

Social Housing Allocation: A Problem Structuring approach

*Original*

Social Housing Allocation: A Problem Structuring approach / Lami, ISABELLA MARIA; Abastante, Francesca; Ingaramo, Luisa; Lombardi, Patrizia. - STAMPA. - 1:(2015), pp. 37-42. (Intervento presentato al convegno International Conference of Group Decision and Negotiation tenutosi a Warsaw nel 22-26 June 2015).

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2637101 since: 2020-02-11T16:04:09Z

*Publisher:*

Warsaw School of Economic Press

*Published*

DOI:

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

(Article begins on next page)

THE 15<sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL  
CONFERENCE ON GROUP  
DECISION & NEGOTIATION LETTERS



# THE 15<sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GROUP DECISION & NEGOTIATION LETTERS

Edited by

Bogumił Kamiński Gregory (Grzegorz) Kersten  
Przemysław Szufel Michał Jakubczyk Tomasz Wachowicz



WARSAW SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS PRESS  
WARSAW 2015

**This publication has been financed by the grant from Polish National Science Centre (DEC-2011/03/B/HS4/03857).**

**All the papers contained in this book were peer reviewed.**

**Volume Editors:**

Bogumił Kamiński  
Decision Analysis and Support Unit  
Warsaw School of Economics  
Warsaw, Poland  
E-mail: bkamins@sgh.waw.pl

Gregory (Grzegorz) E. Kersten  
InterNeg Research Centre  
J. Molson School of Business  
Concordia University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
E-mail: gregory.kersten@concordia.ca

Przemysław Szufel  
Decision Analysis and Support Unit  
Warsaw School of Economics  
Warsaw, Poland  
E-mail: pszufe@sgh.waw.pl

Michał Jakubczyk  
Decision Analysis and Support Unit  
Warsaw School of Economics  
Warsaw, Poland  
E-mail: michal.jakubczyk@sgh.waw.pl

Tomasz Wachowicz  
Department of Operations Research  
Faculty of Informatics and Communication  
University of Economics in Katowice  
Katowice, Poland  
E-mail: tomasz.wachowicz@ue.katowice.pl

**All papers contained in this volume are copyrighted by their authors.  
All rights reserved.**

First edition

ISBN 978-83-7378-985-2

**Warsaw School of Economics Press**  
162 Niepodległości Ave., 02-554 Warsaw, Poland  
www.wydawnictwo.sgh.waw.pl  
e-mail: wydawnictwo@sgh.waw.pl

**Cover design:** Monika Trypuz

**Print and binding:** QUICK-DRUK s.c.

Order 79/VI/15

# Preface

Group Decision and Negotiation refers to the academic and professional discipline that focuses on gaining an understanding of collective decision-making processes. It is involved with the formulation of rules, models, and procedures to improve these processes. The range of GDN research reflects the breath of the strategic and tactical; social-psychological and economic; individual and group; conflict and cooperation; and software-supported and software-conducted processes. The field encompasses theory building and testing, laboratory and online experiments as well as observations in the field. Therefore, GDN researchers are involved in the theoretical, experimental and applied studies as well as in the development, testing and implementation of support systems, decision aids, and software agents. They aim at helping decision makers, advisors, facilitators, and third parties to deal with difficult problems, make better decisions, and/or delegate certain decisions to software.

GDN meetings bring together researchers and practitioners from the fields of humanities, social sciences, economics, law, management, engineering, and computer science. These diverse areas reflect the breath of GDN research. The meetings' participants discuss and compare different paradigms, methods of inquiry, and objectives which they employ in their research. What is common to all participants is their interest in the difficult decision problems that involve conflicts and/or cooperation and the challenges that people face when they attempt to find satisficing agreements and reach consensuses.

Researchers from the Americas, Asia, Europe, Africa, and Oceania participate in GDN meetings. They have a stimulating variety of backgrounds and represent a wide range of disciplines. While many of us come from different traditions, we all share a common passion: research into complex decision making and negotiation involving multiple stakeholders, different perspectives, issues and emotions, requiring decision and negotiation support for both process and content.

