

Constraint and Optimization techniques for supporting Policy Making

Marco Gavanelli and Fabrizio Riguzzi

EnDIF, university of Ferrara
Via Saragat 1, Ferrara Italy

Michela Milano

DEIS, University of Bologna
V.le Risorgimento 2, Bologna, Italy

Paolo Cagnoli

ARPA Emilia-Romagna
Bologna, Italy

Abstract

Modeling the policy making process is a very challenging task. To the best of our knowledge the most widely used technique in this setting is agent-based simulation. Each agent represents an individual entity (e.g., citizen, stakeholder, company, public association, public body). The agent interaction enables emerging behaviours to be observed and taken into account in the policy making process itself. We claim that another perspective should be considered in modeling policy issues, that is the global perspective. Each public body has global objectives, constraints and guidelines that have to be combined to take decisions. The policy making process should be at the same time consistent with constraints, optimal with respect to given objectives and assessed to avoid negative impacts on the environment, economy and society. We propose in this paper a constraint-based model for the global policy making process and we apply the devised model to the regional planning activity. A case study in the field of energy plan is used to evaluate the proposed model. Clearly an interaction with agent-based simulation is desirable and could provide important feedback to the global model. This aspect is the subject of current research.

The problem

Public policy issues are extremely complex, occur in rapidly changing environments characterized by uncertainty, and involve conflicts among different interests. Our society is ever more complex due to globalisation, enlargement and the changing geo-political situation. This means that political activity and intervention become more widespread, and so the effects of its interventions become more difficult to assess, while at the same time it is becoming ever more important to ensure that actions are effectively tackling the real challenges that this increasing complexity entails. Thus, those responsible for creating, implementing, and enforcing policies must be able to reach decisions about ill-defined problem situations that are not well understood, have no one correct answer, involve many competing interests and interact with other policies at multiple levels. It is therefore ever more important to ensure coherence across these complex issues.

In this paper we consider policy issues related to regional planning. Regional planning is the science of the efficient placement of activities and infrastructures for the sustainable growth of a region. Regional plans are classified into

types, such as Agriculture, Forest, Fishing, Energy, Industry, Transport, Waste, Water, Telecommunication, Tourism, Urban and Environmental plans to name a few. Each plan defines activities that should be carried out during the plan implementation. On the regional plan, the policy maker has to take into account impacts on the environment, economy and society. The procedure aimed to assess the impacts of a regional plan is called Strategic Environmental Assessment (Sadler et al. 2010) that relates activities defined in the plan to environmental and economic impacts. This assessment procedure is now manually implemented by environmental experts to check the effects of a given plan or programme, but it is never applied during the plan/program construction. In addition, this procedure is applied on a given, already instantiated plan. Taking into account impacts a posteriori enables only corrective interventions, that can at most reduce the negative effect of wrong planning decisions.

One important aspect to be considered for supporting policy makers with AI approaches is the definition of formal policy models. In the literature, the majority of policy models rely on agent based simulation (Gilbert 2010) (Matthews et al. 2007) (Troitzsch et al. 1999) where agents represent the parties involved in the decision making and implementation process. The idea is that for modelling complex systems, agent-based modelling and simulation is a suitable approach to understand such systems in a more natural way. In particular, agent-based models permit carrying out computer experiments to support a better understanding of the complexity of economic, environmental and social systems, structural changes, and endogenous adjustment reactions in response to a policy change.

In addition to agent-based simulation models, which provide “individual level models”, we claim that the policy planning activity needs a global perspective: in case of regional planning, we need “a regional perspective” that faces the problem at a global level while tightly interacting with the individual level model. Thus rather than proposing an alternative approach with respect to simulation, we claim that the two approaches should be properly combined as they represent two different perspectives of the same problem: the individual and the global perspective. This integration is subject of our current research activity. In this setting, regional planning activities can be cast into complex combinatorial optimization problems. The policy maker has to

take decisions by perceiving a set of (possibly conflicting) objectives, and satisfying a set of constraints while at the same time reducing negative impacts and enhancing positive impacts on the environment, society and economy. For this reason, impact assessment should be integrated into the policy model so as to improve the current procedure performed a posteriori.

