relationships, and how they deal with conflicts. This is the intuitive and creative process. Obviously, these two processes interact in various degrees. In ideal group work, these two processes support each other. We talk about **group dynamics**, when energy and synergetic effects are created in the group as a result of well-balanced processes where the task is just as important as the group trust and identity.

In addition, there is a third social process: the facilitation process. The facilitators are the managers of the social process and their main mission is to inspire, create, direct, and support group dynamics. By focusing and guiding group members' communication and decision-making processes in a creative and structured form, the facilitators can reduce the chances of engaging in faulty processes and harness the strengths of the group. The facilitator is both an artist, being the director of an artistic performance to be performed by the group, and a scientist, supporting a scientific approach to problem solving. This situation can be achieved using the following guidelines:

- Use approaches, for example creative techniques, and scientific methods;
- Specify a set of objective ground rules for the group work;
- Build on the strengths of the group and protect the group against its weakness;
- Balance members participation;
- Support the group with technological know-how;
- Support the group while dealing with conflicts;
- Plan time to close the different social processes;
- Make the group reflect and evaluate the group dynamics; and

- Empower the group.

The facilitators are constantly thinking (reflection) and listening to the deliberations in the group so they can make suitable interventions (decision making). An intervention means communicating with the group, giving information and knowledge, and encouraging the participants to think about important topics.

Let us elaborate now more theoretically about the essence of the facilitation process as opposed to its existence or its accidental qualities or, in other words, the attributes by means of which facilitation as management can be qualified or identified. As we have seen, facilitation is a purposeful process carried out by one or several persons that goes forward between two interacting processes. First, the logical/rational/legal process carried out by a purposeful group (the problem solving group) that wants to achieve some goals. This process has been called the problem solving process, and is the scene of objectivity. Secondly, the non-logical/irrational/illegal process that refers to the chaotic social process provoked by each single participant, by the participants' relations to each other, or by the participants' relations to the facilitator of the purposeful group, these bring into the participants own subjectivity, intuition, fantasy and feelings. This process can be called the problem destruction process and is the scene of subjectivity.

The facilitation process will move in the grey zone between the scene of objectivity and the scene of subjectivity. The rational and the irrational processes are fighting one another; the one wants to impose over the other. They are in conflict with each other, but they need each other because while the problem solving process seeks to achieve realistic solutions, the irrational process will be the basis for the production of new ideas. Rationality needs chaos, and chaos needs rationality. Due to this contradiction, rationality vs. chaos, we can stipulate that facilitation is a **dialectical** process.

Let us also emphasise that facilitation is a purposeful intervention in a social process, a designed process. Facilitation is not a necessity for the evolution of the problem solving process but it is designed to support the problem solving process. The facilitation evolves very dynamically in a grey zone trying to construct a bridge between the traditional/conservative problem solving (business as usual) and the new/revolutionary power to change. The purpose of facilitation is to seek that the two

above-mentioned processes do not destroy each other, but on the contrary support each other.

The facilitation process can be instructed and directed in different manners, as there are several management styles. The facilitators are the managers of this process. Note that if the group can manage itself, there is no need for a facilitator. That is, the group can learn to facilitate itself. As in any management process, it is a good idea to develop a strategy and design an action plan for the facilitation process. Managing by designing is a fundamental principle in any facilitation process (Boland and Collopy, 2004), therefore all the social processes have to be designed.

Management also involves three other central factors: Power, communication and learning. These aspects are always present in any facilitation process and should be reflected and articulated before, during and after the process. Facilitation becomes **an art** when a synergistic effect is achieved due to the constructive interaction between the rational and the irrational processes. The facilitator then becomes the director of a performance, where each participant plays a central role. By the end of the performance if synergy has been created all the participants will explode in a rush of happiness and pleasure, the pleasure of working creatively and collectively to achieve some goals. It is the same feeling that football players experience after a match where the victory has been the result of a combination of individual creativity, collective hard work and suitable facilitation (the coaching).

Summarising, we can state that the purpose of facilitation as management is not only to solve the task, but other additional goals could be:

- Each participant is a potential facilitator, therefore the importance of the learning dimension;
- Empowerment, the participants learn to be more self-confident and learn to work creatively in a group (creativity is an act of liberation from the jail of our own routines!); and
- Praxis, the facilitators should be able to learn from the experience therefore the importance of the evaluation of the intervention and the systematisation of praxis, in addition learning from failure is a good principle for any facilitator.

5. Conclusions

Everything can be approached scientifically and everything can become art. Our main message is that

in what concerns problem solving in complex situations, it is advisable to use both the scientific and the artistic attitudes. More satisfying results will be achieved, the risk of failures will be minimized, all the participants will be empowered, and everybody will learn from the experience, even the facilitator.

In the case of the planning problem, the Ministry could have ordered the decision support system from a firm instead of in-house development. But in such situation the consequences of failure were too serious and could easily become a political issue. In Denmark, there are too many bad experiences with implemented computerized decision support systems that were extremely expensive to develop and implement and that did not solve the problem, on the contrary caused more problematic situations.

In the case study related to the planning of the examinations the facilitator was educated as an engineer, but in the social process he was managing he was an artist although he was not aware of that. He used his intuition to solve conflicts, supervised the experts and used time to dialogue with the users. He was able to create a common language, a common culture and motivate all participants. He was managing by designing.

This note is based in an extended paper published in Vidal (2005). Further discussions and other applications can be consulted in the e-book Vidal (2006) that can be downloaded free-of-charge.

References

1. Boland, J. Richard Jr. and Collopy, Fred (eds.) (2004) *Managing as Designing*, Stanford Business Books, Stanford University Press, California, USA.
2. Hansen, M. P. and Vidal, R. V. V. (1995) Planning of High School Examinations in Denmark, *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 87, pp. 519-534.
3. Silver, E. A., Vidal R. V. V., and De Werra, D (1980) A Tutorial on Heuristic Methods, *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol 5, pp. 153-162.
4. Vidal, R.V.V. (2005) The art and science of problem solving, *Investigação Operacional (Portugal)*, 2005, Vol. 25, pp. 1-22.
5. Vidal, R.V.V. (2006) *Creative and Participative Problem Solving - The Art and*

the Science, IMM, Technical University of Denmark, p. 190, can be downloaded from:

<http://www2.imm.dtu.dk/~vvv/CPPS/>



MCDA Research Groups

Presentation of the research team

« Operations research and multi-objective optimization »

University of Nantes and CNRS, France

Xavier Gandibleux and Matthias Ehrgott

Environment

The LINA (Laboratoire d'Informatique de Nantes Atlantique) is the Computer Science laboratory of the Nantes-Atlantique region of France (FRE CNRS 2729 today, UMR CNRS from January 2008). The lab is hosted by the University of Nantes and the Ecole des Mines de Nantes (School of Engineering) and counts 70 permanent staff. Its scientific project is to develop international research in the "Computer Sciences", with two principal orientations: Distributed software architectures and decision-aid systems. The lab's research teams work on several areas of optimization, such as constraint programming, integer programming, graph theory, bio-informatics, preference modelling and data mining, to name a few.

Formally created in December 2006, the team « Operations research and multi-objective optimization » (ROOM) is the youngest and the smallest of the 11 research teams hosted by the LINA. It is located at the Faculty of Sciences, University of Nantes. With this team, OR and MCDM are now two additional areas of optimization covered by the lab.

The Team

With the recruitment of Xavier Gandibleux in 2004 as full professor in Computer Science by the University of Nantes, and Matthias Ehrgott in 2006

as director of research at the CNRS within LINA, the team is built on basis of more than 10 years of joint work in multi-objective optimization. In 2007, Anthony Przybylski has been recruited by the University of Nantes and he has joined the team as assistant professor. The core of the team consists of these three permanent members.

Non-permanent members are involved in the team for some periods. Sana Belmokhtar (from Ecole des Mines de Saint-Etienne) has joined us as researcher in 2006-2007. She is now assistant professor at the University of Nancy at Epinal. Hadrien Hugot (who is finishing his PhD thesis at LAMSADE, University of Paris Dauphine) got a post-doctoral position in our team funded by the CNRS. He will join us for one year, starting in October 2007.

Master and PhD students contribute to the works of the team. Currently Julien Jorge is preparing his PhD thesis and another PhD student will join us soon. Former PhD students who prepared their thesis under our supervision are Xavier Delorme (now assistant professor, Ecole des Mines de Saint Etienne) and Anthony Przybylski (now assistant professor, University of Nantes).

Research Activities

Our work, based on discrete optimisation in Operations Research, focuses on the accumulation of knowledge towards the development of advanced optimization methods that are capable of solving complex optimization problems in reasonable time. The optimization problems of interest are reference problems in discrete optimization and their application in socio-economic contexts, such as railway transportation (capacity of railway infrastructure), airline operations (crew scheduling), communication networks (routing policies, deployment of new infrastructure), and health (radiotherapy treatment of cancer).

In this context, the motivation characterizing the research direction of the team is to study, model, and solve large scale multiobjective discrete optimization problems. Procedures for these problems are essentially problem dependent and employ, among others, efficient enumerative methods or hybrid optimization techniques (multiobjective metaheuristics and exact algorithms). Our research directions are:

1. **Fundamental:** Study, characterization, and understanding of discrete and combinatorial multiobjective optimization problems.

2. **Methodological and algorithmical:** New techniques and methods for the solution of large scale discrete and combinatorial multiobjective optimization problems; Development of algorithms to improve the efficient solution of NP-hard single and multiobjective problems.
3. **Validation and verification:** Application to real world multiobjective optimization problems with the ultimate goal of being able to solve concrete problems in complex real world environments (production systems, transport, communication, health). Most applications are collaborations with industrial partners such as Alcatel, France Telecom, SNCF, DB, Auckland Hospital, Air New Zealand.

Some Results of Our Work

State of the Art Annotated Bibliographic Survey. For many years we collected and summarized the literature on multi-objective combinatorial optimization (MOCO) problems. In 2000 and in 2002, papers reporting our synthesis have been published. Later we did a similar work about multi-objective metaheuristics (MOMH).

M. Ehrgott, X. Gandibleux (2000). A Survey and annotated bibliography of multiobjective combinatorial optimization. OR Spektrum, 22(4): 425-460.

Path-relinking for multi-objective optimization. Approximation methods for MCDM problems have received a lot of attention in recent years. With two Japanese colleagues we introduced the path-relinking concept for MOMH with success for many MOCO problems.

X. Gandibleux, H. Morita, and N. Katoh (2004). Evolutionary operators based on elite solutions for bi-objective combinatorial optimization. Chapter 23 in *Applications of Multi-Objective Evolutionary Algorithms* (C. Coello Coello and G. Lamont Eds.), pp. 555-579. *Advances in Natural Computation Vol. 1*, World Scientific, Singapore.

Two phase method for MOCO problems. Introduced in the nineties by Ulungu and Teghem, this method has been considered as a generic method for bi-objective optimization problems. One of the major contributions Anthony Przybylski's PhD thesis has

been the generalisation of this method for dealing with problems with more than two objectives.

A. Przybylski (2006) *Méthode en deux phases pour la résolution exacte de problèmes d'optimisation combinatoire comportant plusieurs objectifs : nouveaux développements et application au problème d'affectation linéaire.* PhD thesis, University of Nantes, December 2006 (In French).