The Group Decision and Negotiation (GDN) conference series started in Glasgow, Scotland, U.K. in 2000 and was hosted by Colin Eden. At that time, Mel Shakun – the founding member of the Section and its Chairperson from the 1995 until 2014 – assumed that the next conference may take place only after several years. There was so much interest, however, that the second meeting took place just one year later. It was organized by Alain Checroun and held in La Rochelle in 2001. Mohammed Quaddus organized the next meeting in Perth (2002). Then, from Western Australia we had moved to Istanbul (2003) and the following year to Banff (2004); these latter two meetings were held as a meeting-within-a-meeting at larger INFORMS-affiliated conferences.

The memorable GDN meetings that took place in Vienna and Karlsruhe were hosted by Rudolf Vetschera (2005) and Christof Weinhardt (2006), respectively. The 2007 GDN meeting was organized by Gregory Kersten at Mont Tremblant in Quebec, Canada. João Climaco and João Paulo Costa hosted GDN 2008 in Coimbra. Then, Gwendolyn Kolfshoten organized GDN 2010 in Delft.

Amer Obeidi did a lot of work on the organization of the GDN 2011 in Amman, Jordan. Unfortunately, this meeting did not take place because of the events in neighboring countries at that time. The next year, Adiel Teixeira de Almeida organized GDN 2012 in Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil. GDN 2013 was hosted by Bilyana Martinovski, in Stockholm and it was followed by the GDN 2014 meeting in Toulouse, which was hosted by Pascale Zarate.

Group Decision and Negotiation 2015 was the 15th meeting organized by the INFORMS section on Group Decision and Negotiation. The Conference was hosted by Tomasz Szapiro at the Warsaw School of Economics in Warsaw. During this meeting we revived the Young Researcher Award that was first given at the 2007 meeting. The Award was given to a student researcher who authored and presented the best paper at the Conference. In addition to this Award, young researchers also participated in the Doctoral Consortium. Ofir Turel and Rudolf Vetschera served as the Consortium's Chairs and hereby we acknowledge their contribution.

At the 2014 GDN meeting two volumes of proceedings were introduced; one volume published by Springer in the LBPIN series [1] and the second volume published by the Toulouse University [2]. The GDN 2015 proceedings are also in two volumes: the present volume and the book [3] published in Springer LBPIN series.

In both volumes we have introduced thematic streams of sessions. Researchers who participated in the organization of the streams wrote introductions to each stream. These introductions are included in the separate section "Introductions" (pp. XIII-XLV). They briefly discuss the streams' contributions published in both volumes thus making them better integrated. We hope that this will give the readers a more comprehensive overview of all contributions.

The contributions in this volume and in the book [3] reflect the richness of GDN scholarship. Using a variety of research approaches including real organizational settings and laboratory situations, they focus on the development, application and evaluation of concepts, theories, methods, and techniques.

Contemporary political landscape abounds in situations of multidimensional conflicts which mix military, economic and social dimensions. Troops and tanks, economic measures and sanctions, as well as massive violent protests may become destructive means of conflict resolution. Wisdom armed with values, knowledge and methods will assist politicians in the creation of new instruments for effective group decisions and negotiations. These widely shared expectations challenge researchers and simultaneously direct their efforts in creation and dissemination of ethically driven, knowledge based applicable findings. Multicultural and interdisciplinary GDN community presents their results on progress in this area.