In previous work (Gavanelli et al. 2010) we experimented two different technologies to address the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of a regional plan, i.e., assessing the effects on the environment of a given plan. The applied technologies were Constraint Logic Programming (CLP) (Jaffar and Maher 1994) and Causal Probabilistic Logic Programming (Vennekens, Verbaeten, and Bruynooghe 2004). In (Gavanelli et al. 2011) we proposed a fuzzy model for the SEA. While being far more expressive than a traditional CLP approach, it is far less usable within a Regional planning decision support system. We evaluated a previous regional plan with the two models, and proposed the outputs to an environmental expert. The expert compared the two outputs and chose the CLP model as most close to a human-made assessment.

In this work, we extend the CLP model used for the assessment, and apply it to the planning problem, i.e., deciding which actions should be taken in a plan. In the model, decision variables represent political decisions (e.g., the magnitude of a given activity in the regional plan), potential outcomes are associated with each decision, constraints limit possible combination of assignments of decision variables and objectives (also referred to as criteria) that can be used either to evaluate alternative solutions, or translated into additional constraints. The model has been solved with Constraint Logic Programming (CLP) (Jaffar and Maher 1994) techniques, and tested on the Emilia-Romagna regional energy plan. The results have been validated by experts in policy making and impact assessment.

Other constraint based approaches have been proposed for narrower problems in the field of energy, such as locating biomass power plants in positions that are economically affordable (Freppaz et al. 2003; Bruglieri and Liberti 2008; Chinese and Meneghetti 2009) and environmentally sustainable (Cattafi et al. 2011). Other approaches have been applied to wind turbine placement (Grady, Hussaini, and Abdullah 2005). The problem faced in this paper is much broader, as the Region should decide which strategic investments to perform in the next two-three years (with a longer vision to 2020) in the energy field. All specific details are left to the implementation of the plan, but are not considered at the Regional Planning stage. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time constraint-based reasoning is applied to such a wide and strategic perspective.

Regional Planning and Impact assessment

Regional Planning is the result of the main policy making activity of European regions. Each region has a budget distributed by the Operational Programme (OP): an OP sets out each regions priorities for delivering the funds. On the basis of these funds, the region has to define its priorities: in the field of energy, one example of priority is increasing the

use of renewable energy sources. Then, a region should decide which activities to insert in the plan. Activities may be roughly divided into six types: (1) infrastructures and plants; (2) buildings and land use transformations; (3) resource extraction; (4) modifications of hydraulic regime; (5) industrial transformations; (6) environmental management. Also, a magnitude for each activity should be decided describing how much of a given activity is performed.

Each activity has an outcome (such as the amount of energy produced or consumed) and a cost. We have two vectors $\mathbf{O} = (o_1, \dots, o_{N_a})$ and $\mathbf{C} = (c_1, \dots, c_{N_a})$ where each element is associated to a specific activity and represents the outcome and cost per unit of an activity.

There are constraints linking activities: for instance if a regional plan decides to build three biomass power plants (primary activities for an energy plan), each of these plants should be equipped with proper infrastructures (streets, sewage or possibly a small village nearby, power lines) also called *secondary activities*. Associated to activities we have a matrix of dependencies between activities. In particular we have a $N_a \times N_a$ square matrix \mathcal{D} where each element d_{ij} represents the magnitude of activity j per unit of activity i .

Also, each activity has impacts on the environment in terms of positive and negative pressures: example of positive pressure is the increased availability of energy, while a negative pressure is the production of pollutants. Pressures are themselves linked to environmental receptors such as the quality of the air, of surface water. On both pressures and receptors, there are constraints: for example the maximum amount of greenhouse gas emissions of the overall plan.