Exact and efficient procedures for solving the linear assignment problem with two and three objectives: Considered as a fundamental optimization problem, we proposed algorithms for the exact solution. They have been demonstrated to be the most efficient algorithms considering the literature available.

A. Przybylski, X. Gandibleux and M. Ehrgott (2008). Two-phase algorithms for the bi-objective assignment problem. European Journal of Operational Research 185(2):509-533

Railway infrastructure capacity The question investigated here can be stated as follows: « How many trains can go through a junction or a station? ». With the cooperation of partners we developed methodologies, algorithms and software dealing with this question. The case studies are real situations from the SNCF (France) and the DB (Germany) networks.

J. Rodriguez, X. Delorme, X. Gandibleux, Gr. Marlière, R. Bartusiak, F. Degoutin, and S. Sobieraj (2007). RECIFE: models and tools for analyzing rail capacity. *Recherche Transports Sécurité*, 95:19–36.

Optimization of radiotherapy treatment design: This complex problem concerns the selection of beams, optimization of beam intensity and scheduling of the treatment unit in order to deliver a radiation dose that destroys the tumour while protecting healthy tissue. The team has conducted work on all aspects of this problem.

L. Shao, M. Ehrgott (2007). Approximately solving multiobjective linear programmes in objective space and an application in radiotherapy treatment planning. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*. Accepted for publication.

Some Major Events Involving the Team Members

The members of the team have been involved in several international scientific events, four of which are immediately related to the MCDM field.

1. MOMH 2002: Multiple Objective Metaheuristics Workshop, November 4-5, 2002, Paris - France <http://webhost.ua.ac.be/eume/welcome.htm?workshops/momh/fillinaddress.php&1>
2. MOPGP 2006: 7th International Conference on Multi-Objective Programming and Goal Programming, June 12-14, 2006, Loire Valley (Tours), France <http://www.mopgp06.org/>
3. MCDM 2008 : 19th International Conference on Multiple Criteria Decision Making, 7 - 12 January 2008, Auckland, New Zealand <https://secure.orsnz.org.nz/mcdm2008/>
4. EMO 2009: 5th International Conference on Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization. First Semester 2009, Nantes, France <http://www.emo09.org/>

At the national level, the French Working Group dedicated to Multiple-Objective Programming (PM2O) has been co-founded on 1999 by Xavier Gandibleux. He has served as the coordinator of this group for four years.

Visitors and Collaborators

Invited professors who visited us recently for a period of one month were Kathrin Klamroth in 2005 (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany), Eric Taillard in 2006 (HEIG-VD, Switzerland), and Margaret Wiecek in 2007 (Clemson University, USA).

The team also hosts visiting PhD students: Daniel Salazar Aponte from University Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (6 months from Sept 2005) and Andrea Raith from Auckland University (3 months from August 2007). If you are interested in visiting us, please contact us.

We have a long tradition of working with colleagues in OR and MCDM. Several collaborations are on-going with Karl Doerner and Sophie Parragh (University of Vienna, Austria), Dario Da Silva (University of Nottingham, UK), Naoki Katoh (Kyoto University) and Hiroyuki Morita (Osaka Prefecture University) to name a few.

Since 1999 we are involved in research works related to railway transportation. Joaquin Rodriguez (from INRETS, the French National Research Institute on Transportation and Security) is one of our collaborators on this topic.

To conclude this section, we are collaborating also with colleagues of regional institutions: Fabien Le Huédé (Ecole des Mines de Nantes), Philippe Dépincé (Ecole Centrale de Nantes), Vincent

Barichard (University of Angers) and Marc Sevaux (University of South Brittany-Lorient).

Projects

The team is strongly involved in a large regional project called MILES since the regional council « Pays de la Loire » has recognized « Decision Aid Systems » as a prioritized research theme. In associating the regional research teams in optimization inside this project, it represents a significant task force in the west of France.

Software

RECIFE is a decision support system specifically designed for the analysis of railway infrastructure capacity. For a given station or node of the network, various functionalities such as verifying the feasibility of expected traffic, studying infrastructure saturation and stability of resulting timetables are offered to a decision maker. Two geographical situations have already been studied: The Pierrefitte-Gonesse node located north of Paris and the Lille-Flandres station.

Some References

1. V. Barichard, M. Ehrgott, X. Gandibleux and V. T'kindt (editors). Multi-Objective Programming and Goal Programming. Berlin, Springer, Forthcoming.
2. M. Ehrgott, J. Figueira, X. Gandibleux (editors). Multiobjective Discrete and Combinatorial Optimization. *Annals of Operations Research* 147. 2006.
3. J. Figueira, S. Greco, M. Ehrgott (editors). Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis. State of the Art Surveys. *International Series in Operations Research and Management Science* 78. Berlin, Springer, 2005.
4. M. Ehrgott. Multicriteria Optimization. Second edition. Berlin, Springer, 2005.
5. X. Gandibleux, M. Sevaux, K. Sörensen and V. T'kindt (editors). Meta-heuristics for Multiobjective Optimisation. *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems* 535. Berlin, Springer, 2004.
6. M. Ehrgott and M. Luptacik (editors). 16th International Conference on Multiple Criteria Decision Making. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis* 12(1) 2003.
7. M. Ehrgott and X. Gandibleux (editors). Multiple Criteria Optimization: State of the Art Annotated Bibliographic Survey. *International*

Series in Operations Research and Management Science 52. Boston, Kluwer 2002.

8. X. Gandibleux, A. Jaszkiwicz, A. Fréville, and R. Slowinski (guest editors). Special issue "Multiple Objective MetaHeuristics". Journal of Heuristics 6(3) 2000.

To Contact Us:

XAVIER GANDIBLEUX
LINA - Laboratoire d'Informatique de Nantes
Atlantique (FRE CNRS 2729)
Université de Nantes
2, rue de la Houssinière BP 92208
F-44322 Nantes Cedex 03 - FRANCE

<http://lina.atlanstic.net/en/equipes/team11/>

Forum
(Robustness Analysis)

Robustness analysis in project prioritisation

Alec Morton

London School of Economics and Political Science

Background

A common approach to prioritising investment opportunities (for example, scientific projects) is to sort them in some sort of value for money ordering, that is to say in terms of a ratio v_i/c_i where v_i is a measure of value of a project, and c_i is a measure of the input cost, with i a project index from $K=\{1, \dots, k\}$. In this note, I'll suppose for simplicity that v and c are elicited directly, although they could and often would arise from some transformation and combination of more disaggregate judgements. This priority ordering may be used by the organisation for a one-time allocation of some fixed budget as part of a planning process. Alternatively, it may be kept in a manager's desk drawer, in case a sudden cash or capacity crunch forces the organisation to disinvest from marginal projects: having already thought through priorities can mean that the organisation can respond to this sort of challenge in a relatively co-ordinated way.

Costing and valuation are however, difficult tasks: few assessors can assert their complete confidence in the figures they supply. Accordingly, it is helpful to have a sense of the robustness of this priority ordering. Some people, including this author, find it natural to ascribe a probabilistic meaning to robustness (Butler, Jia et al. 1997; Lahdelma, Hokkanen et al. 1998; Jiménez, Mateos et al. 2005; Morton 2007; Tervonen and Figueira forthcoming). The question which one asks if one takes this view is: if assessments are subject to error, how confident can one be in the priority order delivered by the model?

I shall formalise this notion of error in judgement. To start of with, suppose that we have elicited vectors of cardinal valuations $v=(v_i)$ and of costs $c=(c_i)$ for the projects. Suppose further that there are true costs and valuations (in a sense to be discussed subsequently). As our state of knowledge of these is uncertain, think of these as random vectors and write them as $V=(V_i)$ and $C=(C_i)$ respectively. The expected values of V and C may or may not be equal in value to v and c : in the former case, we will say the assessments are unbiased, in the latter that they are biased.

Given v and c , it should be possible to put the k projects in a value for money order: I will write the rank of an individual project i in this ordering as $o_i(v, c)$, thus defining a vector-valued function $o(v, c)$. Similarly, the (random) vector of project ranks according to their true costs and valuations is $o(V, C)$. With modern software it is easy to find a simulated distribution for $o(V, C)$. One possible way of presenting the information back is just to display box plots (Butler, Jia et al. 1997) of $o_i(V, C)$ for each i . However, in an application setting, the number of projects can be quite large and so there may be an interest in having some sort of summary measure. I propose as a measure of the robustness a function of the form:

$$G(o(v, c), E(g(o_i(v, c) - o_i(V, C))), \dots, E(g(o_k(v, c) - o_k(V, C))))$$

where E is the expectation operator. For convenience, I'll call the terms $E(g(o_i(v, c) - o_i(V, C)))$ the Expected Transformed Rank Differences (ETRDs). Somewhat similar rank-oriented summary statistics have been proposed by Lahdelma and Salminen (2001) but their interest is primarily in identifying attractive compromise solutions in 1-of- n choice tasks rather than in prioritisation tasks and so

their development is somewhat different from that here.

This set-up raises some interesting questions of which I now consider three.

Three questions

1. What distributional forms are appropriate for C ?

If the approach outlined here was to be built into software, I envisage that users could parameterise distributions selected from a menu based on the degree of uncertainty that they feel about v and c . However, the question arises of what should be included in this menu of distributional forms? Answering this question convincingly would require some sort of empirical data gathering exercise. If we were measuring the error properties associated with the measurement of some physical property (mass, volume, etc), what one should do is apply the instrument repeatedly to establish the spread of measurements, and validate against some more accurate instrument to identify whether bias exists. Some authors (e.g. Kleinmuntz 1990) have argued that this sort of reasoning is applicable in the case of modelling error in judgement. However, it is hard to see how one could operationally establish a distribution under this interpretation, as unlike physical instruments, people have memory, with the consequence that successive elicitations can hardly be said to be under the same circumstances.

Accordingly, a more appropriate strategy of investigation may be to identify a number of qualified and reasonably homogeneous cost assessors, and invite them each to assess the costs of the list of projects. The existence or otherwise of systematic bias could be established by investigating the relationship between the assessed judgements and the actual experienced cost of the actual delivered project. The reader will note that the above procedure yields *not* the distribution of true scores given a judgement, but the distribution of judgements given some true score. With suitable supplementary data gathering, however, Bayes Theorem would enable us to deduce the former from the latter.

2. What distributional forms are appropriate for V ?

Establishing an appropriate distributional form for V poses a parallel but more tricky problem to establishing a distributional form for C , since

judgements of value, by their nature, are not "right" or "wrong" in any absolute sense, and so it is hard to think of them as deviating from some underlying true value.

This doesn't give us any difficulty in establishing a distribution of assessments, which is as easy or difficult as in the case of cost assessments discussed above. However, it does make it hard to say how we should establish "true" values. One option (which Kleinmuntz seems to suggest) is to take the mean of the distribution of assessed values as the true value. This has the consequence that value judgements cannot be biased: they must, definitionally, be on average correct.

