International Handbooks on Information Systems

Raymond Bisdorff
Luis C. Dias
Patrick Meyer
Vincent Mousseau
Marc Pirlot *Editors*

# Evaluation and Decision Models with Multiple Criteria

## Case Studies

Springer

# International Handbooks on Information Systems

# Titles in the Series

J. Błażewicz, K. Ecker, B. Plateau and D. Trystram (Eds.)
**Handbook on Parallel and Distributed Processing**
ISBN 978-3-540-66441-3

H.H. Adelsberger, Kinshuk, J.M. Pawlowski and D. Sampson (Eds.)
**Handbook on Information Technologies for Education and Training**
ISBN 978-3-540-74154-1, 2nd Edition

C.W. Holsapple (Ed.)
**Handbook on Knowledge Management 1 Knowledge Matters**
ISBN 978-3-540-43527-3
**Handbook on Knowledge Management 2 Knowledge Directions**
ISBN 978-3-540-43848-9

J. Błażewicz, W. Kubiak, I. Morzy and M. Rusinkiewicz (Eds.)
**Handbook on Data Management in Information Systems**
ISBN 978-3-540-43893-9

P. Bernus, P. Nemes and G. Schmidt (Eds.)
**Handbook on Enterprise Architecture**
ISBN 978-3-540-00343-4

S. Staab and R. Studer (Eds.)
**Handbook on Ontologies**
ISBN 978-3-540-70999-2, 2nd Edition

S.O. Kimbrough and D.J. Wu (Eds.)
**Formal Modelling in Electronic Commerce**
ISBN 978-3-540-21431-1

P. Bernus, K. Merlins and G. Schmidt (Eds.)
**Handbook on Architectures of Information Systems**
ISBN 978-3-540-25472-0, 2nd Edition

S. Kirn, O. Herzog, P. Lockemann and O. Spaniol (Eds.)
**Multiagent Engineering**
ISBN 978-3-540-31406-6

J. Błażewicz, K. Ecker, E. Pesch, G. Schmidt and J. Weglarz (Eds.)
**Handbook on Scheduling**
ISBN 978-3-540-28046-0

F. Burstein and C.W. Holsapple (Eds.)
**Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1**
ISBN 978-3-540-48712-8

F. Burstein and C.W. Holsapple (Eds.)
**Handbook on Decision Support Systems 2**
ISBN 978-3-540-48715-9

D. Seese, Ch. Weinhardt and F. Schlottmann (Eds.)
**Handbook on Information Technology in Finance**
ISBN 978-3-540-49486-7

T.C. Edwin Cheng and Tsan-Ming Choi (Eds.)
**Innovative Quick Response Programs in Logistics and Supply Chain Management**
ISBN 978-3-642-04312-3

J. vom Brocke and M. Rosemann (Eds.)
**Handbook on Business Process Management 1**
ISBN 978-3-642-00415-5
**Handbook on Business Process Management 2**
ISBN 978-3-642-01981-4

T.-M. Choi and T.C. Edwin Cheng
**Supply Chain Coordination under Uncertainty**
ISBN 978-3-642-19256-2

C. Schwindt and J. Zimmermann
**Handbook on Project Management and Scheduling Vol.1**
ISBN 978-3-319-05442-1
**Handbook on Project Management and Scheduling Vol.2**
978-3-319-05914-3

R. Bisdorff, L. Dias, P. Meyer, V. Mousseau and M. Pirlot (Eds.)
**Evaluation and Decision Models with Multiple Criteria**
ISBN 978-3-662-46815-9

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/3795

Raymond Bisdorff • Luis C. Dias • Patrick Meyer •
Vincent Mousseau • Marc Pirlot
Editors

# Evaluation and Decision Models with Multiple Criteria

## Case Studies

Springer

*Editors*
Raymond Bisdorff
Faculty of Science, Technology and Communication
Computer Science and Communications Research Unit
University of Luxembourg
Luxembourg

Luis C. Dias
Faculty of Economics
University of Coimbra
Coimbra, Portugal

Patrick Meyer
Télécom Bretagne
Brest Cedex, France

Vincent Mousseau
Ecole Centrale Paris
Châtenay-Malabry Cedex
France

Marc Pirlot
Faculté Polytechnique
Université de Mons
Mons, Belgium

International Handbooks on Information Systems
ISBN 978-3-662-46815-9 ISBN 978-3-662-46816-6 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-46816-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015942695

Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London


Printed on acid-free paper

Springer-Verlag GmbH Berlin Heidelberg is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

# Preface

The elaboration of this Handbook has a long and colorful history. The initial call for contributions goes back to Spring 2008. It was sent to colleagues we knew were engaged in applications of Multiple Criteria Decision Aiding (MCDA); the aim of the initial book project being to emphasize methodological issues and, in particular, appropriate application of existing procedures for modelling and aggregating preferences in view of aiding decision.

The book project emerged as an initiative of the *Decision Deck Project*[1] and was positively supported by COST Action IC0602 *Algorithmic Decision Theory*.[2] An early contact with Springer offered the opportunity to publish a Handbook on MCDA Applications in their "International Series." From the simple editing of a collection of individual papers, as planned in the beginning and aligning a list of MCDA applications, we shifted hence to an ambitious comprehensive Springer Handbook editing project, including furthermore a methodological part.