Taking as an example the Emilia-Romagna Regional Energy Plan approved in 2007, some objectives of the policy makers are the production of a given amount of energy (400 additional MW from renewable energy sources), while reducing the current greenhouse gas emission percentage by 6.5% with respect to 2003. In addition, the budget constraint limiting the amount of money allocated to the energy plan by the Regional Operational Programme was 30.5M€ in 2007.

The policy maker also has to take into account impacts on the environment, economy and society. One of the instruments used in Emilia-Romagna are the so called *coaxial matrices* (Cagnoli 2010), that are a development of the network method (Sorensen and Moss 1973).

One matrix \mathcal{M} defines the dependencies between the above mentioned activities contained in a plan and *impacts* (also called *pressures*) on the environment. Each element m_j^i of the matrix \mathcal{M} defines a qualitative dependency between the activity i and the impact j . The dependency can be *high, medium, low* or *null*.

The second matrix \mathcal{N} defines how the impacts influence environmental receptors. Each element n_j^i of the matrix \mathcal{N} defines a qualitative dependency between the impact i and an environmental receptor j . Again the dependency can be *high, medium, low* or *null*. Examples of environmental receptors are the quality of surface water and groundwater, quality of landscapes, wildlife wellness and so on.

The matrices currently used in Emilia-Romagna contain 93 activities, 29 negative impacts, 19 positive impacts and 23 receptors, and assess 11 types of plans.

Why constraint based approaches

The regional planning activity is now carried on by human experts that build a single plan, considering strategic regional objectives that perceive national and EU guidelines. After the plan has been devised, the agency for environmental protection is asked to assess the plan from an environmental point of view. Typically, there is no feedback: the assessment can state that the devised plan is environmentally friendly or not, but it cannot change the plan. In rare cases, it can propose corrective countermeasures, that can only mitigate the negative impact of wrong planning decisions. Also, although regulations state that a significant environmental assessment should compare two or more options (different plans) this is rarely done in Europe, because the assessment is typically hand made and requires a long work. Even in the rare cases in which two options are considered, usually one is the plan and the other is the absence of plan (do nothing).

Constraint based modeling overcomes the limitation of a hand made process, for a series of reasons. First, it provides a tool that automatically performs planning decisions, considering both the budget allocated on the plan by the Regional Operative Plan, as well as national/EU guidelines.

Second, it takes into consideration environmental aspects during plan construction, avoiding trial-and-error schemes.

Third, the generation of alternative scenarios is extremely easy, and their comparison and evaluation comes for free. Adjustments can be performed on-the-fly in case results do not satisfy policy makers or environmental experts. For example, by changing the bounds on the amount of energy each source can provide, we can adjust the plan by considering market trends and also the potential receptivity of the region.

A CLP model

To design a constraint-based model, we have to define variables, constraints and objectives. Variables represent decisions that have to be taken. Given a vector of activities $\mathbf{A} = (a_1, \dots, a_{N_a})$, to each activity we associate a variable G_i that defines its magnitude. The magnitude could be represented either in an absolute way, as the amount of a given activity, or in a relative way, as a percentage with respect of the existing quantity of the same activity. We use in this paper the absolute representation.

As stated above, we distinguish primary from secondary activities: let A^P be the set of indexes of primary activities and A^S the set of indexes of secondary activities. The distinction is motivated by the fact that some activities are of primary importance in a given plan. Secondary activities are those supporting the primary activities by providing the needed infrastructures. The dependencies between primary and secondary activities are considered by the constraint:

$$\forall j \in A^S \quad G_j = \sum_{i \in A^P} d_{ij} G_i$$

Given a budget B_{Plan} available for a given plan, we have a constraint limiting the overall plan cost as follows

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_a} G_i c_i \leq B_{Plan} \quad (1)$$

Such constraint can be imposed either on the overall plan, or on parts of it. For example, if the budget is partitioned into chapters, we can impose constraint (1) on activities of a given chapter.