An alternative view would be to try to develop a parallel approach to that suggested above for dealing with cost. In this case, one would contrast the *ex ante* judgements of value of projects prior to sign-off with *ex post* judgements of value subsequent to delivery. The analogy with cost is not complete, since organisations have to arrive an agreed definition of what things cost for financial reporting purposes, but not of what things are worth. Thus, this approach would pose some tricky methodological challenges, but could – perhaps – be doable.

3. How should we select functions g and G ?

g 's purpose is to transform the rank difference between the ranks according to the elicited values and the ranks according to the true values. The simplest option is to take $g(x)=|x|$. This gives twice the weight to a movement of two places in the ranking to one place. However, one can imagine cases where decision makers might feel either more than or less than twice as bad as a consequence, suggesting g should take be a convex or concave increasing function of $|x|$ respectively. One could also imagine cases (for example, where judgements are systematically biased in some way) where a decision maker may be interested in knowing which options tend to move up and which tend to move down the ranking. In such cases, it might be useful to make g a vector-valued which splits a variable into its positive and negative parts, *i.e.* of the form $g(x)=(\max(x,0), \min(x,0))$.

In some circumstances, it may be that one can simply take G as the identity function, and produce a vector of ETRDs for each project i . This could give quite a bit of insight – for example, if the options have a single peaked distribution of values/ cost, one would expect that those in the centre of the

distribution would have higher ETRDs for comparable levels of error, since those projects would have more options in their immediate neighbourhood.

Let us suppose however that we are interested in producing a single "headline" statistic which synthesises all the ETRDs. One possibility is the average ETRD,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k E(g(o_i(v,c) - o_i(V,C)))}{k}$$

However, often, when priority orderings are used to support decision making, a triage line of reasoning is relevant: options high in the priority ordering will probably be done, and options low in the priority ordering will probably not be done, and so the really critical ranks are those of the options in the centre of the ordering. In this case, one might be interested in some sort of weighted average ETRD,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k w(o_i(v,c)) g(o_i(v,c) - o_i(V,C))}{\sum_{i=1}^k w(o_i(v,c))}$$

where $w(o_i(v,c))$ is some sort of concave function which peaks in the middle of the range.

References

- Butler J, Jia J and Dyer J (1997). Simulation techniques for the sensitivity analysis of multi-criteria decision models. *European Journal of Operational Research* **103**: 531-546.
- Jiménez A, Mateos A and Ríos-Insua S (2005). Monte Carlo Simulation Techniques in a Decision Support System for Group Decision Making. *Group Decision and Negotiation* **14**(2): 109-130.
- Kleinmuntz D N (1990). Decomposition and the control of error in decision analytic models. *Insights in decision making: a tribute to Hillel J Einhorn*. R. M. Hogarth. Chicago, University of Chicago Press: 107-126.
- Lahdelma R, Hokkanen J and Salminen P (1998). SMAA - stochastic multiobjective acceptability analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research* **106**: 137-143.
- Lahdelma R and Salminen P (2001). SMAA-2: stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis

for group decision making. *Operations Research* **49**(3): 444-454.

- Morton A (2007). Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis for Project Prioritisation with Multi-Attribute Value Theory London School of Economics Operational Research Group working paper 07.95: London
- Tervonen T and Figueira J (forthcoming). A survey on stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*.

Consultancy Companies

Company Spotlight: Innovative Decisions, Inc. (IDI)

Innovative Decisions, Inc., (IDI), in Vienna, Virginia, is one of a few firms that considers itself to be a "decision analysis" firm. IDI supports the needs of analysts, managers and senior decision-makers through its consulting, facilitation and training services. While IDI also delivers operations research, statistical, and systems engineering support, "helping people make decisions" is the common theme among these domains and is IDI's core business. Started in 2001 by Terry Bresnick and Dennis Buede, IDI now has twenty-seven people delivering decision analysis services. We are still a virtual company, operating primarily within client spaces. We go in and out of client sites, we operate from home offices, but we really have no base location. The vast majority of IDI's client base is in the public sector of the United States.

IDI focuses on four major business areas:

- Decision Modeling and Analysis: Building models and conducting analyses that support solving a specific problem or making a decision.
- Decision Conferencing: Facilitating project teams and working groups of decision-makers and other experts where solutions are based on group consensus.
- Research in Decision-Making: Focusing on individual and group decision-making

processes, decision-oriented methodologies, human factors, and cognitive biases.

- **Decision Analysis Training and Seminars:** Providing tailored instruction and coaching on decision analysis topics pertinent to specific clients.

The nature of the consultancy practice at IDI is somewhat unique. Most of us are decision analysts by trade. Many of the people in the company came out of Ron Howard's program at Stanford in what used to be the Engineering- Economic Systems department. We also have several people with a business school background. More recently, we have added several folks with operations research backgrounds, with several coming from the Naval Postgraduate School and from the Information Technology program at George Mason University. Additionally, we have several social scientists who emphasize the cognitive side of decision making. When we bring the four aspects together, the engineering component, the business component, the operations research component, and the cognitive psychology component, it makes for a fairly powerful combination of perspectives to bring into an organization.

We can best describe our decision analysis practice in terms of the following questions:

What our clients are really buying? Are they buying our analysis where we represent some subset of expertise, or are they buying a process where the goal is to help their experts and their analysts have a process that they can use that they can repeat and they can solve the important problems of the day. For the most part, we sell processes – decision analysis processes that produce valued results in terms of insights into their decisions based upon inputs from key people in a cost-efficient time frame.

Are we selling subject matter expertise or just good advice? Very often people come to us because they trust us. We're objective, we don't have a stake in the decision and they're looking for someone to guide them along the correct path. They're not necessarily looking for sophisticated analytic models; they're not impressed by the fact that we can do large optimizations; they don't come to us because we can build huge probabilistic models. What they really need

is good advice on how to look at their problem, how to structure their problem, how to solve their problem.

Are we providing consulting services or technology transfer? Sometimes, we help a client with a one-time application. The client has a specific problem and we help them solve it and we leave. Other times there is a series of problems that might feed into or build onto another. Frequently, what they really want is to learn how to do decision analysis themselves – the client is looking for technology transfer.

The most unique aspect of our practice is the decision conference. To use the words of Ron Howard to describe decision analysis in general, a decision conference is a structured conversation. Decision conferences were started by Decisions and Designs, Incorporated (DDI) in the late 1970s. They were developed by Dr. Cameron Peterson. The notion is to bring together the experts from the field and the experts on the process – the decision analysis experts. The field people provide the subject-matter expertise. The decision analysts are in the roles of decision process facilitators – often as a team of three. There is the lead facilitator who takes the group of the experts from the company or organization, walks them through the process and builds the models in real time; there is the person who would implement the decision models using computer-based decision tools; and there is the recorder who documents the rationale for the quantitative and qualitative judgments and writes the conference report as it proceeds. All three of the roles are filled by decision analysts and are interchangeable. At any time, any of the decision analysts can assume any of the roles. Collectively, IDI personnel have facilitated more than 2500 decision conferences and working sessions.

We use a wide range of analytical methods and tools. The analysis techniques that are finding the broadest application today include Bayesian networks and dynamic decision networks, decision trees and influence diagrams, multi-attribute utility analysis, benefit/cost analysis, social networks, and step-wise simulation. Specific tools that are used frequently include Logical Decisions, Hiview, Equity, @Risk, Netica, DPL, DATA, Analytical, Crystal Ball, Extend, ORA, and I-Think, among others. Most of the tools we use have been chosen with the human factors side of decision analysis and

decision making in mind. The interfaces are designed for easy use. The use of color has meaning. Scrolling is minimized to maintain focus – concepts that are designed from the cognitive side of group decision making. For decision conferences, we want tools that help the group converge quickly after we've been through the divergent phase in the decision making process. When software doesn't exist that meets the client needs, IDI creates it.

As we look to the future at IDI, we envision modest, steady growth in our highly specialized decision analysis niche. The key to growth to date has been forming strategic alliances with the well known, large consulting firms. By complementing their subject matter experts with our unique perspectives and skills in decision analysis, we can provide a powerful "one-stop shopping" team that can meet most clients needs. The most substantial challenge that we face is finding a continuous stream of skilled decision analysts. As we grow, our reliance on a strong mentoring program for junior analysts will become critical.

Please visit our website at www.innovativedecisions.com for more information.

Terry Bresnick, President, IDI

Software

CSMAA: A user-friendly software for SMAA-III/TRI/3

Tommi Tervonen
(tommi.tervonen@it.utu.fi)

Stochastic Multicriteria Acceptability Analysis (SMAA) is a family of decision support methods that allow to handle problems with partial or missing information about parameter values. Even though the different methods of the family have been used in real-life problems, a user-friendly software has never been available for wider audience. In order to allow the methodology to be used by analysts and academics less accustomed to the techniques of

numerical computation, we have developed a software implementing some methods of the family. The methods of the software apply Monte Carlo simulation to calculate descriptive indices that characterize the decision making problem.

The software was done in conjunction to developing SMAA-TRI and SMAA-III, the two newest methods of the family. It implements these two as well as the SMAA-3 method. In future, other SMAA methods will be added to software. SMAA-TRI is for sorting problems, that is, for assigning alternatives into ordered categories. SMAA-III is for ranking the alternatives. SMAA-3 is similar to SMAA-III, but instead of the complete ELECTRE III procedure, it uses a less discriminative less-in-favor exploitation rule. Another approach to using the software is to use SMAA-TRI and SMAA-III as ELECTRE TRI and ELECTRE III with imprecise parameter values and missing preference information. In this case the SMAA-type indices can be used for parameter sensitivity analysis of the two ELECTRE methods.

The software allows imprecise criteria measurements to be defined with discrete or real values. With discrete values, each number in the imprecise range is considered equiprobable, while with real values they can be defined with uniform or Gaussian distribution. In the case of SMAA-III and SMAA-3, ordinal measurements are allowed as well. In this case, the alternatives are ranked with respect to the ordinal criterion. If SMAA-TRI is used, also the profile measurements as in ELECTRE TRI can be defined with imprecise values. The thresholds of ELECTRE model can be defined with absolute (+-) of percentage values. Both of these can be imprecise within some interval. The uncertainties of criteria and profile measurements can be automatically set to 5%, 10%, or 20% of the values. This way the methods can be used for automatic robustness analysis. Therefore users accustomed to use ELECTRE III or ELECTRE TRI can apply the software to obtain robust conclusions with their model of exact values.

Various preference information can be incorporated into the model. Exact preferences (weights), lower and/or upper bounds for weights, or ordinal (ranking of the weights) information can be used. All other weight information except upper bounds for weights do not cause high computational burden. Upper bounds instead can slow down the computation, but usually this slowdown is of low factor and does not need to be taken into account.

The easy usability of the software allows the analysis to be performed iteratively in SMAA fashion. Usually obtaining more precise measurements means more costs, so the model can initially be defined with imprecise criteria measurements and technical parameter values, and partial or completely missing preference information. If the different indices allow sufficiently trustworthy conclusions to be drawn, the analysis can be ended. Otherwise more precise parameter values can be collected and the analysis repeated. This type of iterative process can stimulate discussion with the decision makers and facilitate obtaining more exact values for the model parameters, especially in the case of preference information.

The three attached figures illustrate some input and results screens of the software. The software can be obtained by contacting the author by email (tommi.tervonen@it.utu.fi). Full versions for Windows, Mac OS X, and Linux are available free of cost for academic use, and for a low cost for commercial purposes.