This move revealed more demanding and time consuming than anticipated. We succeeded in convincing the authors of the Evaluation and Decision Models book series (D. Bouyssou, T. Marchant, P. Perny, M. Pirlot, A. Tsoukiàs, and P. Vincke) to provide the required methodological part. It became also later opportune to add a chapter about XMCDA, a data standard to encode MCDA data in XML, and one about *diviz*, a software workbench to support the analyst in the decision aid process, both developed in the context of the Decision Deck Project.

Finally, we are in the position to present this Handbook to the reader. We would like to address here our apologies to our contributors for the resulting very long editing time, a time span which can explain why some references cited by the earliest contributors in this Handbook might not be the most recent. We acknowledge and take full responsibility for this inconvenience. However, we are convinced that this project became much richer. The book showcases a large variety of MCDA applications, within a coherent framework provided by the methodological chapters

[1] http://www.decision-deck.org.

[2] http://www.cost-ic0602.org/.

and the comments accompanying each case study. The chapters describing XMCDA and *diviz* invite the reader to experiment with MCDA methods, and perhaps develop new variants, using data from these case studies or other cases the reader might face. Every time the lessons and tools presented in this book contribute to the use of MCDA in classrooms or in real-world problems, we will feel our objective has been accomplished.

**Acknowledgements** The editors are thankful to all the chapter contributors for sharing some of their experience in applying MCDA, as well as the authors of the methodological chapters. We would also like to express our gratitude to the many reviewers invited to read and comment on initial drafts of the chapters, thus contributing to improve their organization and clarity.

This project would not have been possible without the support of the Decision Deck Consortium, the COST ACTION IC0602 "Algorithmic Decision Theory" and the GDRI Algodec. Also, Springer, by providing us the ambitious opportunity to edit a Handbook, contributed much to the actual content the reader will discover hereafter.

Luxembourg, Luxembourg — Raymond Bisdorff
Coimbra, Portugal — Luis C. Dias
Brest, France — Patrick Meyer
Paris, France — Vincent Mousseau
Mons, Belgium — Marc Pirlot
July 2014

# Contents

# About the Editors

**Raymond Bisdorff** holds a degree in Business Administration from the University of Liège, Belgium (1975), a Ph.D. in Operations Research (supervisor Prof. B. Roy) from the Université Paris Dauphine (1981) and a Ph.D. in Management Sciences from the University of Liège, Belgium (2002). He is since 2003 full professor of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science at the University of Luxembourg, where he teaches courses on algorithmic decision theory, multiple criteria decision aiding, computational statistics and discrete mathematics. He served the international OR community as president of ORBEL—the Belgian OR society (2008–2010), vice president of EURO—the Association of European OR Societies (1997–2000) and vice president of IFORS—the International Federation of OR Societies (2005–2007). His main research interest is focused on outranking based decision aiding algorithms for selecting, ranking, sorting or rating, and clustering with multiple incommensurable performance criteria. His major articles appeared in EJOR, Computers & OR, 4OR, and JMCDA.

**Luis C. Dias** obtained a degree in Informatics Engineering from the School of Science and Technology at the University of Coimbra in 1992, a Ph.D. in Management by the University of Coimbra in 2001, and a Habilitation degree in Decision Aiding Science in 2013 in the same university. He is currently a tenured assistant professor at FEUC (School of Economics at the University of Coimbra), which he joined in 1992, where he has been teaching courses on decision analysis, operations research, informatics, and related areas. He is also a researcher at the INESC Coimbra R&D Institute, a member of the coordination board of U.Coimbra's Energy for Sustainability Initiative. His research interests include multicriteria decision analysis, performance assessment, group decision and negotiation support, decision support systems, and applications in the areas of energy and environment. His publications include over 50 articles in peer-reviewed international journals.

**Patrick Meyer** obtained a degree in Mathematics from the University of Liège in 1999, a Ph.D. in Mathematics and Engineering Sciences jointly from the University

of Luxembourg and the Faculty of Engineering of Mons in 2007 and, in 2013, a Habilitation degree in Computer Science from the Université Paris Dauphine. He is currently associate professor at Télécom Bretagne, where he teaches courses on operational research, multicriteria decision aiding (MCDA), and algorithmics. He is a researcher in the Lab-STICC CNRS Laboratory (UMR 6285), where he is also co-responsible of the DECIDE research team. His research interests include the modeling of the MCDA process and the development of tools to support it, group decision making and applications of MCDA to real world decision problems, as well as its promotion in other research domains, as, e.g., economics. Moreover, he is the author or co-author of 23 scientific publications.

**Vincent Mousseau** obtained a degree in Computer Science (1989) and a Ph.D. (1993) from Université Paris Dauphine. He received habilitation from Université Paris Dauphine in 2003. He was assistant professor at Université Paris Dauphine (1994–2008), and is now full professor at Ecole Centrale Paris (2008–). He heads the research team on "Decision Aid for Production/Distribution Systems" in the Industrial engineering laboratory (Ecole Centrale Paris). He is president of the Decision Deck Consortium. His research interests include Multiple Criteria Decision Aid, Preference Modelling and Elicitation, Group Decision Making, and Spatial Decision Making. He authored or co-authored more than 50 scientific publications.