Also, given an expected outcome o_{Plan} of the plan we have a constraint ensuring to reach the outcome:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_a} G_i o_i \geq o_{Plan}.$$

For example, in an energy plan the outcome can be to have more energy available in the region, so o_{Plan} could be the increased availability of electrical power (e.g., in megawatts). In such a case, o_i will be the production in MW for each unit of activity a_i .

Concerning impacts of the regional plan, we sum up the contributions of all the activities and obtain the estimate of the impact on each environmental pressure:

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, N_p\} \quad p_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} m_j^i G_i. \quad (2)$$

In the same way, given the vector of environmental pressures $\mathbf{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_{N_p})$, one can estimate the influence on the environmental receptor r_i by means of the matrix \mathcal{N} , that relates pressures with receptors:

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, N_r\} \quad r_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} n_j^i p_i. \quad (3)$$

Also, we can have constraints on receptors and pressures. For example, the pressure “Greenhouse gas emission” should not exceed a given threshold.

Concerning objectives, there are a number of possibilities suggested by planning experts. From an economic perspective, one can decide to minimize the overall cost of the plan (that is anyway subject to budget constraints). Clearly, in this case the most economic energy sources are preferred, despite their potentially negative environmental effects (which could be anyway constrained). On the other hand, one could maintain a fixed budget and maximize the produced energy. In this case the most efficient energy sources will be pushed forward. Or, the planner could prefer a *green* plan and optimize environmental receptors. For example, one can maximize, say, the air quality, or the quality of the surface water. In this case, the produced plan decisions are less intuitive and the system we propose is particularly useful. The link between decisions on primary and secondary activities and consequences on the environment are extremely complex to be manually considered. Clearly, more complex objectives can be pursued, by properly combining the above mentioned aspects.

The regional energy plan

We can now describe how to cast the general model for regional plan described above into the model for designing a regional energy plan. The first step is to identify primary and secondary activities. In the context of a regional energy plan, the environmental and planning experts defined the

following distinction. Primary activities are those capable of producing energy, namely renewable and non-renewable power plants. Secondary activities are those supporting the energy production, such as activities for energy transportations (e.g., power lines), and infrastructures supporting the primary activities (e.g., dams, yards).

One important aspect is the energy source diversification: one should not use a single energy source, but should cover both renewable and non renewable energy sources. This requirement comes from fluctuations of the price and availability of the various resources. For this reason, we have constraints on the minimal fraction F_i of the total energy produced by each source i :

$$\forall i \in A^P \quad G_i O_i \geq F_i O_{Plan}$$

In addition, each region has its own geo-physical characteristics. For instance, some regions are particularly windy, while some others are not. Hydroelectric power plants can be built with a very careful consideration of environmental impacts, the most obvious being the flooding of vast areas of land. This poses constraints on the maximum energy U_i that can be produced by a given energy source i .

$$\forall i \in A^P \quad G_i O_i \leq U_i$$

Finally, the region priorities should be conformant with European guidelines such as the 20-20-20 initiative aimed at achieving three ambitious targets by 2020: reducing by 20% its greenhouse gas emissions, having a 20% share of the final energy consumption produced by renewable sources, and improving by 20% its energy efficiency. For this reason, we can impose constraints on the minimum amount of energy L_{ren} produced by renewable energy sources whose set is referred to as A^P_{ren} . The constraint that we can impose is

$$\sum_{i \in A^P_{ren}} G_i O_i \geq L_{ren}.$$

The Regional Energy Plan 2011-2013

The constraint-based model described in previous sections has been used on the planning of the regional energy plan 2011-2013. The system is implemented in the Constraint Logic Programming language ECLⁱPS^e (Apt and Wallace 2007), and in particular uses its Eplex library (Shen and Schimpf 2005), that interfaces ECLⁱPS^e with a (mixed-integer) linear programming solver. The computation time is not an issue in this application, and it was hardly measurable on a modern computer.