Figure: Input preference information screen.




Figure: Criteria input screen.




Figure: SMAA-TRI results screen.



Persons and Facts

MCDM International Society elections: The MCDM International Society will elect its new President in the beginning of the 2008 year. A member of our working group, Professor Constantin Zopounidis is candidate.

Prof. Constantin Zopounidis got a distinguished award from his Department for his management capabilities as the President of the department over the period 2001-05. Constantin Zopounidis is Professor at the Department of Production, Engineering and Management at the Technical University of Crete and he is also the Director of the Financial Engineering Laboratory.



About the 66th Meeting

The 66th Meeting of the European Working Group «Multiple Criteria Decision Aiding» has held at Club Kahrama, in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 18th to 20th October, 2007. The Meeting was organized by National Airports Authority (ONDA). The main theme of the meeting was: "Polymodality and Multiple Criteria Decision Aiding". The working group met out of Europe for the second time, the meeting was already hosted in Quebec, Canada.

There were 56 registered before the day of the meeting but only 40 participants from 9 countries were participated, (see the distribution of participants over countries below)

Country	Number of participants
Belgium	3
Finland	3
France	4
Greece	8
Italy	3
Estonia	1
Poland	2
Portugal	1
Morocco	15

The number of submitted proposals presentations was 46. Only 22 of them were accepted for presentation and 19 of them have been effectively presented and discussed at the meeting (see the scientific program below). Presentations and discussions were very interesting, according to the opinion of all the participants. There was a friendly and good atmosphere in the meeting group excited by social program composed by Gala Dinner and Guided tour of the most historical monuments.

Gala Dinner was programmed on Friday, October 19, in the "Chez Ali" Restaurant, which is located in outside of the city. Participants enjoyed the dances performed by different folkloric groups and the magic spectacle.

On Saturday, October 20, the guided tour was programmed around the most important historical monuments:

- The Bahia Castle (XIX century) is a vast palace in the rooms of pageantry decorated with arabesques, with a beautiful raised Moorish garden.
- The Saadiens Tombs (XVI Century), the necropolis royal which is next to the mosque of the Kasbah and shelters, behind its high walls, burials of the sultans and their close relations divided into two mausoleums.
- The Ménara Gardens (XII century) and the large central basin, bordered by a promenade, it was intended to store rainwater and that coming from the close mountains.

In the end, participants enjoyed lunch composed by local and typical meals in the "Les Jardins de Tensifit" Restaurant, located on a park of leisure and relaxation made up of a large garden with swimming pool and several living rooms and terraces. The Restaurant is located far from the city towards the road of Casablanca.

For more details about the MCDA '66 meeting, please visit the web site:

<http://www.onda.ma/mcda66>

Hassane Yamnahakki

PROGRAMME

Jeudi le 18 octobre / Thursday, October 18

09:00 - 11:00 **Inscription / Registration**

11:00 - 11:30 **Session d'ouverture / Opening session: A. BENALLOU**

Session 1

Président/Chairman : R. LAHDELMA

11:30 - 12:00 W. K. Brauers: Multi Objective Decision Making for Wellbeing Economy: The case of Morocco (20 minutes)

12:00 - 12:30 M. Hachimi, B. Aghezzaf: Optimality Conditions in Differentiable Multicriteria Optimization via Second-Order Tangent Sets (20 minutes)

12:30 - 13:00 H. Yamnahakki, A. Benallou, A. Menou: Elaboration du Schéma Directeur des Aéroports du Maroc: Aide multicritère en environnement multimodal (20 minutes)

Papiers soumis à discussion/Papers submitted for discussion

– N. Matsatsinis, E. Krassadaki, E. Gountara, Z. Makridou, E. Balla, G. Paulous: Applying a multicriteria satisfaction analysis to an International Airport

– M. Berankova, L. Domeova: Robustness of selected MCDM Methods

– I. Kaldó: Some higher order iterative methods for solving Multi-Objective optimization problems

– P. Kalantonis, C. Zopounidis, C. Gaganis: Multicriteria Classification Model for the Identification of Innovative Firms using Financial Statements

– G. Barberis, M. Rodenas: How to select the best type of coffee shop: applying a multicriteria decision aid model to solve the decision problem in the "Levante Espagnol".

– T. Agouti, A. Tikniouine, M. Eladnani, A. Ait Ouahman: Proposition d'une Méthode d'analyse multicritères « analyse hiérarchique des influences (AHI) »: Application à un problème d'aménagement du territoire « cas d'électrification des zones rurales au Maroc ».

13:00 - 14:00 **Déjeuner/Lunch**

Session 2

Président/Chairman : A. TIKNIOUINE

14:00 - 14:30 T. Agouti, A. Tikniouine, M. Eladnani, A. Aitouahman: Proposition d'une technique floue pour la modélisation des préférences des décideurs:

« choix d'un site pour l'implantation d'une usine de traitement des déchets » (20 minutes)

14:30 - 15:00 M. Huaultmé, M. Baslé : L'économie normative des indices synthétiques :

les « analogies » avec les indicateurs d'impact de politiques publiques et de programmes... (20 minutes)

15:00 - 15:30 M.F. Norese, F. Montagna, S. Riva: A multicriteria approach to support the design of complex systems (20 minutes)

15:30 - 16:00 K. Florios, G. Mavrotas, D. Diakoulaki: Solving bi and tri criteria knapsack instances using mathematical programming and evolutionary algorithms:

Results and analysis (20 minutes)

Papiers soumis à discussion/Papers submitted for discussion

– N. Abriak, D. Damidot, A. Menou, Piloting a Marine Dredging Operation and a Tool for help with Decision-Taking

– R. Ciobanu: Particularities of Decision Making Process: crises, conflicts, risks and errors.

– N. F. Matsatsinis, K. Lakiotaki, P. Delias: Using Marginal Utility Functions to Cluster Customers according to their Satisfaction

– A. Ibenrissoul: La décision multicritère dans les entreprises marocaines en mal de conseil

– A. Tikniouine, A. Ibenrissoul, A. Ait Ouahman: Contribution de l'AMCD aux SID

– T. Agouti, A. Tikniouine, M. Eladnani, A. Ait Ouahman: An hybrid approach of mathematical programming and MCDA for the GISMR: the industrial localization

16:00 - 16:30 **Pause café/Coffee break**

Session 3

Président/Chairman : M.F. Norese

16:30 - 17:00 A. Menou, A. Benallou, H. Yamnahakki: Développement d'un modèle d'aide multicritère à la décision pour la centralisation du Fret Marocain et Africain dans un aéroport Hub (20 minutes)

17:00 - 17:30 Y. De Smet, N. Gothelf: About the choice between a reversed multi-attribute auction and a reversed auction with a quality threshold (20 minutes).

Papiers soumis à discussion/Papers submitted for discussion

- G. Samaras: A study of satisfaction for the project management Department of Technological Education Institute of Larissa, with the Multicriteria Method MUSA
- T. Subrt, H. Brozova: ANP methods in modeling and meta-modeling of competency profiles
- M. Houška, M. Beránková: Multi-objective goal programming model as a general piecewise linear programming model
- A. Soulhi, H. Yamnahakki: Fuzzy decision making in TPM (Total Productive Maintenance)
- M. Benbouziane, A. Benamar: Money-Price Causality in the Maghreb Countries: Co-integration and Bootstrap analyses.

Vendredi le 19 octobre/ Friday, October 19

Session 4

Président/Chairman : A. BENALLOU

- 09:00 - 10:30 S. Greco, V. Mousseau, R. Slowinski: The necessary and the possible in a perspective of robust decision aiding (40 minutes)
- 10:30 - 11:00 R. Lahdelma, P. Salminen: Treatment of semi-ordinal measurements in an environmental MCDA problem (20 minutes)

Papiers soumis à discussion/Papers submitted for discussion

- J. Haidar, A. Ibourk A. Ait Ouahman,: L'aide multicritère à la décision pour la mise en place d'une stratégie de gestion durable des zones protégées
- H. Brozova, M. Ruzicka, T. Subrt: AHP and ANP Methods in Analysis of Environmental Impact of Traffic and Transport Infrastructure
- A. Belkadi, A. Ibourk, A. Ait Ouahman: Choix du mode de gestion des services publics, Eau potable / Assainissement liquide / Electricité à Marrakech: Application de la méthode AHP
- A. Tiziat, A. Ibourk: Aide multicritère à la décision: Application au choix d'un procédé d'épuration et d'un site d'implantation de la station de traitement des eaux usées de la ville de Marrakech

– H. Trabelsi: Aide multicritère à la décision et approche participative pour la gestion des nappes souterraines en Tunisie.

11:00 - 11:30 **Pause café/Coffee break**

Session 5

Président/Chairman : C. ZOPOUNIDIS

- 11:30 - 12:00 O. Cailloux, C. Lamboray, P. Nemery: A taxonomy of clustering procedures (20 minutes)
- 12:00 - 12:30 W. Ouerdane, N. Maudet, A. Tsoukias: Vers un Modèle Combinant Critères et Arguments (20 minutes)
- 12:30 - 13:00 R. Benmoussa, M. Zrikem: Evaluation de la robustesse des systèmes: approche basée sur les plans d'expérience (20 minutes)

Papiers soumis à discussion/Papers submitted for discussion

- W. K. Brauers: Multi-Objective Optimization in Seaport Planning
- P. Oberti, X. Peraldi, M. Rombaldi: Transport maritime interinsulaire durable en Méditerranée occidentale et critères d'évaluation de la performance des configurations reticulaires
- P. Meyer, R. Bisdorff: Exploitation of a bipolar-valued outranking relation for the best k-choice problem
- R. Bisdorff: On the semantics of the bipolar-valued outranking relation
- S. Bettahar: Mesure multidimensionnelle de la pauvreté basée sur la théorie des ensembles flous: cas de la région de Tlemcen, Algérie.

13:00 - 14:00 **Déjeuner/Lunch**

Session 6

Président/Chairman : R. SLOWINSKI

- 14:00 - 14:30 B. Roy: Vie du groupe et prochaines réunions/Working group matters and next meetings
- 14:30 - 15:00 I. Blečić, A. Cecchini, C. Pusccheddu: Actors Strategies Actions(ASA): A Software for a Decision Support Evaluation Model of policies and strategies (20 minutes)
- 15:00 - 15:30. P. Xidonas, D. Askounis, J. Psarras: On the modeling of an integrated multiple-criteria methodology for supporting common stock portfolio construction decisions (20 minutes)

15:30 - 16:00 **Pause café/Coffee break**

Session 7

Président/Chairman : J. FIGUEIRA

16:00 - 16:30 Y. Siskos, Y. Theodoridis, G. Marketos, N. Tsotsolas: Data Mining in Satisfaction Measurement (20 minutes)

16:30 - 17:00 L. El Yazidi, A. El Fazziki: Un système Multi Agent d'Aide à la Décision Multi Acteur Multi Critère (20 minutes).