**Marc Pirlot** holds a degree in Mathematics from Université Libre de Bruxelles and a Ph.D. in Mathematics from Université de Mons-Hainaut (1981). He has been teaching operations research, statistics, and decision analysis at the Faculty of Engineering, University of Mons, since 1989. He served as president of ORBEL, the Belgian OR society (1996–1998) and as principal editor of its journal *JORBEL* (1992–2002). He is the author or co-author of over 80 scientific publications and 3 books, which mainly focus on multicriteria decision analysis, preference modelling, multi-objective optimization, and metaheuristics. He has also been involved in applied research projects with the industry and the public sector.

# Contributors

**Mohamed Ali Aloulou**
LAMSADE, Université Paris Dauphine, Paris, France

**Gabriela Fernández Barberis**
Department of Quantitative Methods, San Pablo - CEU University, Madrid, Spain

**Sébastien Bigaret**
Institut Mines-Télécom, Télécom Bretagne, UMR CNRS 6285 Lab-STICC, Technopôle Brest-Iroise CS 83818, 29238 Brest Cedex 3, France

**Raymond Bisdorff**
Faculty of Science, Technology and Communication, Computer Science and Communications Research Unit, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

**Denis Bouyssou**
CNRS LAMSADE & Université Paris Dauphine, Paris, France

**Oliver Braun**
Department of Quantitative Methods for Business and Management, Trier University of Applied Sciences, Birkenfeld, Germany

**Pierre Bulens**
Laborelec, Linkebeek, Belgium

**Salem Chakhar**
Portsmouth Business School, University of Portsmouth, Portland Building, Portland Street, Portsmouth, PO1 3AH, UK

**Eric Chojnacki**
IRSN - Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire, Centre d'études de Cadarache, Saint Paul Lez Durance, France

**Alberto Colorni**
Dipartimento Design, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy

**Sébastien Damart**
Département d'administration économique et sociale, Université de Rouen, Rouen, France

**Luis C. Dias**
Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

**Michael Doumpos**
Department of Production Engineering and Management, Financial Engineering Laboratory, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Greece

**Léon Duvivier**
Business Development, Laborelec, Linkebeek, Belgium

**María Carmen Escribano**
Department of Quantitative Methods, San Pablo - CEU University, Madrid, Spain

**José Rui Figueira**
CEG-IST Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, A. Rovisco Pais 1, 1049-001 Lisbon, Portugal

**Coralie Goffin**
Sustainable Process Technologies, Laborelec, Linkebeek, Belgium

**Sylvie Guerrand**
SNCF, Saint-Etienne-du-Rouvray, France

**Serge Haddad**
Laboratoire Spécification et Vérification, École Normale Supérieure de Cachan, Cachan, France

**Pierre Louis Kunsch**
CoDE Department, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium

**Alessandro Luè**
Poliedra, Milano, Italy
Dipartimento Design, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy

**Thierry Marchant**
Department of Data analysis, Ghent University, Gent, Belgium

**Catherine Mercat-Rommens**
IRSN - Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire, Centre d'études de Cadarache, Saint Paul Lez Durance, France

**Stéphane Aimé Metchebon Takougang**
Université de Mons, Faculté Polytechnique, Mons, Belgium
Institut Supérieur d'Informatique et de Gestion, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

**Patrick Meyer**
Institut Mines-Télécom, Télécom Bretagne, UMR CNRS 6285 Lab-STICC, Technopôle Brest-Iroise CS 83818, 29238 Brest Cedex 3, France

**Lynda Mokdad**
LACL, Faculté des Sciences et Technologies, Université Paris XII, Créteil, France

**Florent Montignac**
CEA, LITEN, Grenoble, France

**Vincent Mousseau**
Laboratoire Géne Industriel, Ecole Centrale Paris, Grande Voie des Vignes, 92295 Châtenay-Malabry Cedex, France

**Pascal Oberti**
Université di Corsica Pasquale Paoli - CNRS UMR 6240 LISA, Corte, France

**Meltem Öztürk**
Lamsade - Université Paris IX Dauphine, Paris, France

**Christophe Paoli**
Department of Computer Engineering, Galatasaray University, Istanbul, Turkey

**Marc Pirlot**
Université de Mons, Faculté Polytechnique, Mons, Belgium

**Herimandimbiniaina Ralijaona**
AGETIPA, Bâtiment Le Colisée, Ampasanimalo, Antananarivo, Madagascar

**Benjamin Rousval**
LAMSADE, Université Paris Dauphine, Paris, France

**Carlos A. Silva**
IN+ Center for Innovation Technology and Policy Research (IST), MIT Portugal Program, Sustainable Energy Systems, Technical University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

**Blaise Some**
Université de Ouagadoudou, Laboratoire LANIBIO, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

**Marco Spohn**
Department of Quantitative Methods for Business and Management, Trier University of Applied Sciences, Birkenfeld, Germany