The regional energy plan had the objective of paving the way to reach the ambitious goal of the 20-20-20 directive, in particular to have 20% of energy in 2020 produced by renewable sources. This 20% does not consider only the electric energy, but the whole energy balance in the region, including thermal energy, and transports.

Transports can use renewable fuels, like biogas or oil produced from crops. Currently, we do not consider this issue.

Thermal energy can be used e.g. for home heating; renewable sources are thermal solar panels (that produce hot water for domestic use), geothermal pumps (that are used to

heat or to refresh houses), biomass plants, that produce hot water used to heat neighbouring houses during winter.

The considered electric power plants that produce energy from renewable sources are hydroelectric plants, photovoltaic plants, thermodynamic solar plants, wind generators and, again, biomass power plants.

For each energy source, the plan should provide: the installed power, in MW; the total energy produced in a year, in kTOE (TOE stands for Tonne of Oil Equivalent); the total cost, in M€. The ratio between installed power and total produced energy is mainly influenced by the availability of the source: while a biomass plant can (at least in theory) produce energy 24/7, the sun is available only during the day, and the wind only occasionally. For unreliable sources an average for the whole year is taken.

The cost of the plant, instead, depends mainly on the installed power: a solar plant has an installation cost that depends on the square meters of installed panels, which in their turn can provide some maximum power (peak power).

It is worth noting that the considered cost is the total cost of the plant for the regional system, which is not the same as the cost for the taxpayers of the Emilia-Romagna region. In fact, the region can enforce policies in many ways, convincing private stakeholders to invest in power production. This can be done with the financial leverage, or by giving favourable conditions (either economic or other) to investors. Some power sources are economically profitable, so there is no need for the region to give subsidies. For example, currently in Italy biomasses are economically advantageous for investors, so privates are proposing projects to build biomasses plants. On the other hand, biomasses also produce pollutants, they are not always sustainable (see (Cattafi et al. 2011) for a discussion) so local committees are rather likely to spawn against the construction of new plants. For these reasons, there is a limit on the number of licenses the region gives for building biomass-based plants.

Technicians in the region estimated (considering current energy requirements, growth trends, foreseen energy savings) the total energy requirements for 2020; out of this, 20% should be provided by renewable sources. Out of this requirement for 2020, they proposed a percentage to be provided during the plan 2011-2013: about 177kTOE of electrical energy and 296kTOE of thermal energy.

Starting from these data, they developed a plan for electrical energy and one for thermal energy.

We used the model presented earlier considering initially only “extreme” cases, in which only one type of energy source is used. For instance, if we impose to build only biomass power plants, the application provides in output the spreadsheet file represented in Table 1; the file has the same format as the tables included in the regional energy plan. Beside the plan, the application provides also its environmental assessment, namely an evaluation of the environmental receptors.

In order to understand the individual contributions of the various energy forms, we plotted all the plans that use a single type of energy in Figure 1, together with the plan developed by the region’s experts. On the abscissa, we chose the receptor *Quality of the air* because it is probably the most

Electrical power plants	Power	Power	Energy	Investments
	2010 (MW)	2013 (MW)	2013 (kTOE)	(M€)
Hydroelectric	300	300	67.06	0
Photovoltaic	230	230	23.73	0
Thermodyn. solar	0	0	0	0
Wind generators	20	20	2.58	0
Biomasses	430	724.47	436.13	1030.64
Total	980	1274.47	529.5	1030.64

Table 1: Example of energy plan for electrical power, if only biomass power plants can be developed




Figure 1: Plot of the *extreme* plans using only one energy source, compared with the plan by the region’s experts.

sensitive in the Emilia-Romagna region. On the y axis we plot the cost of the plan. As explained previously, all plans provide the same energy in kTOE, while they can require different installation power (in MW).