Papiers soumis à discussion/Papers submitted for discussion

- M. Garcia Centeno, R. Minguez Salido: The discrete multicriteria decision methods used to choice the best stochastic volatility models
- A. Mendas: Intégration des SIG et analyse multicritère en vue de choisir le meilleur emplacement d'une retenue collinaire
- V. Postolica: A Recent Survey on Pareto efficiency in infinite dimensional vector space
 - T. Agouti, A. Tikniouine, M. Eladnani, A. Aitouahman: Toward an integration of the fuzzy logic and MCDA to GIS: Application to the project of the localization of a site for the implantation of chemical products factory
 - L. Dömeová, M. Houška: Cost and Benefit Criteria in MCDM Methods
 - M. El Mangad, A. Ibourk :Les déterminants de choix pour la délocalisation des centres d'appel au Maroc: Approche dynamique
 - M. Doumpos, Y. Marinakis, M. Marinaki, C. Zopounidis: Evolutionary approaches for the development of outranking relation models in classification problems.

17:30 - 18:00 **Fermeture/Closing**

20:00 **Banquet.**



Forthcoming Meetings

(This section is prepared by Juscelino Carlos Henggeler Antunes)

Forthcoming EWG Meetings/ Prochaines réunions du Groupe

Note:

- It should be remarked again that this is a bilingual group; all the papers should be presented in both official languages of the group (i.e. French with English slides, and *vice-versa*).
- Ceci en un groupe bilingue ; tous les papiers doivent être présentés dans
- les deux langues officielles du groupe (i.e. en français avec les transparents en anglais et *vice-versa*).

The 67th Meeting of the EWG on MCDA will be organized by Risto Lahdelma (risto.lahdelma@cs.utu.fi), Kaisa Miettinen, Pekka Salminen and Ahti Salo and will be held in the 3-5 April, 2008 in Finland, more precisely in Lapland, Rovaniemi. www.operaatitotutkimus.fi/mcda67/

The 68h Meeting of the EWG on MCDA will be organized by Constantin Zopounidis (kostas@dpem.tuc.gr) and Michael Doumpos (mdoumpos@dpem.tuc.gr) will be held in Chania, Crete (Greece) in October 2008, 9-11 or 23-25. Topic: Robustness in MCDA.

Other Meetings

IFIP/IIASA/GAMM Workshop on Coping with Uncertainty (CwU), Laxenburg/Vienna, Austria; December 10-12, 2007
[<http://www.iiasa.ac.at/~marek/wrksp/cwu07/>]

ISDSI2008: International Conference on Decision Sciences and Technology for Globalization, Ghaziabad/Delhi, India; January 2-4, 2008
[<http://www.imt.edu/isdsi2008/index.asp>]

19th International Conference on Multiple Criteria Decision Making ("MCDM for Sustainable Energy and Transportation Systems"), Auckland, New Zealand; January 7-12, 2008 [http://mcdm2008.orsnz.org.nz]

10th International Conference on Application of Advanced Technology in Transportation (AATT 2008) Athens, Greece; May 27-31, 2008 [http://www.civil.ntua.gr/aatt/aatt.htm]

Applied mathematical Programming and Modelling (APMOD 2008), Bratislava, Slovakia; May 28-30, 2008 [http://www.apmod2008.org/]

International Conference on Engineering Optimization, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
June 1-5, 2008 [http://www.engopt.org]

2008 IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence (WCCI 2008), Hong Kong
June 1-6, 2008 [http://www.wcci2008.org]

Group Decision and Negotiation 2008, GDN 2008, June 17-20, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal, 2008 [<http://gdn2008.org>]

IEEE Engineering Management Conference- IEMC Europe 2008, Estoril, Portugal; June 28-30, 2008 [http://iemceur08.tagus.ist.utl.pt/]

18th Triennial Conference of the International Federation of Operational Research Societies (IFORS), Sandton, South Africa; July 13-18, 2008 [http://www.acitravel.co.za/event/index.php?eventID=3]

International Conference Operations Research 2008, Augsburg, Germany
September 3-5, 2008 [http://www.or2008.de]

INFORMS Annual Meeting 2008, Washington DC, USA; October 12-15, 2008 [http://www.informs.org]

Announcements

Call for Papers

Web site for Call for Papers:

www.inescc.fe.uc.pt/~ewgmcda/CallforPapers.html

The 2nd International Conference on Metaheuristics and Nature Inspired Computing, META'08, will held in Tunisia from 29 to 31 Oct.

The Conference will be an exchange space thanks to the sessions of the research works presentations and also will integrate tutorials and a vocational training of metaheuristics and nature inspired computing.

The scope of the META'2008 conference includes, but is not limited to:

- Local search, tabu search, simulated annealing, VNS, ILS, ...
- Evolutionary algorithms, swarm optimization, scatter search, ...
- Emergent nature inspired algorithms: quantum computing, artificial immune systems, bee colony, DNA computing, ...
- Parallel algorithms and hybrid methods with metaheuristics, machine learning, game theory, mathematical programming, constraint programming, co-evolutionary, ...
- Application to: logistics and transportation, telecommunications, scheduling, data mining, engineering design, bioinformatics, ...
- Theory of metaheuristics, landscape analysis, convergence, problem difficulty, very large neighbourhoods, ...
- Application to multi-objective optimization
- Application in dynamic optimization, problems with uncertainty, ...

Submission papers:

- Submission of papers should be in shape of an abstract of two pages sent before the 15st May 2008 via the website.

- Selected papers will be published in international journals.

- Predefined styles are available on the website

<http://www.lifl.fr/META08> that we invite you to visit regularly and which evolves when the organization progresses.

Invited sessions and tutorials: Deadline 15th May 2008.
contact: talbi@lifl.fr

IEEE International Engineering Management
Conference IEMC-Europe 2008
June 28-30, 2008, Estoril, Portugal
MANAGING ENGINEERING, TECHNOLOGY
AND INNOVATION FOR GROWTH

<http://iemceur08.tagus.ist.utl.pt/>

Topics

- 1- Decision Analysis (1.1- Decision Analysis with Multiple Criteria; 1.2- Decision Analysis Tools for Risk Assessment, Management, and Communication; 1.3- Decision Analysis for Public Decision-Making).
- 2- Technological Change and Management of Innovation (2.1- Innovation and Productivity Growth; 2.2- Technology-based Entrepreneurship; 2.3- Managing Organisational Change; 2.4- Technological Foresight).
- 3- Operations and Supply Chain Management (3.1- Operations and Supply Chain Optimization; 3.2- Environmental Issues and Sustainable Operations; 3.3- Close Loop Supply Chains).
- 4- Cross-functional Emerging Domains (4.1- Actor Networks and Collaborative Models; 3.2- Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management; 3.3- Education in Engineering Management).

Submission deadline: January 25, 2008

Books

Advances in Multiple Criteria Decision Making and Human Systems Management: Knowledge and Wisdom

Edited by

Yong Shi, David L. Olson, Antonie Stam

2007

ISBN 978-1-58603-748-2

This volume, edited as a Festschrift in honor of Prof. Milan Zeleny, reflects and emulates his unmistakable legacy: the essential multidimensionality of human and social affairs. There are many levels of this multidimensionality presented in this volume: 1. Multidisciplinarity of contributed papers 2. Multinationality of their authors, extending even to the editors and the publisher and 3. Multicultural and multilevel exposition, ranging from empirical studies to philosophical foundations. Generally, these papers can be divided into three parts: Multiple Criteria Decision Making; Social and Human System Management; and Information, Knowledge and Wisdom Management. It is the recognition of multidimensionality in decision making, economics, optimization, systems, cybernetics and the pursuit of knowledge that bear the stamp of specific Zeleny's contributions. His life-long dedication to multidimensionality has produced an ultimate multidimensional being, living in academic 'multiverse', functioning in a boundaryless world of all continents, cultures and countries. This book is as diverse and as multidimensional as the man and his work.

IOSPress Nieuwe Hemweg 6B, 1013 BG
Amsterdam, The Netherlands Tel.: +31 20 688 3355,
Fax: +31 20 687 0039
E-mail: info@iospress.nl

*** **

Multiple Criteria Decision Making'05

Edited by

Tadeusz Trzaskalik

Contents. PREFACE. Tomasz Błasczyk: THE TARGET COSTING APPROACH IN MULTICRITERIA PROJECT BIDDING. Rafael Caballero, Trinidad Gómez, Mónica Hernández, Maria Amparo León: GOAL PROGRAMMING WITH LINEAR FRACTIONAL CRITERIA: AN APPLICATION TO A FOREST PROBLEM. Sydne CK Chu, Christina SY Yuen: EFFECTIVE HEURISTIC VS GP SOLUTIONS FOR SHIFT DUTIES GENERATION. Cezary Dominiak: MULTICRITERIA DECISION AID UNDER UNCERTAINTY. Petr Fiala: MULTIPLE CRITERIA SUPPLIER SELECTION NETWORK MODEL. Josef Jablonsky: A SLACK BASED

MODEL FOR MEASURING SUPER-EFFICIENCY IN DATA ENVELOPMENT ANALYSIS. Dorota Kuchta: BICRITERIAL ROBUST APPROACH IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT. Mikuláš Luptáčík, Bernhard Böhm: MEASURING ECO-EFFICIENCY IN A LEONTIEF INPUT-OUTPUT MODEL. Kaisa Miettinen: IND-NIMBUS FOR DEMANDING INTERACTIVE MULTIOBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION. Sigitas Mitkus: GRAPHICAL RISK ALLOCATION MODEL IN CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR CHANGES IN MARKET PRICES. Maciej Nowak: AN INTERACTIVE PROCEDURE FOR PROJECT SELECTION. Włodzimierz Ogryczak: EQUITY, FAIRNESS AND MULTICRITERIA OPTIMIZATION. Jaroslav Ramik: DUALITY IN FUZZY MULTIPLE OBJECTIVE LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH POSSIBILITY AND NECESSITY RELATIONS. Jaideep Roy, Honorata Sosnowska: IMPOSSIBILITY OF STRATEGYPROOFNESS WITH COALITION FORMATION UNDER TRANSFERABLE UTILITY. Edita Šarkienė, Vaidotas Šarka, Leonas Ustinovichius: A MODEL FOR EVALUATING THE INVESTMENT IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF DWELLING HOUSES BASED ON MULTIPLE CRITERIA DECISION SYNTHESIS METHODS. Ralph E. Steuer, Yue Qi, Markus Hirschberger: DEVELOPMENTS IN MULTI-ATTRIBUTE PORTFOLIO SELECTIONS. Tadeusz Trzaskalik, Sebastian Sitarz: TRIANGULAR NORMS IN DISCRETE DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING. Małgorzata Trzaskalik-Wyrwa, Maciej Nowak, Tadeusz Trzaskalik: APPLICATION OF MULTICRITERIA ANALYSIS TO RESTORATION OF HISTORICAL PORTABLE ORGAN. Leonas Ustinovichius, Galina Ševcenko, Dmitry Kochin: CLASSIFICATION OF REAL ALTERNATIVES AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE INVESTMENT RISK IN CONSTRUCTION. Tomasz Wachowicz: APPLICATION OF MULTIPLE ATTRIBUTE STOCHASTIC DOMINANCE TO SELECTION OF NEGOTIATION STRATEGIES IN E-NEGOTIATIONS.

