

Report of Scientific Committee

ORP³, Paris 26-29 September 2001

Denis Bouyssou

I- Before the Conference

Composition of the Scientific Committee

Denis Bouyssou	France (Chair of the Scientific Committee)
Valerie Belton	UK
Rainer Burkard	Austria
Federico Della Croce	Italy
Roman Słowiński	Poland
Sophie Toulouse	France (chair of OC)
Marino Widmer	Switzerland

Note. The composition of the Scientific Committee was decided on an ad hoc basis after discussions between Denis Bouyssou and the EURO VP2 in charge of ORP³. The Scientific Committee never met. All business was handled via e-mail.

Preparation of the Conference

The EURO Council in Budapest approved the principle of the ORP3 in July 2000. The Call for Papers for the Conference was issued shortly after this date. The deadline for submission of the papers was 1 March 2001. Each author was asked to send 4 copies of the paper, an electronic version and a resumé.

Notes

1. It was made clear in the Call for Papers that only PhD students, young (no more than two years after the completion of the PhD) doctoral researchers or young OR analysts (no more than two years of professional experience), may attend the meeting as regular participants. We nevertheless we received some submissions by senior researchers which were rejected.
2. Co-authored papers were considered acceptable as long as a participant fulfilling the requirements explained above presented them.

Selection of papers

41 papers were submitted coming from nearly 20 different countries. Thanks to the hard work of the members of the Scientific Committee, each paper was evaluated by two referees. The final decisions of acceptance were taken by the Scientific Committee and communicated at the beginning of June 2001. The Scientific Committee aimed at selecting papers *of publishable quality in an international OR journal*. In total 24 papers coming from 14 different countries were selected (rejection rate around 40%).

Notes

1. Apparently some authors did not understand that the selection process was to be made on full paper submissions. All (more or less) extended abstracts were rejected.
2. The 41 papers were divided between the members of the Scientific Committee according to their area of interest. Each member of the Scientific Committee has been responsible for the evaluation of 6 or 7 papers. This was surely a difficult and time-consuming task. It should be made clear for the future edition of the Conference that the Scientific Committee will have to work hard!
3. Some countries (Germany, UK, Scandinavia) were not well represented.
4. All authors were required to send an electronic copy of their papers. The refereeing process was conducted entirely via e-mail. The four paper copies were not used.
5. The number of submission was below what was expected (we expected around 60 submissions).
6. The deadline for the reception of the revised version of the papers was 1 September 2001. Denis Bouyssou checked that the revised versions took into account the points raised by the referees. There was no time for another round of refereeing.
7. The refereeing process helped much in improving the quality of the papers.

Discussants

Each participant was asked to be the discussant of another paper (more or less related to his/her own interests). The discussant was asked to be ready for a 10-minute discussion.

Note

All papers were transmitted electronically to discussants via an FTP site.

Tutorial Speakers

Besides regular communications, three prominent OR scientists accepted to give tutorials during the Conference:

- Ken Bowen, UK (History and Methodology of OR),
- Michel Minoux, France(Linear and Integer Programming),
- Dominique de Werra, Switzerland (Combinatorial Optimisation).

Note

1. The choice of the tutorial speakers was made by the Scientific Committee on an informal basis with the following criteria in mind:
 - Variety of themes
 - Variety of countries
 - Costs
2. It would be a good policy to ask tutorial speakers to attend most of the Conference. Ken Bowen attended the four days of the first edition!
3. The mixture between technical (Dominique de Werra, Michel Minoux) and non-technical (Ken Bowen) tutorials was very nice.

Proceedings

As announced, the proceedings of the Conference were made available on the WWW (www.orp3.com) a few days before the Conference. A printed copy was distributed to all participants.

Note. The Organising committee bought the domain “www.orp3.com”. It would be a good idea for EURO to continue to retain this domain name and to ensure the availability of proceedings for at least a couple of years.

II- The Conference

Organisation

1. The Conference lasted for 4 days with one half-day devoted to Social activities and the last day (Saturday) ended at 1 p.m. with a social activity at night.
2. All sessions were plenary sessions.
3. Papers were arranged in thematic sessions of 2 and 3 papers (see the programme at www.orp3.com)
4. All sessions were chaired by a participant
5. Each paper was allocated a 40-minute time slot: 25 minutes for the presentation, 10

minutes for the discussant, 5 minutes for questions. Participants were very efficient chairpersons.

Attendance and atmosphere

1. All selected authors attended the Conference with only two exception (one no-show: Vyachaslav Pokhilko—which is a pity since he was selected and attended the ESWI in Toulouse the week before ORP3—and AS Mukhacheva who was unable to attend).
2. All sessions were very well attended in spite of the variety of the themes of the papers.
3. All presentations were very well prepared. The fact that the paper had been selected obviously helped much in having nice presentations.
4. Most discussants were very well prepared (some having up to 10 slides). This was a very positive aspect of the Conference. Each paper received detailed and constructive comments. The ensuing general discussion was, in general, very lively.
5. Thanks to the organising committee (and the support of EURO!), the coffee breaks and social events helped create a friendly and relaxed work atmosphere.
6. Two members of the Scientific Committee were able to attend the Conference (Val Belton and Federico della Croce). This was very helpful!