First of all, we notice that some of the energy types improve the quality of the air (positive values in abscissa), while others worsen it (negative values). Of course, no power plant can improve the quality of the air by itself (as it cannot remove pollutants from the air). The point is that building the plant provides electrical energy without introducing new pollutants; if such energy would not have been provided in the electrical network, it would have been imported from neighbouring regions. In such a case, the required energy would be produced with the same mixture of energy sources as in the national production, including those emitting pollutants, so the net contribution is positive for the quality of the air. Note also that the different energy sources have different impacts on the quality of the air not only due to the emissions of the power plants, but also to the impact of the secondary activities required by the various sources.

Finally, note that the “extreme” plans are usually not feasible, in the sense that the constraint on the real availability of the energy source in the region was relaxed. For example, wind turbines provide a very good air quality at a low cost, but the amount required in the corresponding extreme plan is not possible in the region considering the average availability of wind and of land for installing turbines.

The plan proposed by the region’s experts is more *bal-*

anced: it considers the real availability of the energy source in the region, and provides a mixture of all the different renewable types of energy. This is very important in particular for the renewable sources, that are often discontinuous: wind power is only available when the wind is blowing at a sufficient speed, solar power is only available during the day and there is more availability in sunny days, etc., so having a mixture of different sources can provide an energy availability more continuous during the day.

Beside assessing the plan proposed by the experts, we also provided new, alternative plans. In particular, we searched for optimal plans, both with respect to the cost, and to the *quality of the air*. Since we have two objective functions, we plotted the Pareto-optimal frontier; each point of the frontier is a point such that one cannot improve one of the objectives without sacrificing the other. In our case, the quality of the air cannot be improved without raising the cost, and, vice-versa, it is impossible to reduce the cost without sacrificing the quality of the air. The Pareto frontier is shown in Figure 2, together with the experts’ plan. Note that being our formulation of the problem linear, we can compute the Pareto frontier by changing coefficients in the objective function that boils down to a weighted sum of single criteria.




Figure 2: Pareto frontier of the quality of air against cost.

The picture shows that, although the plan devised by the experts is close to the frontier, it can be improved. In particular, we identified on the frontier two solutions that dominate the experts’ plan: one has the same cost, but better air quality, while the other has same air quality, but a lower cost.

Table 2 contains the plan developed by the region’s experts, while Table 3 shows the plan on the Pareto curve that has the same quality of air as the plan of the experts. The energy produced by wind generators is almost doubled (as they provide a very convenient ratio (air quality)/cost, Figure 1), we have a slight increase in the cheap biomass energy, while the other energy sources reduce accordingly.

Concerning the environmental assessment, we plot in Figure 3 the value of the receptors in significant points of the Pareto front. Each bar represents a single environmental receptor for a specific plan plotted in the Pareto Frontier of

Electrical power plants	Power 2010	Power 2013	Energy 2013	Investments
	(MW)	(MW)	(kTOE)	(M€)
Hydroelectric	300	310	69.3	84
Photovoltaic	230	850	87.7	2170
Thermodyn. solar	0	10	1	45
Wind generators	20	80	10.3	120
Biomasses	430	600	361.2	595
Total	980	1850	529.5	3014

Table 2: Energy plan developed by the region's experts

Electrical power plants	Power 2010	Power 2013	Energy 2013	Investments
	(MW)	(MW)	(kTOE)	(M€)
Hydroelectric	300	303	67.74	25.2
Photovoltaic	230	782.14	80.7	1932.51
Thermodyn. solar	0	5	0.5	22.5
Wind generators	20	140	18.03	240
Biomasses	430	602.23	362.54	602.8
Total	980	1832.37	529.5	2823

Table 3: Energy plan that dominates the experts' plan, retaining same air quality but with lower cost