*** **

Metodologia multicriterio de ayuda a la decision

Bernard Roy
(Traducido por Begona Alvarez)

Tireyki Edicions, S.L. 2007, Poligono do Tambre, Via Edison 33-35, 15890 Santiago de Compostela, Espagne.

Tanto a nivel nacional como en el ámbito de una colectividad local (Administración, empresa, fábrica o servicio) o, simplemente, en la vida familiar se toman decisiones sobre hacer y no hacer o actuar de una manera u otra. En este libro se sientan las bases de una metodología de ayuda a la decisión que se dirige a los directivos y gestores que toman decisiones o solicitan asesoramiento con respecto a la toma de decisiones, y a todos aquellos que desarrollan trabajos profesionales para ofrecer ese asesoramiento.

El libro también se dirige a los estudiantes que deseen comprender los problemas y los métodos relacionados con la ayuda a la decisión y a los investigadores – especialmente a los que quieren ayudar a que la “ciencia” de ayuda a la decisión se desarrolle.

*** **

Managerial Decisions with Multiple Criteria

Edited by
Constantin Zopounidis and Michael Doumpos

Special Issue of Annals of Operations Research, Vol, 144, 2007, Springer Science + Business Media Inc.

*** **

Advances in Operations Research - Series Editor:
Prof. Constantin Zopounidis, Technical
University of Crete

Book Description:

ADVANCES IN OPERATIONS RESEARCH
NOVA Publishers

Series Editor:

Prof. Constantin Zopounidis. Technical University of Crete. Dept. of Production Engineering and Management . Financial Engineering Laboratory. University Campus. 73100, Chania, Greece.E-mail: kostas@dpem.tuc.gr

Since its introduction in the 1940s, operations research (OR) has evolved rapidly in terms of its theory and its real world applications. OR is now a well established field, covering a broad field of topics, including but not limited to inventory management, logistics, transportation, telecommunications, finance, service operations, health care, public policy and marketing.

This book series focuses on the publication of high quality books (monographs and edited volumes) on new OR and Multicriteria Decision Making methodologies, but it also emphasizes on real world applications from a broad range of fields. Special interest is given on books exploring the interdisciplinary character of OR and its connections with other fields, such as probability theory and statistics, artificial intelligence and computer science, fuzzy sets, simulation, etc..

Proposals should be submitted electronically to the Series Editor.

*** **

Studies in Financial Optimization and Risk Management (Series Description)

Book Description:

STUDIES IN FINANCIAL OPTIMIZATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT
NOVA Publishers

Series Editor:

Prof. Constantin Zopounidis. Technical University of Crete. Dept. of Production Engineering and Management . Financial Engineering Laboratory. University Campus. 73100, Chania, Greece.E-mail: kostas@dpem.tuc.gr

Risk management has evolved within the field finance as a topic of major practical importance for corporate entities, firms, organizations and investors. Optimization models and methods play an increasingly important role in financial risk management. Many problems in quantitative finance and risk management such as asset allocation, derivative pricing, value at risk modeling and model fitting, are now efficiently solved using state-of-the-art optimization techniques.

The purpose of this book series is to cover this exciting and rapidly growing field through the publication of high quality books (monographs and edited volumes) related to financial optimization and risk management, which would be of interest to researchers and practitioners working on this field.

Proposals should be submitted electronically to the Series Editor.

*** **

NEW JOURNAL

Journal of Computational Optimization in Economics and Finance

<https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/index.php?cPath=125&sort=2a&page=3>



Articles Harvest

(This section is prepared by Juscelino ALMEIDA DIAS)

Aardal, K.I. S.P.M. van Hoesel, A.M.C.A. Koster, C. Mannino and A. Sassano (2007). Models and solution techniques for frequency assignment problems. *Annals of Operations Research* 153 (1), 79-129.

Aguilar-Ruiz J.S., R. Giráldez and J.C. Riquelme (2007). Natural Encoding for Evolutionary Supervised Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 11 (4), 466-479.

- Alves M.J. and M. Almeida (2007). MOTGA: A multiobjective Tchebycheff based genetic algorithm for the multidimensional knapsack problem. *Computers & Operations Research* 34 (11), 3458-3470.
- Alves M.J., J. Clímaco, C. Henggeler Antunes, H. Jorge and A.G. Martins (2008). Stability analysis of efficient solutions in multiobjective integer programming: A case study in load management. *Computers & Operations Research* 35 (1), 186-197.
- Amin G.R. (2007). Notes on properties of the OWA weights determination model. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 52 (4), 533-538.
- Araz C., P.M. Ozfirat and I. Ozkarahan (2007). An integrated multicriteria decision-making methodology for outsourcing management. *Computers & Operations Research* 34 (12), 3738-3756.
- Augusto M., J. Lisboa, M. Yasin and J.R. Figueira (2008). Benchmarking in a multiple criteria performance context: An application and a conceptual framework. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (1), 244-254.
- Ballesterio E. (2007). Compromise programming: A utility-based linear-quadratic composite metric from the trade-off between achievement and balanced (non-corner) solutions. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (3), 1369-1382.
- Bana e Costa C.A., C.S. Oliveira and V. Vieira (2008). Prioritization of bridges and tunnels in earthquake risk mitigation using multicriteria decision analysis: Application to Lisbon. *Omega* 36 (3), 442-450.
- Banaitiene N., A. Banaitis, A. Kaklauskas and E.K. Zavadskas (2008). Evaluating the life cycle of a building: A multivariant and multiple criteria approach. *Omega* 36 (3), 429-441.
- Barcus A. and G. Montibeller (2008). Supporting the allocation of software development work in distributed teams with multi-criteria decision analysis. *Omega* 36 (3), 464-475.
- Barthélemy J.-P., F. Brucker and C. Osswald (2007). Combinatorial optimisation and hierarchical classifications. *Annals of Operations Research* 153 (1), 179-214.
- Belgacem T. and M. Hifi (2008). Sensitivity analysis of the knapsack sharing problem: Perturbation of the weight of an item. *Computers & Operations Research* 35 (1), 295-308.
- Ben-Arieh D. and T. Easton (2007). Multi-criteria group consensus under linear cost opinion elasticity. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (3), 713-721.
- Beynon M.J. and P. Wells (2008). The lean improvement of the chemical emissions of motor vehicles based on preference ranking: A PROMETHEE uncertainty analysis. *Omega* 36 (3), 384-394.
- Birnbaum M.H. and J.P. Bahra (2007). Gain-Loss Separability and Coalescing in Risky Decision Making. *Management Science* 53 (6), 1016-1028.
- Boh W.F., S.A. Slaughter and J.A. Espinosa (2007). Learning from Experience in Software Development: A Multilevel Analysis. *Management Science* 53 (8), 1315-1331.
- Bollinger D. and J. Pictet (2008). Multiple criteria decision analysis of treatment and land-filling technologies for waste incineration residues. *Omega* 36 (3), 418-428.
- Boğ R.L., S.-M. Grad and G. Wanka (2007). A general approach for studying duality in multiobjective optimization. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research* 65 (3), 417-444.
- Buchanan J. and D. Vanderpooten (2007). Ranking projects for an electricity utility using ELECTRE III. *International Transactions in Operational Research* 14 (4), 309-323.
- Chang A.-Y. (2007). On the measurement of routing flexibility: A multiple attribute approach. *International Journal of Production Economics* 109 (1-2), 122-136.
- Chen Y., D.M. Kilgour and K.W. Hipel (2008). A case-based distance method for screening in multiple-criteria decision aid. *Omega* 36 (3), 373-383.
- Chen Y., K.W. Li, D. M. Kilgour and K.W. Hipel (2008). A case-based distance model for multiple criteria ABC analysis. *Computers & Operations Research* 35 (3), 776-796.
- Chen Y.-W., C.-H. Wang and S.J. Lin (2008). A multi-objective geographic information system for route selection of nuclear waste transport. *Omega* 36 (3), 363-372.
- Chinchuluun A. and P.M. Pardalos (2007). A survey of recent developments in multiobjective optimization. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 29-50.
- Chinchuluun A., D. Yuan and P.M. Pardalos (2007). Optimality conditions and duality for nondifferentiable multiobjective fractional programming with generalized convexity. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 133-147.

- Cho Y.-G. and K.-T. Cho (2008). A loss function approach to group preference aggregation in the AHP. *Computers & Operations Research* 35 (3), 884-892.
- Cruz J.M. (2008). Dynamics of supply chain networks with corporate social responsibility through integrated environmental decision-making. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184(3), 1005-1031.
- Damart S., L.C. Dias and V. Mousseau (2007). Supporting groups in sorting decisions: Methodology and use of a multi-criteria aggregation/disaggregation DSS. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (4), 1464-1475.
- Danielson M., L. Ekenberg, J. Idefeldt and A. Larsson (2007). Using a Software Tool for Public Decision Analysis: The Case of Nacka Municipality. *Decision Analysis* 4 (2), 76-90.
- Deblaere F., E. Demeulemeester, W. Herroelen and S. Van de Vonder (2007). Robust Resource Allocation Decisions in Resource-Constrained Projects. *Decision Sciences* 38 (1), 5-37.
- Demoulin N.T.M. (2007). Marketing decision support system openness: A means of improving managers' understanding of marketing phenomena. *Decision Support Systems* 44 (1), 79-92.
- Dombi J., C. Imreh and N. Vincze (2007). Learning lexicographic orders. *European Journal of Operational Research* 183 (2), 748-756.
- Doukas H.C., B.M. Andreas and J.E. Psarras (2007). Multi-criteria decision aid for the formulation of sustainable technological energy priorities using linguistic variables. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (2), 844-855.
- Ehrgott M., J. Puerto and A.M. Rodríguez-Chía (2007). Primal-Dual Simplex Method for Multiobjective Linear Programming. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 134 (3), 483-497.
- Escobar M.T. and J.M. Moreno-Jiménez (2007). Aggregation of Individual Preference Structures in Ahp-Group Decision Making. *Group Decision and Negotiation* 16 (4), 287-301.
- Espinosa A. and R. Harnden (2007). Team synteegrity and democratic group decision making: theory and practice. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 58 (8), 1056-1064.
- Gabriel S.A., P. Sahakij, M. Ramirez and C. Peot (2007). A multiobjective optimization model for processing and distributing biosolids to reuse fields. *Journal of the Operational Research Societ* 58 (7), 850-864.
- Gimpel H. (2007). Loss Aversion and Reference-Dependent Preferences in Multi-Attribute Negotiations. *Group Decision and Negotiation* 16 (4), 303-319.
- Gomes C.F.S., K.R.A. Nunes, L.H. Xavier, R. Cardoso and R. Valle (2008). Multicriteria decision making applied to waste recycling in Brazil. *Omega* 36 (3), 395-404.
- Gonçalves-Coelho A.M. and A.J.F. Mourão (2007). Axiomatic design as support for decision-making in a design for manufacturing context: A case study. *International Journal of Production Economics* 109 (1-2), 81-89.
- González-Pachón J. and C. Romero (2007). Inferring consensus weights from pairwise comparison matrices without suitable properties. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 123-132.
- Guo M., J.-B. Yang, K.-S. Chin and Hongwei Wang (2007). Evidential reasoning based preference programming for multiple attribute decision analysis under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (3), 1294-1312.
- Hajkowicz S. and A. Higgins (2008). A comparison of multiple criteria analysis techniques for water resource management. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (1), 255-265.
- Hamacher H.W., C.R. Pedersen and S. Ruzika (2007). Finding representative systems for discrete bicriterion optimization problems. *Operations Research Letters* 35 (3), 336-344.
- Higgins A.J., S. Hajkowicz and E. Bui (2008). A multi-objective model for environmental investment decision making. *Computers & Operations Research* 35 (1), 253-266.
- Hoffmann S., P. Fischbeck, A. Krupnick and M. McWilliams (2007). Elicitation from Large, Heterogeneous Expert Panels: Using Multiple Uncertainty Measures to Characterize Information Quality for Decision Analysis. *Decision Analysis* 4 (2), 91-109.
- Islam R. (2007). MBNQA criteria in education: assigning weights from a Malaysian perspective and proposition for an alternative evaluation scheme. *International Transactions in Operational Research* 14 (5), 373-394.
- Kahraman C., S. Çevik, N.Y. Ates and M. Gülbay (2007). Fuzzy multi-criteria evaluation of industrial robotic systems. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 52 (4), 414-433.
- Kress M., M. Penn and M. Polukarov (2007). The minmax multidimensional knapsack problem with application to a chance-constrained

