Global Multicriteria Decision Support by Web-HIPRE

A Java-applet for Value Tree and AHP Analysis

Raimo P. Hämäläinen Jyri Mustajoki

Systems Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology http://www.hut.fi/Units/Systems.Analysis



The first interactive MCDM software in the Internet

- Web-HIPRE = HIerarchical PREference analysis in the World Wide Web
- Successor of the the decision support software HIPRE 3+
- Unlimited global access
- Opens up a new dimension in decision support





Helsinki University of Technology

Global Platform for Individual and Group Decision Support

- Computer-Supported Collaborative Decision Making
- Physical distance is no longer a barrier
- Internet provides an easy way to communicate and share information
- Individual models can be processed synchronously or asynchronously
- Group results easy to combine



Web-HIPRE as a Java-applet

- Platform independent works in different computer environments
- No installations on local computers just a Java-enabled browser needed (e.g. Netscape 3.01, Internet Explorer 3.0)
- Updated version always available



Starting Window



6



Web-HIPRE Main Window



- Completely mouse-driven structuring of the value tree
- This example: Selecting a cellular phone

Systems Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology

WWW-links in Web-HIPRE

- Each element can be linked to a web-page
- Links can contain additional WWW-links, graphics, sound or video
- This can increase the quality of decision support dramatically
- On-line help also implemented by WWW-links



Web-HIPRE links can refer to any web-pages



Selecting a Cellular Phone

In this Web-HIPRE example we are comparing cellular phones. The decision maker (DM) is Ms. <u>Minna</u> <u>Westerlund</u> from the <u>Systems Analysis Laboratory</u>. She has already shortlisted three possibe phones, which we have included in the evaluation. These three alternatives are: <u>Ericsson GF768</u>, <u>Motorola 8700</u> and <u>Nokia 6110</u>. If you want to compare some other phones or use some other criteria, you can modify the model to match your personal views. Technical information about other phones can be found for example at the following web-sites: <u>Matkaviesti 2/1998 (in Finnish)</u> and <u>Telephone Comparison</u>. This model reflects Minnas personal opinions. You can do your own evaluation by clearing her weightings and replacing them with your own views. The technical information used here is obtained from the s mentioned above.



Systems

Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology





g

Web-HIPRE links can refer to any web-pages

Criteria 2

STYLE

WEIGHT

Web-HIPRE - cellular.jmd

Goal

SELECT

PHONE

4

*** Current Element: Nokia 6110 *** 🐨 🥘 Unsigned Java Applet Window

CELLULAR

File Model Priorities Analysis WWW-Links Window Help

Criteria 1

DESIGN

PRICE

SIZE

PERFORMANC



Systems Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology

On-line help

Web-HIPRE - cellular.imd

Goal

SELECT

PHONE

CELLULAR

File Model Priorities Analysis WWW-Links Window Help

Criteria 1

DESIGN

PRICE

SIZE

🐨 🥘 🛛 Unsigned Java Applet Window

PERFORMANC

User's Guide.

STYLE

TALK TIME

STANDBY

WEIGHT

DIMENSIONS



11

Systems **Analysis Laboratory** Helsinki University of Technology

Weighting Methods supported by Web-HIPRE

- Direct weighting, SMART, SWING
- SMARTER rank based
- Pairwise Comparisons (AHP)
- Value Functions
- Any combinations of these



Direct Weighting	
Direct SMART SWING SMARTER Nokia 6110 0.785 Motorola 8700 0.105 Ericsson GF768 0.935 Import Pairwise Import Valuefn Normalize Now	Note: Weights in this example are her
Unsigned Java Applet Window	personal opinions

S ystems Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology

SWING, SMART and SMARTER Methods

Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology

Direct SMART SWING 1. Assign 100 points to th 2. Give points (<100) to re to the most important a	SMARTER Pairwis e most important at eflect the importanc ttribute	se Valuem tribute (Rank = 1) se of the attribute relative		• SMARTER uses rankings only
LENGTH WIDTH HEIGHT	Hank Points 1 100 2 80 3 80	Weight 0.385 0.308 0.308 0.308	Priorities - I Direct SM/ 1. Assign 2. Give po to the	PERFORMANCE _ [ART SWING SMARTER Pairwise Valuem] 10 points to the least important attribute (Rank = 2) oints (>10) to reflect the importance of the attribute relative least important attribute
Clear All	Orig	inal Order Ord	ier by Rank	Show Ranks Rank Points Weight ANDBY 1 15 0.600 JLK TIME 2 10 0.400
🖅 🥶 Unsigned Java Applet W	OK	Cancel		Clear All Original Order Order by Rank OK Cancel

Pairwise Comparison - AHP

		9	now man	2		, 9		
SIZE	•	•				Þ	PERFORMANCE	-
Next Compa	arison		slightly p	referred		-	Clear All	
	A B	C	D				CM: 0.096	
A SIZE	1.0 0.5	3.0	1.0		SIZE	0.227]
B PERFORMA	2.0 1.0	5.0	3.0		PERFORMAN	0.486		
C PRICE	0.33 0.2	1.0	0.33		PRICE	0.080		
D DESIGN	1.0 0.33	3.0	1.0		DESIGN	0.207		כ
		1		1	Caract	1		

vstems

Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology

- Continuous scale 1-9
- Numerical, verbal or graphical approach

Value Function



S ystems Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology

Combined Use of Weighting Methods



- Combinations of methods allowed
- Each element can store all methods
- Selections shown by indicators



Composite Priorities



Systems

Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology

- Bar graphs or numerical values
- Bars divided by the contribution of each criterion

Sensitivitity Analysis



Systems

Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology

• Total weights of alternatives shown with respect to the weight of the criterion