"Collaboration leads to growth, which engenders accomplishment." [2, p. VIII]. The GDN 2015 Conference and its proceedings were made possible through the collaboration of many researchers, students, and support staff. Their dedication and support was exceptional. We are grateful to all of them; to those who made contributions, presented papers, prepared the proceedings, maintained the conference website, and undertook many other necessary tasks. Their contributions, including help in the organization of the streams and the sessions as well as the accompanying events was key to the success of this meeting. We thank the reviewers for their work. It is thanks to their in-depth reviews we are able to maintain the

high academic standard of the GDN meetings. The stream organizers and reviewers work is greatly appreciated, particularly because often they were given very little time. Their reviews provided the authors with much-needed feedback. Thank you:

Fran Ackerman, Yasir Aljefri, Adiel Almeida, Marek Antosiewicz, Reyhan Aydogan, Deepinder Bajwa, Martin Bichler, Réal Carbonneau, Wojciech Cellary, João Clímaco, Grazia Concilio, Ana Paula Costa, Suzana Daher, Luis Dias, Colin Eden, Verena Dorner, Liping Fang, Mario Fedrizzi, Michael Filzmoser, Florian Hawlitschek, Shawei He, Keith Hipel, Masahide Horita, Michał Jakubczyk, Marc Kilgour, Mark Klein, Grzegorz Koloch, Beata Koń, Sabine Koszegi, Kevin Li, Jan Machowski, Yasser Matbouli, Paul Meerts, Danielle Morais, José Maria Moreno-Jiménez, Hannu Nurmi, Amer Obeidi, Pierpaolo Pontrandolfo, Ewa Roszkowska, Anne Rutkowski, Mareike Schoop, Roman Słowiński, Rangaraja Sundraraj, Przemysław Szufel, David Tegarden, Timm Teubner, Ernest Thiessen, Sathyanarayanan Venkatraman, Rudolf Vetschera, Doug Vogel, Tomasz Wachowicz, Christof Weinhardt, Dariusz Witkowski, Paweł Wojtkiewicz, Shi Kui Wu, Yinping Yang, Bo Yu, Yufei Yuan, Pascale Zaraté, Mateusz Zawisza, John Zeleznikow, and Daniel Zeng.

The quality of the presentations is associated with the excellence of the papers. It is also affected by the venue and the overall organization of the meeting and its associated events. The Local Organizing Committee was responsible for these aspects of the meeting and they did everything to make the meeting pleasant and memorable. Thank you:

Przemysław Szufel, Marek Antosiewicz, Michał Jakubczyk, Grzegorz Koloch, Beata Koń, Tomasz Kuszewski, Jan Machowski, Paweł Wojtkiewicz, and Karolina Zakrzewska-Szlichtyng.

We hope that you find the contents of this volume as well as the contents of the book [3] useful and interesting. The authors' effort in clarifying complex problems and proposing innovative solutions should help you to cope with numerous challenges that are posed before researchers of group decision and negotiations. We also hope that the meeting and the contributions foster collaboration among the meeting's attendees as well as joint projects with researchers who were not able to come to Warsaw and participate in GDN 2015.

April 2015

*Bogumił Kamiński  
Gregory E. Kersten  
Melvin F. Shakun  
Tomasz Szapiro*



## References

1. Zaraté, P., Kersten, G.E., and Hernández, J.E. (eds.): Group Decision and Negotiation. A Process-Oriented View. LNBIP. vol. 180. Springer: Heidelberg. pp. XV+278 pages (2014)
2. Zaraté, P., Camilleri, G., Kamissoko, D., and Amblard, F. (eds.): Group Decision and Negotiation 2014: Proceedings of the Joint International Conference of the INFORMS GDN Section and the EURO Working Group on DSS. 2014, Toulouse University: Toulouse. pp. 363 (2014)
3. Kamiński, B., Kersten, G.E., and Szapiro, T. (eds.): Outlooks and Insights on Group Decision and Negotiation. LNBIP vol. 218, Springer (2015)

# Organization

## General Chairs

Melvin F. Shakun  
Tomasz Szapiro

New York University, USA  
Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

## Program Chairs

Bogumił Kamiński  
Gregory (Grzegorz) E. Kersten

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland  
Concordia University, Canada