Notes

1. Members of the Scientific Committee should be invited to attend the Conference. They should be able to attend free of charge.
2. Three participants (from Brazil, Mexico and Moldova) were supported by IFORS.

III- Evaluation of the Conference and Suggestions

Positive aspects

1. The idea of ORP³ is very nice. Participants liked it (see the enclosed comments by participants; I did not receive negative comments). In spite of the absence of a general theme, the scientific exchanges were lively. *Such Conferences should be continued in the future.*
2. The idea of having papers selected on the basis of full paper submissions with proceedings available on the WWW is very nice and should be continued.
3. The idea of having each paper discussed worked well and should be continued.

4. The editors of EJOR have agreed to have a feature of EJOR devoted to the first edition of ORP³. It is now on its way.

Suggestions and Concerns

1. There were no participants from industry. The future organisers should try to attract some (maybe it could be a good idea to soften the “age” constraint).
2. Members of the Scientific Committee should be prepared to work hard (i.e. obtain two reports on 7 papers within a couple of months). A slightly lighter refereeing process could maybe be envisaged *e.g.* having only one report per paper.
3. EURO, with the help of its members, should widely publicise the next Conference in order to attract submissions from most member countries. Furthermore, it would be a good thing to have someone from EURO attending the Conference.
4. It would be good to formalise the roles of the OC and SC in order to help future organisers. This would also help convincing the editors of EJOR to agree on future feature issues.

Appendix 1

List of accepted papers

R. Aggoune	Luxembourg
Minimizing the Makespan for the Flow shop Scheduling Problem with Availability Constraints	
C. Archetti	Italy
The vehicle routing problem with capacity 2 and 3, general distances and multiple customer visit	
P. Belotti	Italy
Obnoxious p-median problems: polyhedral structure and a branch and cut approach	
S. Bertel	France
A genetic algorithm for an industrial multiprocessor flowshop scheduling problem with recirculation	
E. Camponogara	USA
Matching network agents to tasks: probelm formulation, experiments and polyhedral results	
X. Delorme	France
GRASP for set packing problems	
D. Feillet	France
Traveling salesman with profits; an overview	
J.A. Fernandez del Pozo	Spain
Knowledge synthesis optimizing combinatorial storage of multidimensional matrix	
J.P. Garcia-Sabater	Spain
The Problem of JIT Dynamic Sequencing. A Model and a Parametric Procedure	
B. Kotnyek	UK

- Generalisations of total unimodularity
J. Leyva Lopez **Mexico**
A new method for group decision support based on ELECTRE III methodology
- S. Mannor** **Israel**
Generalized approachability results for stochastic games with a single reachable state
- Y. Mati** **France**
The Complexity of the Two-job Shop Problems with Resource Flexibility
- G. Montibeller** **Brazil**
Reasoning Maps for Decision Aid
- E. Muciek** **Poland**
Optimal control of portfolio risk, a network model for financial planning
- A.S. Mukhacheva** **Russia** **Did not attend**
Hybrid genetic algorithms of two-dimensional bin-packing problems
- C. Petic** **Moldova**
Optimal path in dynamic network games with p players
- O. Peton** **Switzerland**
A brief tutorial on ACCPM
- V. Pokhilko** **Belarus** **No show**
Strong quasistability of vector problem on substitutions
- M. Pranzo** **Italy**
Batch scheduling in a two machine flow shop with limited buffer and sequence independent setup times
- R. Ruiz Garcia** **Spain**
A decision support system for a real logistic problem
- M.P. Scaparra** **Italy**
A multi-exchange heuristic for the single source capacitated facility location problem
- V. T'kindt** **France**
A Branch-and-Bound algorithm to Solve a Two-Machine Bicriteria Flowshop Scheduling Problem
- I. Vaz** **Portugal**
Robot trajectory planning with semi-infinite programming

Appendix 2
Comments from participants
(names suppressed)

Dear Denis and Sophie,

I have enjoyed ORP3 more than any other meeting I've attended. The organization has been superb, I enjoyed all the social activities and made some close and intimate friendships. I've also found Mr. Bowen's comments delightful.

I would like to offer my collaboration in the next edition of the conference, I know that a lot of work is needed and I would like to be useful. Please let me know if I can be of any assistance.

Thank you very much for your excellent work done in the ORP3!!

Take care,

Denis and Sophie,

let me apologise, but I forgot to thank you for everything and to congratulate you for the "really good" organisation.

I did enjoy the time, and i did learn really a lot of things.

At the social events part I really liked very much the dinners (the one on saturday superb)

At the scientific part I have to thank you very much on being the first on organising such a really interesting event.

Thanks again for everything.

Dear Denis,

About the conference: It was one of the best conferences I have participated. The idea of organizing a conference for young OR researchers is excellent. One can find people having the same interest and because of the same age it is very easy to make friends with them. It is also very useful to see what OR will be in the next few years.

Your organisation matched the excellent idea, it was almost flawless. If I'd have to find problems, then I could come up only with minor things which can happen in every conference.

Thank you for the good conference and best wishes,