**Jacques Teghem**
Université de Mons, Faculté Polytechnique, Mons, Belgium

**Tommi Tervonen**
Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, Netherlands

**Miguel Trigueiros Covas**
Portugal Telecom, MIT Portugal Program, Sustainable Energy Systems, Lisboa, Portugal

**Alexis Tsoukiàs**
CNRS - LAMSADE, UMR 7243 Université Paris Dauphine, Paris, France

**Berthold Ulungu**
Université de Mons, Faculté Polytechnique, Mons, Belgium
Institut Supérieur des Techniques Appliquées de Kinshasa, Kinshasa, DR Congo

**Mathieu Vander Straeten**
CoDE Department, Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium

**Philippe Vincke**
Université libre de Bruxelles, Ecole Polytechnique, Campus de la Plaine, CP210/01, boulevard du Triomphe, 1050 Bruxelles, Belgium

**Samuel Yonkeu**
Institut Supérieur d'Informatique et de Gestion, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

**Samir Youcef**
LAMSADE Université Paris Dauphine, Paris, France

**Constantin Zopounidis**
Department of Production Engineering and Management, Financial Engineering Laboratory, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Greece

# Chapter 1
# Introduction

**Raymond Bisdorff, Luis C. Dias, Patrick Meyer, Vincent Mousseau, and Marc Pirlot**

**Abstract** This introductory chapter explains, first, the strategy guiding the editing of the MCDA application case studies. The second section illustrates the overall organization of the handbook into three parts: a concise methodological introduction to the concepts of decision aiding, preference modelling and recommendation building; the main part with 15 case studies of MCDA applications; and a short third part devoted to support tools for the MCDA process. The chapter ends with listing some highlights of the book content.

## 1.1 The Editing Strategy

Our main goal with this book was to illustrate the rich diversity of aspects which is typical of multiple criteria decision problems. Decision aiding is a *process*. As such, it involves a series of actors (decision maker(s), stakeholders, experts, analysts, etc.); interaction and feedback play a crucial role. The activity of modelling the problem

R. Bisdorff (✉)
Faculty of Science, Technology and Communication, Computer Science and Communications Research Unit, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg
e-mail: raymond.bisdorff@uni.lu

L.C. Dias
Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal
e-mail: lmcdias@fe.uc.pt

P. Meyer
Institut Mines-Télécom, Télécom Bretagne, UMR CNRS 6285 Lab-STICC, Technopôle Brest-Iroise CS 83818, 29238 Brest Cedex 3, France
e-mail: patrick.meyer@telecom-bretagne.eu

V. Mousseau
Laboratoire Génie Industriel, Ecole Centrale Paris, Grande Voie des Vignes, 92295 Châtenay-Malabry Cedex, France
e-mail: vincent.mousseau@ecp.fr

M. Pirlot
Université de Mons, Faculté Polytechnique, Mons, Belgium
e-mail: marc.pirlot@umons.ac.be



R. Bisdorff et al. (eds.), *Evaluation and Decision Models with Multiple Criteria*, International Handbooks on Information Systems,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-46816-6_1

and the decision maker's preferences is more important and time consuming than the more technical part consisting in choosing and applying a method for aggregating the decision maker's (DM's) preferences. Formulating a recommendation to the DM is also a delicate part of the process.

In line with our desire to illustrate the complexity of the decision aiding process, we addressed the interested contributors the following guidelines for writing their application.

- The context of the case should be described: what is the decision problem, the decision maker(s), the stakeholders, the analysts, the alternatives, the criteria, the performances of the alternatives, ...?
- What have been the difficulties in the process of identifying or constructing these elements?
- Which method(s) has (have) been used ? How have the parameters of these methods been set?
- How did the decision aiding process evolve (main steps, feedback loops, branching, abandoned branches, ...)?
- Recommendation, decision.
- Comments on the case and on the decision aiding process.

The proposed framework underlies a way of conceiving a decision aiding process that is quite general. A wide range of applications fit in the model that is described in a formal way in the methodological part of this book (see Chap. 2). The study of decision aiding processes is a research domain in itself, in which there is still much work to be done. In particular, a detailed and operational description of this sort of process is required in view of building computerized decision aiding systems that could help analysts to monitor such processes.

The 15 applications presented in Part II of this book describe examples of decision aiding processes. In view of emphasizing their salient features, we decided to add an individual editors' commentary to each application chapter. A common line of critical reviewing guidelines was therefore developed. The eventually chosen template for structuring our comments identifies five major aspects: application context, problem structuring, performance evaluation modelling, decision aiding process, tangibility and practical impact of results.

1. Context of the decision aid application
   - How does this application fit into the "big picture" of the book, and MCDA in general?
   - What was the objective of the decision aid intervention?
   - (Possibly:) Other objectives: e.g., had authors the objective of trying a novel method?
   - Who was the decision aid addressee?
   - What actors participated directly or indirectly?
   - Who acted as analyst and what was his role?
   - What phases can be identified and what was the time span of the decision aid process?