## Organizing Chair

Przemysław Szufel

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

## Doctoral Consortium Chairs

Ofir Turel  
Rudolf Vetschera

California State University, USA  
University of Vienna, Austria

## Program Committee

Fran Ackerman  
Adiel Almeida  
Reyhan Aydogan  
Deepinder Bajwa  
Martin Bichler  
Tung Bui  
Christer Carlsson  
Wojciech Cellary  
João Climaco  
Grazia Concilio  
Suzana F.D. Daher  
Luis Dias  
Colin Eden  
Liping Fang  
Mario Fedrizzi  
Raimo Pertti Hamalainen  
Keith Hipel  
Masahide Horita  
Takayuki Ito  
Michał Jakubczyk  
Catholjin Jonker

Curtin University, Australia  
Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil  
Delft U. of Technology, The Netherlands  
Western Washington University, USA  
TUM, Germany  
University of Hawaii, USA  
Abo Akademi University, Finland  
Poznań University of Economics, Poland  
University of Coimbra, Portugal  
Politecnico di Milano, Italy  
FUP, Brazil  
University of Coimbra, Portugal  
University of Strathclyde, UK  
Ryerson University, Canada  
University of Trento, Italy  
Aalto University, Finland  
University of Waterloo, Canada  
University of Tokyo, Japan  
Nagoya Institute of Technology, Japan  
Warsaw School of Economics, Poland  
Delft Univ. of Technology, The Netherlands

Marc Kilgour	Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada
Mark Klein	MIT, USA
Sabine Koeszegi	Vienna University of Technology, Austria
Hsiangchu Lai	NTNU, Taiwan
Michael Lewis	University of Pittsburgh, USA
Kevin Li	University of Windsor, Canada
Ivan Marsa-Maestre	Universidad de Alcala, Spain
Paul Meerts	Clingendael Institute, The Netherlands
Ugo Merlone	University of Torino, Italy
Daniel Mittleman	DePaul University, USA
Danielle Morais	FUP, Brazil
José Maria Moreno-Jiménez	Zaragoza University, Spain
Hannu Nurmi	University of Turku, Finland
Amer Obeidi	Cybernetics Consultants, Canada
Pierpaolo Pontrandolfo	Politecnico di Bari, Italy
Ewa Roszkowska	University of Białystok, Poland
Anne-Françoise Rutkowski	Tilburg University, Netherlands
Mareike Schoop	Hohenheim University, Germany
Wei Shang	Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
Gheorghe Cosmin Silagh	Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania
Rangaraja Sundraraj	IIT Madras, India
Katia Sycara	Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Przemysław Szufel	Warsaw School of Economics, Poland
David P Tegarden	Virginia Tech, USA
Ernest M. Thiessen	SmartSettle, Canada
Ofir Turel	California State University, USA
Rustam Vahidov	Concordia University, Canada
Rudolf Vetschera	University of Vienna, Austria
Gert-Jan de Vrede	University of Nebraska-Omaha, USA
Tomasz Wachowicz	University Economics in Katowice, Poland
Christof Weichardt	KIT, Germany
Haiyan Xu	Nanjing U. Aeronautics and Astronautics, China
Yinping Yang	AStar, Singapore
Yufei Yuan	McMaster University, Canada
Pascale Zarate	University Toulouse 1, France
John Zeleznikow	Victoria University, Australia

#### Doctoral Consortium Committee

Keith W. Hipel	University of Waterloo, Canada
Masahide Horita	Graduate School of Frontier Sciences, Japan
Paweł Kalczyński	California State University, USA
Gregory (Grzegorz) E. Kersten	Concordia University, Canada
José Maria Moreno-Jiménez	Zaragoza University, Spain