- problem. *Naval Research Logistics* 54 (6), 656 – 666.
- Labreuche Ch. and M. Grabisch (2007). The representation of conditional relative importance between criteria. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 93-122.
- Lehtinen A. (2007). The Welfare Consequences of Strategic Voting in Two Commonly Used Parliamentary Agendas. *Theory and Decision* 63 (1), 1-40.
- Lenca Ph., P. Meyer, B. Vaillant and S. Lallich (2008). On selecting interestingness measures for association rules: User oriented description and multiple criteria decision aid. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (2), 610-626.
- Lourenço R.P. and J.P. Costa (2007). Incorporating citizens' views in local policy decision making processes. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (4), 1499-1511.
- Lussier Y.A., R. Williams, J. Li, S. Jalan, T. Borlawsky, E. Stern and I. Kohli (2007). Partitioning knowledge bases between advanced notification and clinical decision support systems. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (4), 1274-1286.
- Maltz E. N., K.E. Murphy and M.L. Hand (2007). Decision support for university enrollment management: Implementation and experience. *Decision Support Systems* 44 (1), 106-123.
- Merrick J.R.W. and J.R. Harrald (2007). Making Decisions About Safety in US Ports and Waterways. *Interfaces* 37 (3), 240-252.
- Mishra S. (2007). Weighting method for bi-level linear fractional programming problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* 183 (1), 296-302.
- Montmain J., G. Mauris and A. Akharraz (2005). Elucidation and decisional risk in a multi-criteria decision based on a Choquet integral aggregation - a cybernetic framework. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis* 13 (5-6), 239-258.
- Nasibov E.N. and G. Ulutagay (2007). A new unsupervised approach for fuzzy clustering. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 158 (19), 2118-2133.
- Natividade-Jesus E., J. Coutinho-Rodrigues and C. Henggeler Antunes (2007). A multicriteria decision support system for housing evaluation. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (3), 779-790.
- Neumann M. (2007). Choosing and Describing: Sen and the Irrelevance of Independence Alternatives. *Theory and Decision* 63 (1), 79-94.
- Ogryczak W., A. Wierzbicki and M. Milewski (2008). A multi-criteria approach to fair and efficient bandwidth allocation. *Omega* 36 (3), 451-463.
- Öztürk M. and A. Tsoukiàs (2007). Modelling uncertain positive and negative reasons in decision aiding. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (4), 1512-1526.
- Park S. and L. Rothrock (2007). Systematic analysis of framing bias in missile defense: Implications toward visualization design. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (3), 1383-1398.
- Parr D. and J.M. Thompson (2007). Solving the multi-objective nurse scheduling problem with a weighted cost function. *Annals of Operations Research* 155 (1), 279-288.
- Parreiras R.O. and J.A. Vasconcelos (2007). A multiplicative version of PROMETHEE II applied to multiobjective optimization problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* 183 (2), 729-740.
- Pennington R. and B. Tuttle (2007). The Effects of Information Overload on Software Project Risk Assessment. *Decision Sciences* 38 (3), 489-526.
- Petkov D., O. Petkova, T. Andrew and T. Nepal (2007). Mixing Multiple Criteria Decision Making with soft systems thinking techniques for decision support in complex situations. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (4), 1615-1629.
- Petrovic D., A. Duenas and S. Petrovic (2007). Decision support tool for multi-objective job shop scheduling problems with linguistically quantified decision functions. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (4), 1527-1538.
- Phillips L.D. and C.A. Bana e Costa (2007). Transparent prioritisation, budgeting and resource allocation with multi-criteria decision analysis and decision conferencing. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 51-68.
- Pictet J. and D. Bollinger (2005). The silent negotiation or how to elicit collective information for group MCDA without excessive discussion. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis* 13 (5-6), 199-211.
- Rajagopal R. and E. del Castillo (2007). A Bayesian approach for multiple criteria decision making with applications in Design for Six Sigma. *Journal of the Operational Research Societ* 58 (6), 779-790.
- Ramsey D.M. and K. Szajowski (2008). Selection of a correlated equilibrium in Markov stopping games. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (1), 185-206.
- Rommelfanger H. (2007). A general concept for solving linear multicriteria programming

- problems with crisp, fuzzy or stochastic values. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 158 (17), 1892-1904.
- Sadiq R. and S. Tesfamariam (2007). Probability density functions based weights for ordered weighted averaging (OWA) operators: An example of water quality indices. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (3), 1350-1368.
- Salvietti L. and N.R. Smith (2008). A profit-maximizing economic lot scheduling problem with price optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (3), 900-914.
- Sarkar M. (2007). Fuzzy-rough nearest neighbor algorithms in classification. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 158 (19), 2134-2152.
- Sarker B.R., A.M.M. Jamal and S. Mondal (2008). Optimal batch sizing in a multi-stage production system with rework consideration. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (3), 915-929.
- Sato Y. (2007). Administrative evaluation and public sector reform: an analytic hierarchy process approach. *International Transactions in Operational Research* 14 (5), 445-453.
- Siskos Y., E. Grigoroudis, E. Krassadaki and N. Matsatsinis (2007). A multicriteria accreditation system for information technology skills and qualifications. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (2), 867-885.
- Smith J.C., C. Lim and J.N. Bearden (2007). On the multi-attribute stopping problem with general value functions. *Operations Research Letters* 35 (3), 324-330.
- Steiner S. and T. Radzik (2008). Computing all efficient solutions of the biobjective minimum spanning tree problem. *Computers & Operations Research* 35 (1), 198-211.
- T'kindt V., K. Bouibede-Hocine and C. Esswein (2007). Counting and enumeration complexity with application to multicriteria scheduling. *Annals of Operations Research* 153 (1), 215-234.
- Tavana M. (2007). A threat-response multi-criteria funding model for homeland security grant programs. *International Transactions in Operational Research* 14 (4), 267-290.
- Tavares-Pereira F., J.R. Figueira, V. Mousseau and B. Roy (2007). Multiple criteria districting problems: The public transportation network pricing system of the Paris region. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 69-92.
- Teixeira de Almeida A. (2007). Multicriteria decision model for outsourcing contracts selection based on utility function and ELECTRE method. *Computers & Operations Research* 34 (12), 3569-3574.
- Tervonen T., H. Hakonen and R. Lahdelma (2008). Elevator planning with stochastic multicriteria acceptability analysis. *Omega* 36 (3), 352-362.
- Trainor T.E., G.S. Parnell, B. Kwinn, J. Brence, E. Tollefson and P. Downes (2007). The US Army Uses Decision Analysis in Designing Its US Installation Regions. *Interfaces* 37 (3), 253-264.
- Tsai J.-F., M.-H. Lin and Y.-C. Hu (2008). Finding multiple solutions to general integer linear programs. *European Journal of Operational Research* 184 (2), 802-809.
- Tsetlin I. and R.L. Winkler (2007). Decision Making with Multiattribute Performance Targets: The Impact of Changes in Performance and Target Distributions. *Operations Research* 55 (2), 226-233.
- Tsoukiàs A. (2007). On the concept of decision aiding process: an operational perspective. *Annals of Operations Research* 154 (1), 3-27.
- Vergidis K., A. Tiwari, B. Majeed and R. Roy (2007). Optimisation of business process designs: An algorithmic approach with multiple objectives. *International Journal of Production Economics* 109 (1-2), 105-121.
- Vitanov V., B. Tjahjono and I. Marghalany (2007). A decision support tool to facilitate the design of cellular manufacturing layouts. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 52 (4), 380-403.
- Wang J.-J. and D.-L. Yang (2007). Using a hybrid multi-criteria decision aid method for information systems outsourcing. *Computers & Operations Research* 34 (12), 3691-3700.
- Wang W. and Y. Zhang (2007). On fuzzy cluster validity indices. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 158 (19), 2095-2117.
- Wang X. and E. Triantaphyllou (2008). Ranking irregularities when evaluating alternatives by using some ELECTRE methods. *Omega* 36 (3), 45-63.
- Wang Y.-M. and T. M.S. Elhag (2007). A fuzzy group decision making approach for bridge risk assessment. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 53 (1), 137-148.
- Wang Y.-M. and Z.-P. Fan (2007). Fuzzy preference relations: Aggregation and weight determination. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 53 (1), 163-172.

- Weibull J.W., L.-G. Mattsson and M. Voorneveld (2007). Better May be Worse: Some Monotonicity Results and Paradoxes in Discrete Choice Under Uncertainty. *Theory and Decision* 63 (2), 121-151.
- Wu Z. and Y. Chen (2007). The maximizing deviation method for group multiple attribute decision making under linguistic environment. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 158 (14), 1608-1617.
- Youghbaré J.W. and J. Teghem (2007). Relationships between Pareto optimality in multi-objective 0-1 linear programming and DEA efficiency. *European Journal of Operational Research* 183 (2), 608-617.
- Zhao H. (2007). A multi-objective genetic programming approach to developing Pareto optimal decision trees. *Decision Support Systems* 43 (3), 809-826.
- Zhou P. and L. Fan (2007). A note on multi-criteria ABC inventory classification using weighted linear optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research* 182 (3), 1488-1491.

Other Works

(Communicated by the authors)

Collections du LAMSADE

(Université Paris-Dauphine)

Available at: www.lamsade.dauphine.fr/cahdoc.html

Preprints du SMG

(Université Libre de BRuxelles)

Available at: www.ulb.ac.be/polytech/smg/

Research Reports of INESC Coimbra

Available at: www.inescc.fe.uc.pt/ingles/pubinter.php

Working Papers of CEG-IST Lisbon

Available at:
www.deg.ist.utl.pt/cegist/artigosinternos_en.shtml

Seminars

SÉMINAIRE «MODÉLISATION DES PRÉFÉRENCES ET AIDE MULTICRITÈRE À LA DÉCISION»

Responsables : Bernard ROY,
Daniel VANDERPOOTEN
(le mardi, à 14.00, en salle P 510)

Prochaines réunions : see

www.lamsade.dauphine.fr

Dissertations

LAMBORAY, Claude: "Prudent ranking rules: Theoretical contributions and applications". PhD thesis, done under a "co-tutelle" agreement between the "Université Libre de Bruxelles" and the "Université du Luxembourg", has been successfully defended in Brussels on the 3rd of October 2007. Jury: Philippe Vincke (supervisor), Thierry Marchant, Marc Pirlot, Bertrand Mareschal, Raymond Bisdorff (co-supervisor), Philippe Van Ham, Jean-Luc Marichal.