2. Problem structuring
   - (Possibly:) Use of problem structuring methods.
   - Type of result sought (problem statement[1]).
   - How was the set of alternatives defined ? Global characteristics of this set.
   - How was the set of evaluation criteria defined? Global characteristics of this set.
   - (Possibly:) Modelling of uncertainties.
3. Performance evaluation
   - MCDA model choice for aggregating criteria.
   - Elicitation process.
   - (Possibly:) How divergence among actors was addressed (aggregation, discussion, ...)
4. Process-related aspects
   - Client-analyst interaction.
   - Reiterations.
   - Interactions between phases.
   - Sensitivity/robustness analysis.
5. Results
   - Tangible results: artifacts
   - Intangible results: knowledge, relationship among actors
   - Impact relatively to the objective of the decision process
6. Other remarks
   - Methodology aspects (questionable aspects, success factors, what else might have been tried).
   - Relevance of this application.

We hope that the case studies of MCDA applications may thus contribute to validate the general framework and permit to deepen the analysis of decision aiding processes, as a step towards the implementation of decision aiding monitoring systems.

## 1.2 Organization of the Handbook

The Handbook is divided into three, unequal parts. A first methodological part, consisting of three chapters, gives insight into respectively the concepts and issues of a decision aid approach, the problem of constructing an aggregated perspective with multiple preference dimensions, and the building of convincing decision aid recommendations. The second and by far the main part consists of 15 chapters devoted to present and discuss selected MCDA applications that will be introduced in detail hereafter in Sect. 1.2.2. Each application is followed by a short commentary. The last part, which describes tools to support the MCDA process, first presents the

[1] In some of the contributed chapters of this book, the authors use the french word *problématique* when they refer to the problem statement.

XMCDA data standard, before detailing the *diviz* software platform to design and execute MCDA methods.

### *1.2.1 Theoretical Background*

Besides aiming to contribute to the analysis of decision aiding processes, this book also aims at shedding some light on multicriteria decision methods, i.e. methods that aggregate the decision maker's preferences on the different criteria in an overall preference. Such methods make the necessary trade-offs between conflicting objectives, and yield a model of the decision maker's overall preference. A bunch of methods have been proposed since the 1950s. Some of them are inserted in elaborated methodologies, and all of them use more or less complex mathematical procedures (for panoramas of such procedures, see e.g. Vincke, 1992; Roy and Bouyssou, 1993; Pomerol and Barba-Romero, 2000; Belton and Stewart, 2002; Ishizaka and Nemery, 2013).

The choice of an aggregation method is an issue in MCDA. Several papers in the literature deal with the selection of the most appropriate MCDA method depending on the decision problem, the type of data available, etc. (see e.g. Ozernoy, 1987, 1992; Hobbs et al., 1992; Guitouni and Martel, 1998; Polatidis et al., 2006). Why such a diversity of methods? Is there a best one? Some authors—and most proponents of such methods—support this idea. Also, in applications, many analysts systematically use a particular method or a family of variants of a method. Our *credo* is different. We believe that some methods are better suited for some contexts and other for some other contexts. For instance, certain methods can naturally deal with qualitative evaluations. The logic underlying the aggregation of the criteria values in some methods may be more easily understandable by some decision makers than by some others. Or these may be more inclined to answer certain types of questions than other types. The logical analysis of the aggregation methods allows to produce a precise view of the strengths and weaknesses of the various models. It is possible, for instance, to determine which kind of preferences can be represented by a given method (through an axiomatic analysis of the methods or the preferences). Alternatively, the properties of the methods can be established, which allows to compare them and select one in a more informed way. Hence, in our view, the analyst should master several methods and be able to choose the most appropriate one in a given context.

Chapter 3 in Part I, entitled *Modelling preferences*, browses a picture of the main logic at work in usual aggregation procedures. More precisely, it characterizes the families of preferences that can be represented by some general types of models. This chapter does not provide a description of all aggregation methods used throughout the book. Instead, it analyzes general frameworks, into which most particular methods do belong. These frameworks allow to better understand the logic of aggregation implemented in the methods. Analysts can benefit from such a knowledge for improving the way they question decision makers about their preferences. Or, even better, to design methods that maximize the information yielded by

each answer to well-chosen questions (*active learning*). In the applications we can see how the general aggregation principles were used and it may also be interesting to question the choice made by the analyst in charge. We observe that in some applications, several aggregation methods were used for the same decision problem, leading to decision recommendations that are likely to be more convincing.

A third methodological issue is the subject of the last chapter (Chap. 4) in Part I. This chapter is entitled *Building recommendations*. It deals with the last part of the decision aiding process. It uses the model of the decision maker's preferences that was built during the aggregation phase to derive a recommendation addressed to the decision maker. Such a conclusion is by no means a decision, the latter pertaining to the exclusive responsibility of the decision maker. The recommendation gathers the conclusions that appear sufficiently well-established to be valid independently on the remaining uncertainties about the decision maker's preferences (*robust conclusions*). Less robust conclusions can be part of the recommendation but these should be accompanied with appropriate comments. The main source of the difficulty in formulating recommendations is that the decision maker's preferences may not be always fully determined and they are not, in general, perfectly reflected in the aggregation model. Chapter 4 reviews the different problem statements contexts (choosing, sorting, ranking) and specifies, in each case, a certain number of ideas that can be used to derive reasonably well-established recommendations.