Hannu Nurmi

University of Turku, Finland

Tomasz Szapiro

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

**Organizing Committee**

Marek Antosiewicz

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Michał Jakubczyk

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Grzegorz Koloch

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Beata Koń

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Tomasz Kuszewski

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Jan Machowski

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Paweł Wojtkiewicz

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

Karolina Zakrzewska-Szlichtyng

Warsaw School of Economics, Poland

# Social Housing Allocation: A Problem Structuring approach

Isabella M. Lami<sup>1\*</sup>, Francesca Abastante<sup>1</sup>, Luisa Ingaramo<sup>2</sup>, and Patrizia Lombardi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Regional and Urban Studies and Planning (DIST), Politecnico di Torino,  
Viale Mattioli 39, 10125 Turin, Italy

<sup>2</sup> SiTI – Higher Institute on Territorial Systems for Innovation, Torino (Italy), Via P.C.  
Boggio 61, 10138 Turin, Italy

\* Corresponding author, e-mail: isabella.lami@polito.it

The demand for social housing (SH) has emerged all over Europe and it is exponentially increasing particularly since the 2008 global economic crisis. This growing temporary housing demand comes from a sector of the population living in the so-called “grey zone”, also known as the ‘in-work poverty’ population. The “grey zone” is composed of individuals in a situation of housing vulnerability [39]: people whose housing needs cannot be met by the market and at the same time who are not eligible to access public housing programs, such as the homeless, internal migrants, city users, single-earner families, the elderly, people subject to eviction, single parents.

Typically, the process underpinning the selection of SH projects has focused on reducing the SH shortage by providing enough supply. Nowadays, the process of selection of SH projects is no longer simply related to the lack of housing stock but also to the social, economic and cultural changes that currently affect a wide segment of the European population [7, 9, 19]. In this new scenario, the focus of SH policies is shifting from the building understood as a product to the people who live in the building. In fact where the human factor is fundamental to target the recipients, in order to pursue the integration of different social groups and the improvement the living conditions in the buildings. As the attention now being given to the topic in the international arena testifies, the scientific community and the market are looking to SH as a key area in which to test new approaches to sustainable design and implementation, taking into account not only the three “consolidated” pillars of sustainability (i. e. environment, society and economy), but also relevant additional dimensions, such as ethics, culture and technology [5].

In this scenario, SH represents a challenge that requires to be made with limited investments and at the same time designed to ensure the reduction of housing cost for users, promoters and managers in the use phase, as well as the achievement of the highest quality

standards. The housing cost, including both the rental costs and those of utilities should not exceed 40% of the users income [33].

It is a given fact that sustainable design has, above all, the environmental performance in terms of building envelope as its object and purpose. Usually, alongside this, the use of renewable energy, eco-friendly materials and technological solutions for the quality of life indoors and the optimal management of water and waste are recognized as integrated quality of the intervention. An aspect that nowadays is considered increasingly important is the ability of real estate transactions to generate and preserve value. Moreover, a key objective of SH is the creation of an “active community” where people can easily integrate into the urban context. Therefore, it is essential to pay particular attention to the location of the project, its accessibility and proximity to services, to all the forms of participation and co-planning that the project can stimulate, to the mix of facilities to be offered (in the individual building and in the neighbourhood), promoting reduced economic and social inequalities and avoiding the creation of social segregation [3]. In this sense, along with the architectural design it is therefore essential to simultaneously undertake the “project of social management” of the intervention, which means predicting the set of actors and actions in the use phase that can ensure their sustainability in terms of the community. In the planning phase it a reference profile of the future community that will ensure a balanced social mix should already be established. However, in the light of recent international environmental protocols for assessing sustainability in construction, such as LEED, SB 100, BREEAM communities, CasaClima Habitat, protocol ITHACA, Lidera, AUDIS [3, 24, 25] it is clear that, if these types of assessments are applied to SH operations, the environmental dimension takes precedence, mostly linked to energy efficiency and the attention to building materials, rather than to the social and economic aspects. Little attention is given to interpersonal sphere of living, or the aptitude of the building for the implementation of specific activities of social inclusion, or to the expected interventions and targeted aid to contrast the difficulties of the future users of social housing. These “non-traditional” aspects for a conventional residence become paramount in an SH intervention.