Figure 2. In this way it is easy to compare how receptors are impacted by different plans. Notice that the receptors have different trends: some improve as we move towards higher quality of the air (like *quality of climate*, *wellness of mankind*, *value of material goods*), while others improve when moving to less expensive solutions (like *quality of sensitive landscapes*, *wellness of wildlife*, *soil quality*). This is due to several reasons, depending both on the type of power plants installed, and on the secondary activities. For example, wind turbines have a good effect on the quality of the air, but they are also considered aesthetically unpleasant, so they cannot be installed in sensitive zones, like on the hills without having protests from the residents (receptor *quality of sensitive landscapes*). Migratory birds follow wind streams to reduce fatigue in their travel for long distances; on the other hand, wind turbines are to be installed in windy zones to be effective. So, during migration, birds would have a high likelihood to unexpectedly meet large rotating wind blades, possibly impacting with them; this effect cannot be ignored in particular for endangered species (receptor *wellness of wildlife*).

Added value of CLP

The application (including both the assessment and the planning) was developed in few person-months by a CLP expert. It does not have a graphical user interface yet, and it is currently usable only by CLP experts; however it produces spreadsheet files with tables having the same structure as those used for years by the region's experts, so the output is easily understandable by the end user. We are currently developing a web-based application, to let users input the relevant data, and try themselves producing plans on-the-fly.




Figure 3: Value of the receptors on the Pareto front

The assessment module (Gavanelli et al. 2010) was first tested on a previously developed plan, then used during the planning of the 2011-2013 regional energy plan. The various alternatives have been submitted to the regional council, that will have the ability to choose one of them, instead of accepting/rejecting the only proposal, as in previous years.

One of the results is the ability to generate easily alternative plans with their assessment; this is required by the EU regulations, but it is widely disregarded.

Another result is the possibility to provide plans that are optimal; the optimization criteria can include the cost, or one of the various environmental receptors. The user can select two objectives, and in this case the application generates the Pareto front. This helps the experts or the regional council to do choices that are more grounded.

We still do not know which plan the regional council will choose, neither we know if and how the directives given in the regional plan will be indeed implemented. However, in a perfect world, in which everything is implemented as expected, the added value of CLP in monetary terms could be the difference of the *investment* columns in the plans in Tables 2 and 3: 191M€ saved (by the various actors, public and private, in the whole region) in three years.

Finally, the choice of Constraint Programming greatly enables model flexibility. Discussing with experts, it is often the case that they change their mind on some model constraints or on objectives. Therefore, the flexibility in dealing with side constraints and in dealing with non linear constraints facilitates knowledge acquisition making Constraint Programming the technique of choice for the problem and its future extensions.

Conclusion and Future Open Issues

Global public policy making is a complex process that is influenced by many factors. We believe that the use of constraint reasoning techniques could greatly increase the ef-

fectiveness of the process, by enabling the policy maker to analyse various aspects and to play with parameters so as to obtain alternative solutions along with their environmental assessment. Given the amount of financial, human and environmental resources that are involved in regional plans, even a small improvement can have a huge effect.

Important features of the system are: its efficiency as a plan is returned in few milliseconds, its wide applicability to many regional plans, to provincial and urban plans and also to private and public projects. The system was used for the environmental assessment of the regional energy plan of the Emilia-Romagna region of Italy. Beside performing automatically the assessment (that was performed by hand in previous years), the assessment for the first time includes the evaluation of alternative plans: this is a requirement of EU regulations that is largely disregarded in practice. Moreover, the alternative plans were produced by optimizing the quality of the environmental receptors, together with the cost for the community of the plan itself.

This work is a first step towards a system that fully supports the decision maker in designing public policies. To achieve this objective, the method must be extended to take into account the individual level, by investigating the effect of a policy over the parties affected by it. This can be achieved by integrating constraint reasoning with simulation models that reproduce the interactions among the parties. In our current research, we are studying how the region can choose the form of incentives and calibrate them in order to push the energy market to invest in the directions foreseen by the Regional Energy plan.

At the moment the system can be used only by IT expert people. In order to turn it into a practical tool that is routinely used by decision makers, we must equip it with a user-friendly interface. In particular, we are in the process of developing a web interface to the constraint solver, in order to make it easy to use and widely accessible.