### *1.2.2 Case Studies of MCDA Applications*

The applications collected in Part II of this book span multiple countries, multiple fields, and multiple types of problems. In geographical terms, most applications occurred in Europe, with Belgium, France, and Greece represented in more than one case. The exceptions are two applications in African countries, coauthored by African and European authors. In terms of type of problem statement, the book presents choice, ranking, and classification problems. Nine out of the 15 applications intend to eventually select the best alternative, although many of them perform a ranking or a classification of the alternatives as a modelling option. One classification method, ELECTRE TRI, is the aggregation approach used more often in this set of applications, but other approaches such as additive value aggregation (Chaps. 14 and 17), AHP (Chap. 18), and PROMETHEE (Chap. 19), among others, are also represented in the book. Table 1.1 provides a summary of the applications chapters, indicating these and other characteristics of each application.

The first chapters have diversified application domains, but share a common goal: to select the most preferred alternative. The chosen modelling options are however diverse. Chapter 5, by R. Bisdorff, addresses a problem of a decision by a jury intending to select a winner in a posters competition. It describes how the process unfolded and further (re-)analyzes the problem using a different approach. Chakhar et al.'s Chap. 6 presents a framework to evaluate webservices that need to be assembled for a particular purpose. Although the ultimate goal is to select one composition of services, it proceeds to classify the possible compositions according

**Table 1.1** Applications in this book

| Application | Field of application | Country | Goal | Problem statement | Method | Client type | Decision maker(s) | Decision support system |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter 5 choosing the best poster in a conference | Jury decisions | Greece | Analysis of a problem | Choice | Condorcet method and RUBIS | Scientific association | Jury members | An existing software |
| Chapter 6 composite web service selection | Internet services | France | Framework | Choice (by sorting) | ELECTRE TRI | Consumer | An individual | A prototype was developed |
| Chapter 7 site selection for a kindergarten | Education | Spain | Analysis of a problem | Choice (by ranking) | SMAA-III | Corporation | Group of decision makers | An existing software |
| Chapter 8 choosing a cooling system for a power plant | Energy/environment | Belgium | Proof of concept (ex-post) | Choice (by ranking) | Weighted sum and ELECTRE II | Competence centre | Group of experts | Not mentioned |
| Chapter 9 localization of wind farm projects | Energy/environment | France | Proof of concept | Choice (by ranking) | ELECTRE III | Public administration | Group of stakeholders | A SDSS was developed |
| Chapter 10 assessment of data centers environmental sustainability | Energy/environment | Portugal | Framework | Sorting | ELECTRE TRI | Corporation | Group of experts | An existing software |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter 11 cost valuation of a nuclear-fuel repository | Energy/environment | Belgium | Analysis of a problem | Choice (determining a value) | fuzzy inference | Public administration | Group of experts | A DSS was developed |
| Chapter 12 Assessing the response to land degradation risk | Energy/environment | Burkina Faso | Framework | Sorting | ELECTRE TRI | (Public administration) | An expert | A SDSS was developed |
| Chapter 13 Post-accident nuclear risk evaluation | Energy/environment | France | Analysis of a problem | Sorting | ELECTRE TRI | Public administration | Group of stakeholders | A SDSS was developed |
| Chapter 14 hazardous material transport | Energy/environment, transportation | Italy | Proof of concept | Choice (by ranking) | Weighted sum | Public administration | Group of experts | SDSS (custom adapted) |
| Chapter 15 rural road maintenance | Transportation | Madagascar | Proof of concept | Sorting | ELECTRE TRI | Public administration | Group of stakeholders | A DSS was developed |
| Chapter 16 evaluation of comfort | Transportation | France | Proof of concept | Sorting | ELECTRE TRI | State-owned company | Group of experts | Not mentioned |

(continued)

**Table 1.1** (continued)

| Application | Field of application | Country | Goal | Problem statement | Method | Client type | Decision maker(s) | Decision support system |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter 17 evaluating hydrogen storage systems for future vehicles | Transportation | European Union (sponsor) | Proof of concept | Choice (by ranking) | MACBETH | (Several corporations) | Group of experts | An existing software |
| Chapter 18 personal financial planning | Finance | Germany (authors) | Framework | Choice | Optimization and AHP | (Generic) | An individual | A DSS was developed |
| Chapter 19 bank rating | Finance | Greece | Analysis of a problem | Rating/scoring | PROMETHEE | Corporation | Group of experts | A DSS was developed |

to quality of service classes. Chapter 7, by T. Tervonen et al., addresses the choice of one location among several candidate sites for a kindergarten, but approaches the problem using a ranking method.