In order to tackle this social challenge, meet the user needs and foster effective means of public/private investment, this research intends to propose a new more tailored and effective approach for the decision making process related to the allocation of public (and private) resources for SH projects. Our research is articulated through an overview of the literature of the field and the analysis of the process of evaluation and selection of the SH interventions actually adopted by a banking foundation, in order to develop specific considerations and contributions on the topic.

A large and consolidated amount of recent literature concerning SH problems exists in different fields. Mention can be made of the studies conducted in the spheres of the link between energy and technical aspects [16, 18, 19, 20] the relation between technical aspects and construction costs [8, 10, 11, 13, 28, 37, 40], the evaluation methods of the social retrofitting intervention [31, 2, 4, 17, 26, 32, 35, 36], the quality of life and the reduction of social exclusion [12, 14, 21, 23, 29, 30]. The above mentioned extensive literature highlights the need to understand and decide which SH projects are worth funding, based on technical and social considerations, in order to provide access to housing and related social support for

those who need it [26, 38]. Therefore, a consolidated and structured evaluation method able to simultaneously consider all the aforementioned aspects in SH field is still needed. The research presented in this paper begins with the experience of an Italian bank foundation that has been involved in SH projects since 2007. This foundation developed its own assessment methodology to screen large funding requests from social agencies (cooperatives, religious bodies, public administration) wishing to implement SH projects. The methodology consists of three decision-making process stages:

1. A technical evaluation of the buildings in which the SH projects will be hosted is performed. A team according to four main criteria: (i) overall architectural consistency of the building; (ii) economic correctness of the adjustment work planned; (iii) accessibility of the spaces for people with disabilities; and, (iv) flexibility/modularity of the building. These criteria are in turn divided into thirteen sub-criteria;
2. A social evaluation of how the projects intend to provide social support destined for the future beneficiaries (mainly the inhabitants but also the neighbourhood communities) of the SH units is undertaken. A team comprising psychologists, community psychologists and psychotherapists assess all the SH projects according to three main criteria: (i) overall quality of the social support project; (ii) fairness of the financial plan of the social project; and, (iii) possibility to create synergies with cooperatives and social agencies in order to perform social activities. These criteria are subsequently divided into eleven sub-criteria;
3. Criteria weights are assigned and aggregated during the technical and social assessments by a multidisciplinary group of experts in order to obtain a ranking of the projects.

This study conceives the above assessment methodology as a Problem Structuring Method (PSM) [1, 15, 22, 27, 34], since it is configured as a flexible and real mechanism for addressing complex problems by representing the situation in a structured manner, as it exhibits many similarities with consolidated and recognised PSMs [27]. Moreover, the aforementioned methodology has the potential to be significantly improved in order to address complex issues characterized by the presence of multiple actors often with different perspectives or objectives and conflicting interests supporting participants' learning about their own and others' perspectives, as well as the problematic situation of concern [34, 6].

From this perspective, the research intends to experiment a possible improvement to the Bank foundation's assessment methodology, exploiting a participative method, based on the use of emerging technologies. ICT could provide spontaneous and voluntary data to be incorporated into a structured method, not only to support the Decision Maker (DM) in the *ex-ante* phase (with portfolio problems or constructing a tender; with the definition of the architectural, technical and social characteristics of the intervention), but also *in itinere* and in the *ex-post* phases, when it will be possible to monitor if the final outcomes meet the initial objectives.

The decision-making process related to the SH projects will be structured as follows:

- The first level of the decision-making process will directly involve the citizens and the stakeholders with the aim of clarifying the real needs of the beneficiaries of the SH units. In this phase the data will be collected in two ways: “spontaneous data”, via the analysis of social networks data, such as tweets and Flickr data; “voluntary data”, through partially structured and partially open surveys, analysed with specific semantic theories and tools;

– The second level of the decision-making process will involve the DM, experts, specific stakeholders operating directly in the SH sector (i.e. the managers of the SH buildings) and the citizens, in order to structure the decision-making model through a series of workshops. In this phase the use of PSM and ICT will be strongly supported by visual representation (3D models).