ABSTRACT: Arrow and Raynaud introduced a set of axioms that a ranking rule should verify. Among these, axiom V' states that the compromise ranking should be a so-called prudent order. Intuitively, a prudent order is a linear order such that the strongest opposition against this solution is minimal. Since the related literature lacks in solid theoretical foundations for this type of aggregation rule, it was our main objective in this thesis to thoroughly study and gain a better understanding of the family of prudent ranking rules. We provide characterizations of several prudent ranking rules in a conjoint axiomatic framework. We also prove that we can construct profiles for which the result of a prudent ranking rule and a non-prudent ranking rule can be contradictory. Finally we illustrate the use of prudent ranking rules in a group decision context and on the composite indicator problem.

TERVONEN, Tommi. "New directions in Stochastic Multicriteria Acceptability Analysis". PhD thesis, done under a "co-tutelle" agreement between the "University of Coimbra" and the "University of Turku", will be defended in Turku on the 1st of December 2007. Jury: Risto Lahdelma (supervisor), José Rui Figueira (supervisor), Pekka Salminen, Anika Kangas, Jyrki Kangas, João Paulo Costa, Salvatore Greco.

ABSTRACT: Decisions taken in modern organizations are often multi-dimensional, involving multiple decision makers and several criteria measured on different scales. Multiple Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) methods are designed to analyze and to give recommendations in this kind of situations. Among the numerous MCDM methods, two large families of methods are the multi-attribute utility theory based methods and the outranking methods. Traditionally both method families require exact values for technical parameters and criteria measurements, as well as for preferences expressed as weights. Often it is hard, if not impossible, to obtain exact values. Stochastic Multicriteria Acceptability Analysis (SMAA) is a family of methods designed to help in this type of situations where exact values are not available. Different variants of SMAA allow handling all types of MCDM problems. They support defining the model through uncertain, imprecise, or completely missing values. The methods are based on simulation that is applied to obtain descriptive indices characterizing the problem. In this thesis we present new advances in the SMAA methodology. We present and analyze algorithms for the SMAA-2 method and its extension to handle ordinal preferences. We then present an application of SMAA-2 to an area where MCDM models have not been applied before: planning elevator groups for high-rise buildings. Following this, we introduce two new methods to the family: SMAA-TRI that extends ELECTRE TRI for sorting problems with uncertain parameter values, and SMAA-III that extends ELECTRE III in a similar way. An efficient software implementing these two methods has been developed in conjunction with this work, and is briefly presented in this thesis. The thesis is closed with a comprehensive survey of SMAA methodology including a definition of a unified framework.

SALAMANCA, Juan. "KBM2L List for Knowledge Synthesis on Decision" PhD defended in November 2006 at the Technical University of Madrid. Supervised by Concha Lozoya.

ABSTRACT: The implementation, evaluation and exploitation of Decision Support Systems by means of Bayesian Networks and Influence Diagrams, among other reasoning models, imply the use of tables with diversified information. Among them we focus on the conditional probability tables that represent the probabilistic relationships among variables and the tables of the optimal decisions resulting from the model evaluation. The tables, that can be very complex, include structured knowledge from the application domains over a set of variables of the probabilistic graphical model. Under the name of *KBM2L* we introduce a technique to build the knowledge base of the decision support system. We try to exploit the *KBM2L list* as a useful tool for the knowledge representation of the system that includes the model graph, the utility and probability models and the evaluation output. The graphical representation is qualitative and intuitive and then the users can easily access the knowledge if they are experts on the problem. On the other hand, the quantitative models of probability and utility and the evaluation output do not show easily the knowledge because it is coded numerically, in the case of these models, and due to the huge size of the optimal decision tables, in the case of the evaluation output. Both aspects do not allow us to recognize the main variables and relationships that describe the knowledge and explain the results. While the tables can be regarded as static objects or entities, *KBM2L* lists are dynamic knowledge representations. A specialist configuration determines the ability of knowledge explanation, the efficiency to solve queries to the decision support system from many different points of view and the memory complexity required to manage the knowledge base. The structure of the list allows us to reveal the granularity of knowledge from tables while the configurations show us the role of the model variables in the inferred evaluation. The granularity provides procedures to structure and understand better the knowledge that the system hosts in its tables. The role of the variables in the different contexts and in the whole model gives us a mechanism to generate explanations of knowledge and of the system proposals and also the sensitivity analysis of the model itself. After the introduction we show the foundations of the *KBM2L* list for knowledge representation and describe the problems

of the optimal representation search and several proposals of solution. We face a combinatorial optimization problem that is dealt with algorithms and methods adapted to our objective in the framework of metaheuristics. Next, we show the application of these techniques to optimal decision tables and conditional probability tables of the influence diagram. Finally, we propose to perform a model sensitivity analysis by means of the natural extension of the usual *KBM2L* list with the meaningful parameters.

Tavares-Pereira, Fernando "Multiple Criteria Territory Partition Problems: Models, Algorithms, and Applications". PhD thesis, done under a "cotutelle" agreement between the "University of Coimbra" and the "University of Paris-Dauphine", has been successfully defended in Coimbra in July 2007. Jury: Bernard Roy (supervisor), José Rui Figueira (supervisor), Vincent Mousseau (supervisor), Marc Sevaux, Maria João Alves, Manuel Matos, Carlos Fortuna.

ABSTRACT: Currently, districting problems have a bigger attention from the scientific community, as the decision maker's. A careful districting map can represent an improvement of efficiency of an activity, a bigger work load balance or a lesser distance covered, depending on the problem context. In this work we analyzed the different districting problems that have been studied until now, in view of classifying them, according to its very nature and in the used methodology to solve them. From this analysis we tried to fill some gaps, enriching the set of modelling theoretical tools, establishing a taxonomy of the criteria and designing a platform of comparison between different districts maps, through the definition of measures of similarity that translate the concepts which we associated the terms compatibility, inclusion, and distance. Each one of these concepts was tested through the implementation of a compatible measure with what it is intended to evaluate. The problem of the enumeration of all the efficient solutions is known as being NP-hard, when it is considered more than one criterion. This fact implies the abandonment of exact methods to solve a large-size instances. Our reply to this evidence resulted in the development of a new method to approach the Pareto front, based on evolutionary algorithms with local search, capable to deal with any districting problems with two criteria. The developed algorithm uses a new solution

representation and crossover/ mutation operators, composed of generic elements in order to allow an easy adaptation the distinct realities and that it makes possible its integration in an interactive decision support system. Our algorithm solved large-size instances in an acceptable CPU time and generated solutions of good quality. The algorithm was tested with data of a real-world problem, that resulted from a study to reform the pricing system of public transports in metropolitan Paris region.

Announcement:

The "Useful links" section of the group's homepage

(<http://www.inescc.pt/~ewgmcda>)

is being enlarged. Contributions of URL links to societies, research groups and other links of interest are welcome.

A membership directory of the European Working Group on "Multiple Criteria Decision Aiding" is available at the same site. If you would like to be listed in this directory please send us your data (see examples already in the directory).

Contact: José Figueira (figueira@ist.utl.pt) and Luís Dias (ldias@inescc.pt)

**Web site for the EURO
Working Group "Multicriteria
Aid for Decisions"**

A World Wide Web site for the EURO Working Group on "Multicriteria Aid for Decisions" is already available at the URL:

<http://www.inescc.pt/~ewgmcda>

This WWW site is aimed not just at making available the most relevant information contained in the Newsletter sections, but it also intends to become an online discussion forum, where other information and opinion articles could appear in order to create a more lively atmosphere within the group.

**Groupe de Travail Européen "Aide Multicritère à la Décision" /
European Working Group "Multiple Criteria Decision Aiding"**

Board of Coordinators of the EURO Working Group:

Bernard Roy
Roman Slowinski
José Rui Figueira

or by fax to:

+351 21 423 35 68

Newsletter editor:

José Rui Figueira

or by electronic mail to:

figueira@ist.utl.pt

URL:

<http://www.inescc.pt/~ewgmcda>

Permanent Collaborators:

Maria João Alves, Carlos Henggeler Antunes,
Juscelino Almeida-Dias

This newsletter is published twice a year by the "E-WG on MCDA", in November/December and April/May, with financial support of the Association of European Operational Research Societies and the logistics support of INESC-Coimbra and CEG-IST, Instituto Superior Técnico, Lisbon.

Reproduction and distribution by B. Roy
LAMSADE, Université Paris-Dauphine, Place du Maréchal
De Lattre de Tassigny, F-75775 Paris Cedex 16.

Contributions should be sent to:

José Rui Figueira
CEG-IST, Instituto Superior Técnico,
Dpt. Engenharia e Gestão, TagusPark
2780-990 Porto Salvo, PORTUGAL
E-mail: figueira@ist.utl.pt

Call for Papers

IEEE International Engineering Management Conference IEMC-Europe 2008
June 28-30, 2008, Estoril, Portugal
MANAGING ENGINEERING, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION FOR GROWTH
<http://iemceur08.tagus.ist.utl.pt/>
(Submission deadline: January 25, 2008)

Invitation:

The IEEE Technology Management Council (formerly known as the Engineering Management Society) and the IEMC-Europe 2008 Conference Committee invite full paper contributions from researchers, educators, managers and students of engineering management on the theme Managing Engineering, Technology and Innovation for Growth. Contributions may be conceptual, theoretical or experimental. They should be the result of research activity, case studies or best practices, must shed light on the theory or practice of engineering, technology or innovation management and consider the strategic objective of economic growth.

Topics include:

- 1- Decision Analysis (1.1- Decision Analysis with Multiple Criteria; 1.2- Decision Analysis Tools for Risk Assessment, Management, and Communication; 1.3- Decision Analysis for Public Decision-Making).
- 2- Technological Change and Management of Innovation (2.1- Innovation and Productivity Growth; 2.2- Technology-based Entrepreneurship; 2.3- Managing Organisational Change; 2.4- Technological Foresight).
- 3- Operations and Supply Chain Management (3.1- Operations and Supply Chain Optimization; 3.2- Environmental Issues and Sustainable Operations; 3.3- Close Loop Supply Chains).
- 4- Cross-functional Emerging Domains (4.1- Actor Networks and Collaborative Models; 3.2- Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management; 3.3- Education in Engineering Management).

Submission of Papers:

Papers, in final form, should be Word documents written in English, have a maximum of five pages and use the format prescribed in [TRANS-JOUR.doc](#). Each paper should mention the name and number of Topic and Sub-Topic within which it is submitted. Papers will be blind reviewed.

There will be a best paper award for each topic and one best student paper.

Important Dates:

Papers submission deadline	25th January 2008
Notification of acceptance	28th April 2008
Early registration deadline	8th May 2008
Normal registration deadline	23rd May 2008
Conference dates	28-30th June 2008