Finally, economic indicators will be used to assess the economic aspect of the plan. Up to now, only budget and few economic pressures and receptors are considered. We believe that a comprehensive system should aggressively incorporate this aspect. We will integrate a well established approach (UN and Eurostat Guidelines) and robust data from official statistics into the system to combine economic accounts (measured in monetary terms) and environmental accounts (measured in physical units) into a single framework useful for the evaluation of the integrated economic, environmental-social performance of regions.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by EU project *ePolicy*, FP7-ICT-2011-7, grant agreement 288147. Possible inaccuracies of information are under the responsibility of the project team. The text reflects solely the views of its authors. The European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained in this paper.

References

- Apt, K. R., and Wallace, M. 2007. *Constraint logic programming using Eclipse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bruglieri, M., and Liberti, L. 2008. Optimal running and planning of a biomass-based energy production process. *Energy Policy* 36(7):2430–2438.
- Cagnoli, P. 2010. *VAS valutazione ambientale strategica*. Dario Flaccovio.
- Cattafi, M.; Gavanelli, M.; Milano, M.; and Cagnoli, P. 2011. Sustainable biomass power plant location in the Italian Emilia-Romagna region. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 2(4).
- Chinese, D., and Meneghetti, A. 2009. Design of forest bio-fuel supply chains. *International Journal of Logistics Systems and Management* 5(5):525–550.
- Freppaz, D.; Minciardi, R.; Robba, M.; Rovatti, M.; Sacile, R.; and Taramasso, A. 2003. Optimizing forest biomass exploitation for energy supply at regional level. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 26:15–24.
- Gavanelli, M.; Riguzzi, F.; Milano, M.; and Cagnoli, P. 2010. Logic-Based Decision Support for Strategic Environmental Assessment. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming, 26th Int'l. Conference on Logic Programming (ICLP'10) Special Issue* 10(4-6):643–658.
- Gavanelli, M.; Riguzzi, F.; Milano, M.; Sottara, D.; Cangini, A.; and Cagnoli, P. 2011. An application of fuzzy logic to strategic environmental assessment. In Pirrone, R., and Sorbello, F., eds., *Artificial Intelligence Around Man and Beyond - XIIth International Conference of the Italian Association for Artificial Intelligence*, volume 6934 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 324–335. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer.
- Gilbert, N. 2010. *Computational Social Science*. SAGE.
- Grady, S. A.; Hussaini, M. Y.; and Abdullah, M. M. 2005. Placement of wind turbines using genetic algorithms. *Renewable Energy* 30(2):259 – 270.
- Jaffar, J., and Maher, M. J. 1994. Constraint logic programming: A survey. *Journal of Logic Programming* 19/20:503–581.
- Matthews, R.; Gilbert, N.; Roach, A.; Polhill, G.; and Gotts, N. 2007. Agent-based land-use models: a review of applications. *Landscape Ecology* 22(10).
- Sadler, B.; Aschemann, R.; Dusik, J.; Fischer, T.; Partidario, M.; and (eds.), R. V. 2010. *Handbook of Strategic Environmental Assessment*. Earthscan.
- Shen, K., and Schimpf, J. 2005. Eplex: Harnessing mathematical programming solvers for constraint logic programming. In van Beek, P., ed., *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming - CP 2005*, volume 3709 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 622–636. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Sorensen, J. C., and Moss, M. L. 1973. Procedures and programs to assist in the impact statement process. Technical report, Univ. of California, Berkeley.

Troitzsch, K. G.; Mueller, U.; Gilbert, G. N.; and Doran, J. 1999. Social science microsimulation. *J. Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 2(1).

Vennekens, J.; Verbaeten, S.; and Bruynooghe, M. 2004. Logic programs with annotated disjunctions. In Demoen, B., and Lifschitz, V., eds., *International Conference on Logic Programming*, volume 3131 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 195–209. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.