After a pilot test in Italy, the research will continue by performing test planning activities of the decision-making process in other European Countries.

## References

1. Ackermann, F.: Problem structuring methods ‘in the Dock’: Arguing the case for Soft OR. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 219(3), pp. 652–658 (2012)
2. Albacete, X., Pasanen, K., and Kolehmainen, M.: A GIS base method for the selection of the location of residence. *Geo-Spatial information science*, doi: 10.1080/10095020.2012.708159 (2012)
3. Bodano, F. and Sabatino, S.: Esigenze di sostenibilità integrata. In: Ingaramo, L. (ed.): *Social Housing. Modelli e processi integrati per valutare la sostenibilità*. Celid, Torino, pp. 107–127 (2015)
4. Boeri, A., Gabrielli, L., and Longo, D.: Evaluation and feasibility study of retrofitting interventions on social housing in Italy. *Procedia Engineering*, 21, pp. 1161–1168 (2011)
5. Brandon, P.S. and Lombardi, P.: *Evaluating sustainable development in the built environment*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford (2011).
6. Checkland, P. and Poulter, J.: *Learning for action: a short definitive account of soft systems methodology and its use for practitioners, teachers and students*. Wiley, Chichester (2006)
7. Crook, T. and Kemp, P.A. (eds.): *Private Rental Housing*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham (2014)
8. Crowe, C., Dell’Ariccia, G., Igan, D., and Rabanal, P.: How to deal with real estate booms: Lessons from country experiences. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 9, pp. 300–319 (2013)
9. Czischke, D.: A policy network perspective on Social Housing Provision in the European Union: the case of CECODHAS. *Housing theory and Society*, 24, pp. 63–87 (2007)
10. Deng, S., Wang, R.Z., and Dai, Y.J.: How to evaluate performance of net zero energy building – A literature research. *Energy*, 71, pp. 1–16 (2014)
11. Desideri, U., Arcioni, L., Leonardi, D., Cesaretti, L., Perugini, P., Agabiti, E., and Evangelisti, N.: Design of a multipurpose zero energy consumption. *Energy and Buildings*, In press (2014)
12. Dodson, J.: Social Theory and housing. In: *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*: pp. 506–514, ISBN: 978-0-08-047171-6 (2012)
13. Fabbri, K., Tronchin, L., and Tarabusi, V.: Energy retrofit and economic evaluation priorities applied at an Italian case study. *Energy Procedia*, 45, pp. 379–384 (2014)
14. Filandri, M. and Olagnier M.: Housing Inequality and Social Class in Europe. *Housing Studies*, doi: 10.1080/02673037.2014.925096 (2014)
15. Franco, L.A.: Rethinking Soft OR interventions: Models as boundary objects. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 231(3), pp. 720–733 (2013)
16. Gagliano, A., Nocera, F., Patania, F., and Capizzi, G.: A Case Study of Energy Efficiency Retrofit in Social Housing Units. *Energy Procedia*, 42, pp. 289–298 (2013)
17. Gibb, K.: Economics of Social Housing. In: *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*: pp. 55–60, ISBN 978-0-08-047171-6 (2012)