Chapters 8–14 address applications related with the energy/environment field, which is clearly in this book, as it is probably in practice, the most popular application area for MCDA. Problems concerning the environment typically gather multiple actors in the decision process and involve evaluating many criteria that are not easy to convert into a single performance measure. The work "Choosing a Cooling System for a Power Plant in Belgium" by M. Pirlot et al. intended to demonstrate the usefulness of MCDA to an industrial client by examining *a posteriori* a decision it had faced concerning a technology choice. In their Chap. 9, Oberti and Paoli provide an account of a decision process open to the general public that addressed a siting problem. Chapter 10, by M. Covas et al., addresses the assessment of environmental impacts of the data centers that underlie most common Internet and telecommunications services available today, proposing a classification framework.

Chapters 11–14 address a particular concern in applications dealing with the environment/energy field: risk. Kunsch and Vander Straeten's Chap. 11 focuses on costs, namely on the problem of estimating the costs of a project by aggregating the opinions of different experts, the main concern being the risk of budget overrun. In Chap. 12, S. Metchebon et al. make an assessment of risks of land degradation, using a classification method to assign geographical locations to risk classes. Mercat-Rommens et al. also use a method to classify risks, in the event of an accident, for different geographical locations in their Chap. 13. Their work considers not only risks to the environment and human health, but also risks for economic activities. Finally, the Chap. 14, by A. Luè and A. Colorni, considers the choice of routes for transportation of hazardous materials, taking into account the risk of accidents. Chapters 12–14 (and also Chap. 9) have in common the development of Spatial Decision Support Systems (SDSS), based on extending the capabilities of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) to deal with MCDA problems.

A. Luè and A. Colorni's chapter, together with the next three chapters, address transportation-related issues. In Chap. 15, A. Tsoukiàs and H. Ralijaona provide an account of their involvement in a project to classify roads with regards to their maintenance needs. Öztürk et al.'s Chap. 16 also addresses a classification problem, aiming at assigning potential future railways rolling stock to comfort classes. The Chap. 17, by F. Montignac et al., concerns a technology choice problem for future vehicles, which was addressed as a ranking problem.

The two final applications in this book are related with the field of finance (Chap. 11 is also loosely related to this field). Chapter 18, by O. Braun and M. Spohn focuses on the perspective of an individual, offering a portfolio optimization framework for planning personal finances. Chapter 19, by M. Doumpos and C. Zopounidis, concerns the perspective of a central bank who must rate commercial banks. Although rating is usually considered as a sorting problem, in this case a ranking method was used to derive a global performance value for each bank being evaluated.

There are a few aspects shared by many of the applications in these chapters that deserve some reflection. Although the set of contributed chapters cannot be interpreted as an accurate representation of the panorama of all MCDA applications throughout the world, these shared aspects will match what happens in many situations. The main aspect (not depicted in Table 1.1 because it applies to most chapters with very few exceptions) is the importance attributed to problem structuring. By going through these cases the reader will be able to appreciate the effort required to define the set of alternatives to be evaluated and the set of evaluation criteria, besides other discussions concerning the actors involved and the problem statement to be adopted. In many cases, most of the value of the analysis concerns this stage: after the problem structuring stage the following steps can be sometimes relatively easy.

The type of client commissioning the application varies. In some cases it is a publicly or a privately owned company, but in most cases it was some type of public administration entity (a regional administration, an agency, or other). Indeed, this type of "client" is the one most likely to value the added transparency brought by conducting an explicit MCDA analysis. Another concern of public administration (also shared by private organizations) is the need to involve many parties in decision processes. Indeed, most of the applications deal with multi-actor situations, involving a group of decision makers, or a group of experts, or a group of stakeholders potentially affected by a decision, including the general public. As demonstrated in these chapters, MCDA can be an excellent instrument to gather the interested parties and to model their potentially different concerns, in a joint problem-solving activity. Nevertheless, true decision makers did not intervene much in most of the applications. Perhaps due to the nature of the client—often a public administration—the expression of priorities and preferences is delegated to experts and/or to stakeholders, rather than the person or a group of persons who have the authority to decide.

Another peculiar aspect emerging from this set of applications is that in many cases they are described as a proof of concept, a pilot study, or a demonstration project (all labeled as proof of concept in Table 1.1). In these cases, as the authors explain, the MCDA intervention was conducted to prove its value to the client. MCDA was applied on a no-problem (as in the case of an ex-post evaluation) or a small-scale problem, so that it would be approved and legitimated to be applied on a larger scale. Fortunately, in most cases, this demonstration was deemed successful.

Under the heading "Goal" in Table 1.1, the reader will see that some case studies are labeled "Framework". By this expression, we mean that the decision models involved are designed for a generic decision problem in a specific domain of application. In general, the proposed approach is illustrated on real data and expert evaluations, but the decision aiding process may be incomplete (e.g. there may be no definite decision maker). In contrast, the label "Analysis of a problem" refers to an actual decision aiding process for a specific instance of a decision problem and with a well-identified decision maker.

In most applications, there were tangible outcomes besides the answer to the initial problem statement. It is generally accepted that a factor that contributes to

the popularity of MCDA is the availability of software. Indeed, the use of some software is reported in most of the applications in this book. It is noteworthy however that in some cases the software itself was developed on purpose for the particular application, thus remaining as a tangible tool on the hands of the client for the reiterated use of the models and knowledge developed during the intervention. In some cases, as already mentioned, the development consisted in building a SDSS, using a GIS as a starting basis.