Group Decision Support

Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology



Defining Group Members

virect	SMART SWING	SMARTER Pairwise	Valuefn Group	
	Username: caro			
	Filename: cellu	lar	Refresh	
	Nokia 6110 Motorola 8700 Ericsson GF768	0.728		
		C Normaliz	e weights in analysis Cancel	

stems

Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology

- Individual value trees can be different
- Composite priorities of each group member
- obtained from their individual models
- shown in the definition phase

Aggregate Group Priorities



Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology

• Contribution of each group member indicated by segments

Sensitivity analysis



Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology

• Changes in the relative importance of decision makers can be analyzed

Web-HIPRE Architecture



stems

Analysis Laboratory

Helsinki University of Technology

- Browser loads Web-HIPRE -applet, which operates in the memory of the local computer
- Nothing remains on the local computer after closing Web-HIPRE
- Models are saved on the server computer and operated via file server
- Web-HIPRE can also be installed locally

Model Handling in Web-HIPRE

- Models can be saved on the Web-HIPRE server
 - to a public directory
 - to your own password protected directory
- On the Internet use models cannot be saved on user's local machine due to Java security reasons
 - A local server can be installed to save models locally
- HIPRE 3+ models can be imported



Local use of Web-HIPRE

- Web-HIPRE can be installed on a local computer
 - The file server is on the user's computer
 - \rightarrow Models are saved locally
- Locally installed Web-HIPRE can also be used via the Internet or via Local Area Network (LAN)
 - Organizations can install Web-HIPRE on their Intranet



Real Life Use of Web-HIPRE

- Value prioritizations related to the regulation policy for Lake Päijänne
- Decision analysis interviews of stakeholders
- Open for public prioritizations



Analysis Laboratory Helsinki University of Technology





Web-Page for the Lake Päijänne Case



http://leino.hut.fi



The WWW-address of Web-HIPRE:

http://www.hipre.hut.fi

Model for cellular phone example: cellular.jmd

Site will be open free of charge for academic use. Please, let us know your experiences: raimo@hut.fi, jyri.mustajoki@hut.fi



Our DSS tools on the Internet

• Web-HIPRE

http://www.hipre.hut.fi

• Joint Gains

http://www.jointgains.hut.fi

• Opinions-OnLine

http://www.opinion.hut.fi or http://www.opinions-online.com



iterated i cici chees

Buede, D. (1998), "Decision Analysis Software Survey: Aiding Insight IV", OR/MS Today, August 1998, pp. 56-63.

DeSanctis, G. and R. B. Gallupe, 'A Foundation for the Study of Group Decision Support Systems', Management Science, Vol. 33, No. 5, 1987, pp. 589-609.

French, S., L. Simpson, E. Atherton, V. Belton, R. Dawes, W. Edwards, R. P. Hämäläinen, O. Larichev, F. Lootsma, A. Pearman and C. Vlek (1998), "Problem Formulation for Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis: Report of a Workshop", Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis, 7, pp. 242-262.

Hämäläinen, R. P. (1988), "Computer Assisted Energy Policy Analysis in the Parliament of Finland," Interfaces, 18(4), 12-23.

- Hämäläinen, R. P. and H. Lauri (1993), HIPRE 3+ Decision Support Software vs. 3.13, User's Guide, Systems Analysis Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology.
- Hämäläinen, R. P. and E. Kettunen (1994) "On-Line Group Decision Support by HIPRE 3+ Group Link", Proc. of the Third Int. Conference on Analytic Hierarchy Process, July 11-13, 1994, George Washington University, Washington D.C., 547-557.
- Hämäläinen, R. P., E. Kettunen, M. Marttunen and H. Ehtamo (1999), "Towards decision and negotiation support in multi-stakeholder development of lake regulation policy", Proc. of the Hawaii Int. Conference on System Sciences, IEEE Computer Society Press, Hawaii, January 5-8, 1999. (to appear)
- Marttunen, M. and R. P. Hämäläinen (1995), "Decision Analysis Interviews in Environmental Impact Assessment," European Journal of Operational Research, 87, 551-563.
- Pöyhönen, M. and R. P. Hämäläinen (1997), "On the convergence of multiattribute weighting methods", Research Report A66, Systems Analysis Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology.
- Pöyhönen, M., R. P. Hämäläinen and A. A. Salo (1997), "An Experiment on the Numerical Modelling of Verbal Ratio Statements", Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis, Vol. 6, pp. 1-10.
- Pöyhönen, M., H. C. Vrolijk, and R. P. Hämäläinen (1997), "Behavioral and Procedural Consequences of Structural Variation in Value Trees", Research Report A69, Systems Analysis Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology. Downloadable at http://www.hut.fi/Units/Systems.Analysis/Publications/.
- Pöyhönen, M. and R. P. Hämäläinen (1998), 'Notes on the Weighting Biases in Value Trees', Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, Vol. 11, pp. 139-150.
- Pöyhönen, M. and R. P. Hämäläinen (1998), "There is hope in attribute weighting", Research Report A74, Systems Analysis Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology. Downloadable at http://www.hut.fi/Units/Systems.Analysis/Publications/.
- Saaty, T.L. (1980), 'The Analytic Hierarchy Process', McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Salo, A. A. (1995), "Interactive decision aiding for group decision support," European Journal of Operational Research, 84, 134-149.
- Salo, A. A. and R. P. Hämäläinen (1997), "On the Measurement of Preferences in the Analytic Hierarchy Process" (and comments by V. Belton, E. Choo, T. Donegan, T. Gear, T. Saaty, B. Schoner, A. Stam, M. Weber, B. Wedley), Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis, Vol. 6, pp.309-343.

von Winterfeldt, D. and W. Edwards (1996), 'Decision Analysis and Behavioral Research', Cambridge University Press.