18. Hoppe, T.: Adoption of innovative energy systems in social housing: Lessons from eight large-scale renovation projects in The Netherlands. *Energy policy*, 51, pp. 791–801 (2012)
19. Ingaramo, L., Sabatino, S., and Talarico, A.: Housing Cost Affordability in social housing interventions: analysis of the operation variables impact on the housing costs of a temporary dwelling in Turin. *European Real Estate Society 20<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference 3<sup>rd</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> July 2013*, <http://library.eres.org/eres2013/paperupload/158.pdf> (2013)
20. Jenkins, D.P.: The value of retrofitting carbon-saving measures into fuel poor social housing. *Energy Policy*, 38, pp. 832–839 (2010)
21. Karatas, A. and El-Rayes, K.: Optimal Trade-Offs between Social Quality of Life and Life-Cycle Cost in Housing Units. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000895 (2014)
22. Lami, I.M., Abastante, F., Bottero, M., Masala, E., and Pensa, S.: A MCDA and data visualization framework as a Problem Structuring Method (PSM) to address transport projects. *EURO Journal on Decision Processes*, 2(3–4), pp. 281–312 (2014)
23. Li, D., Cheng, H., Chi Man Hui, E., Yang, H., and Li, Q.: A methodology for ex-post assessment of social impacts of an affordable housing project. *Habitat International*, 43, pp. 32–40 (2014)
24. Lombardi, P. and Cooper, I.: The challenge of the e-Agora metrics: the social construction of meaningful measurements. *International Journal Of Sustainable Development*, 12(2/3/3), pp. 210–222 (2009)
25. Lombardi, P., Giordano, S., Farouh, H., and Wael Y.: Modelling the smart cities performances. *Innovation*, 25(2), pp. 137–149 (2012)
26. Meehan, J. and Bryde, D.J.: Procuring sustainably in social housing: The role of social capital. *Journal of purchasing and supply management*, 20, pp. 74–81 (2014)
27. Mingers, J. and Rosenhead, J.: Problem structuring methods in action. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 152, pp. 530–554 (2004)
28. Moore, T.: Modelling the through-life costs and benefits of detached zero (net)energy housing in Melbourne, Australia. *Energy and Buildings*, 70, pp. 463–471 (2014)
29. Mukherji, S.: Affordable housing: In conversation with Ramesh Ramanathan, Chairman, Janalakshmi Social Services and Janaadhar. *IIMB Management Review*, 26, pp. 183–192 (2014)
30. Munch, S.: Social Excluding and housing. In: *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, pp. 377–381, ISBN: 978-0-08-047171-6 (2012)
31. Natividade-Jesus, E., Coutinho-Rodrigues, J., and Henggeler Antunes, C.: A multicriteria decision support system for housing evaluation. *Decision Support Systems*, 43, pp. 779–790 (2007)
32. Nuuter, T., Lill, I., and Tupenaite, L.: Comparison of housing market sustainability in European based on multiple criteria assessment. *Land Use Policy*, 42, pp. 642–651 (2015)
33. Pittini, A. and Laino, E.: *Housing Europe Review 2012. The nuts and bolts of European social housing systems*. CECODHAS Housing Europe's Observatory (2011)
34. Rosenhead, J., Mingers, J. (eds.): *Rational analysis for a problematic word Revised*. Wiley, Chichester (2001)
35. Sharp, M. and Jones, K.: Perceived inefficiency in social housing maintenance. *Construction Innovation*, 12(4), pp. 414–428 (2012)
36. Taillandier, F., Abi-Zeid, I., Taillandier, P., Sauce, P., and Bonetto, R.: An interactive decision support method for real estate management in a multi-criteria framework-REMIND. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, doi: 10.3846/1648715X.2014.941432 (2014)
37. Weissenberg, M., Jensch, W., and Lang, W.: The convergence of life cycle assessment and nearly zero energy buildings: the case of Germany. *Energy and Buildings*, 76, pp. 551–557 (2014)

38. Whitehead, C., Monk, S., Scanlon, K., Markkanen, S., and Tang, C.: The Private Rented Sector in the New Century – A Comparative Approach. Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, pp. 27–38, Cambridge (2012)
39. Wills, J. and Linneker, B.: In-work poverty and the living wage in the United Kingdom: A geographical perspective. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 39(2) (2013)
40. Xu, P. and Chan, E.H.W.: ANP model for sustainable Building Energy Efficiency Retrofit. *Habitat International*, 37, pp. 104–112 (2013)