Finally, maybe the biggest testimony of success in many of these applications, is the fact that the chapter is coauthored not only by MCDA analysts but also by someone from the client organization. This is not only an indication of approval, but also a sign that MCDA know-how was passed onto the client organization, which might now be able to conduct further analyzes without MCDA expertise from outside.

### *1.2.3 MCDA Process Support Tools*

The third and final part of the book consists of two chapters. First, Chap. 20, which describes XMCDA, a proposal for an MCDA data standard, and second, Chap. 21, which presents the *diviz* environment for multi-criteria decision analysis. Why these chapters? It was stated in the outset that the project of this book grew up in the framework of the Decision Deck Consortium, a gathering of researchers which aims at making publicly available software tools that allow to deal with multi-criteria decision problems. The collaborative development effort of the consortium gave birth to various initiatives, among which a quite impressive set of web-services, which allow to access to elementary MCDA resources (aggregation algorithms, data treatment and visualization components, ...) in a unified manner. These calculation elements all speak a common language, namely XMCDA. This XML-based encoding standard for MCDA data and concepts, which is presented thoroughly in Chap. 20, allows to make these web-services interoperable. Consequently very naturally, the need for a tool to combine these calculation elements in complex workflows appeared. Chapter 21 presents the *diviz* workbench, which facilitates the construction of such calculation sequences via a very intuitive graphical user interface. This chapter also illustrates, on a didactic example, how *diviz* can be used to support a decision aiding process. The idea is to suggest that the reader could play the role of the analyst in all the case studies for which the evaluation and preferential data are available. In view of allowing for this, we asked the authors to make the data used in their application available to the reader (whenever this was possible). The reader can consequently reproduce the analyzes performed in the cases, test other hypotheses, apply other methods they may wish to try, or follow other methodologies. This also means that the cases, together with the *diviz* software, can be used for teaching purposes, e.g. for training students to act as analysts. What is particular to decision aiding, indeed, is the fact that numerical data is not enough to describe a problem. The context and sufficient information on the

goals and preferences of the decision maker must be specified before a meaningful sequence of treatments can be proposed in view of "solving the problem". In most of the cases described in this book, a teacher can find enough material to design an exercise for training students to play the analyst's role in a realistic simulated decision aiding process. As such, *diviz* provides an adequate environment to support the students in their analyzes of the case and their experimentation with several methods.

## 1.3 Highlights

To summarize, this book may be useful:

- for studying the decision aiding process: the book contains the description of 15 cases of decision aiding processes in various domains of application and with contrasted characteristics. These case studies are commented within a decision aiding process framework that is described in the three initial methodological chapters. This corpus of case studies provides a basis for deepening a scientific analysis of the decision aiding process.
- for experimenting with a variety of MCDA methods in the realistic decision aiding situations described in the case studies. The *diviz* software platform provides a common framework for such an experimentation.
- for training students for the role of analyst by involving them in simulated decision aiding processes inspired from a case study. Again, the *diviz* platform is a suitable tool for supporting this training.
- for providing decision analysts with examples of decision aiding processes in which they could find inspiration for their own practice.

We trust the reader will find in the descriptions of the applications and the adjoined commentaries motivation and lessons useful to apply MCDA in all types of organizations, possibly using the tools described in the third part of this book. We are sure new lessons will emerge. And, who knows, the reader may share such lessons in a future book like this one.

## References

Belton, V., & Stewart, T. (2002). *Muliple criteria decision analysis: An integrated approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Guitouni, A., & Martel, J. -M. (1998). Tentative guidelines to help choosing an appropriate {MCDA} method. *European Journal of Operational Research, 109*(2), 501–521.

Hobbs, B., Chankong, V., Hamadeh, W., & Stakhiv, E. (1992). Does choice of multicriteria method matter? An experiment in water resources planning. *Water Resources Research, 28*(7), 1767–1779.

Ishizaka, A., & Nemery, P. (2013). *Multi-criteria decision analysis: methods and software*. New York: Wiley.

Ozernoy, V. (1987). A framework for choosing the most appropriate discrete alternative multiple criteria decision-making method in decision support systems and expert systems. In Y. Sawaragi, K. Inoue, & H. Nakayama (Eds.), *Toward Interactive and Intelligent Decision Support Systems: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Multiple Criteria Decision Making*. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems (Vol. 2, pp. 56–64), Kyoto, Japan. New York: Springer.

Ozernoy, V. (1992). Choosing the best multiple criteria decision-making method. *INFOR, 30*(2), 159–171.

Polatidis, H., Haralambopoulos, D. A., Munda, G., & Vreeker, R. (2006). Selecting an appropriate multi-criteria decision analysis technique for renewable energy planning. *Energy Sources, Part B: Economics, Planning, and Policy, 1*(2), 181–193.

Pomerol, J., & Barba-Romero, S. (2000). *Multicriterion decision making in management*. Series in Operation Research. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Roy, B., & Bouyssou, D. (1993). *Aide Multicritère à la Décision: Méthodes et Cas*. Paris: Economica.

Vincke, P. (1992). *Multicriteria decision-aid*. New York: Wiley.