# 16. Similarity Feasibility Analysis Of Naval Base Relocation Using Swot And Ahp Method To Support Main Duties Operation

*By* Okol Sri Suharyo

# FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS OF NAVAL BASE RELOCATION
# USING SWOT AND AHP METHOD
# TO SUPPORT MAIN DUTIES OPERATION

**Putu YOGI***
**Okta RIZAL***
**AHMADI***
**Okol S. SUHARYO***

*Indonesian Naval Technology College, STTAL,
Bumimoro-Morokrembangan, Surabaya 60187, Indonesia

*Naval Base as part of Integrated Fleet Weapon System has an important role in maintaining the strategic environment in the region of Indonesia. Naval Base with a strategic location will support Indonesian Navy's main duty to carry out the administrative and logistical support. Due to the limitation of Naval Base's condition, feasibility study will be required to relocate the Naval Base. In this feasibility study, a combination of methods between SWOT analysis and Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) is used. The results of the Internal Factors Evaluation (IFE) Matrix Analysis is 4.72 and External Factors Evaluation (EFE) Matrix Analysis is 2.91. In general, the balance of power between the IFE Matrix and EFE Matrix is located in Quadrants I and thus, the Aggressive Strategy is supported. While the Matrix Analysis' result of Internal - External (IE) showed that the score of IFE and EFE located in Quadrant II and VII.*

**Key words:** *Feasibility Study, Naval Base, SWOT, AHP*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a maritime country comprising over 17.000 islands. It is located between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and links Asia land with the Pacific world (1). The geo-strategic of Indonesian is a potential tool to controls several critical path across the oceans in the world (2).

Under the changing circumstances of operational environment and in the face of new security environment which is more complex and ambiguous than before, modern armies have started to look for alternatives or better options to surpass the challenge of transition in the new era (3). The prospect of declining budgets

14

and the changing geostrategic environment had also urged the Navy to change its strategy decision (4).

Therefore, to protect Indonesia's marine territory, Indonesian Navy holds a program to strengthen the defense with The Integrated Fleet Weapon System. That program consists of navy vessel, aircraft, troops (Marines) and Naval Base. As part of Integrated Fleet Weapon System, the Naval Base should be able to carry out its functions optimally to resolve cases of violations in Indonesia's marine territory (5). One of the Indonesian Navy strategic plans in the dynamics of change is to relocate the Naval Base into a better place because the current condition of the Naval Base is still lacking

the ability to carry out its duties.

The feasibility study on the relocation of the Naval Base is carried out by doing an investigation the areas and supporting facilities in terms of technical and strategic aspects along with interviewing Indonesian Navy's officer. The technical aspects of a port include Hinterland/ Area of Influence aspect and Geography and Oceanography aspect (6). Geographically, military also considers of militarism perspective and spatial perspective (7). This is because globalization and economic power are worthless without the existence of military (8). A strategic position is an important element for the operation of a concept (9).



**Fig. no. 1.** *Map of the Indonesian Naval Main Base*

Strategic Decisions (SD) are made based on the special characteristics of the decision (both the perceived characteristics and typology objectives strategic decisions) which is part of the management leadership characteristics and has contextual factors refer to the external and internal environment (10). The purpose of this feasibility study is to provide a more realistic perspective from key decision makers in decision making process (11). This study is necessary to determine the effectiveness and to manage the risks of some system that will be used (12).

Therefore, this feasibility study to relocate the Naval Base is part of a research operation based on multi-criteria decision making (MCDM). The core of the operations research is to develop approaches for optimal decision making. A prominent class of such problems is multi-criteria decision making (MCDM). The typical MCDM problem deals with the evaluation of alternatives in a set of decision criteria (13). One way MCDM approach is to use a SWOT and AHP analysis. The combined use of the AHP and SWOT analysis has been widely used to support strategic decision-making processes (14).

SWOT analysis is an important part of feasibility study (15). A SWOT analysis is able to identify conditions, potentials, and problems with related aspects which resulted in the decision of a number of factors or variables (16). This combination can efficiently evaluate SWOT sub-criteria and thus give them priority in order to allow decision-makers to determine which of those should be given attention first (17). To obtain the scale ratio from the actual measurement or the fundamental scale that reflects the relative strength, AHP method is used (18). There are some basic principles in resolving the problems with the AHP method, namely Decomposition, Comparative Judgment, Synthesis of Priority, and Logical Consistency (19).

By combining SWOT and AHP analysis stages, the right strategies can be determined for planning the relocation of the Naval Base. Furthermore, this strategic planning can be used as a tool of organization to start and manage their strategic functions of the organization (20). This study is necessary in order for the Naval Base to function optimally and effectively. This study determines the strategic priorities of location and relocation of the Naval Base. It also provides a feasibility study for the development of Naval Base as a guideline in planning other Naval Bases and facilities in future.

Section 2 of this paper laid out the research methodology. The results are discussed in Section 3. Section 4 provides general discussion of the results, while conclusion of the study can be found in Section 5.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

SWOT and AHP integration is used for the flowchart in this research (21). SWOT provides the basic frame to perform an analysis of the decision situation, and the AHP assists in carrying out SWOT more analytical and elaborating the analysis so that alternative strategic decisions can be prioritized (22). The aim of applying the combined method is to improve the quantitative side of strategic planning (21).



**Fig. no. 2.** *Research Integration SWOT and AHP Flowchart*

### 2.1. Naval Base Environment

Naval Base is expected to be the spearhead force in carrying out the task of supporting the warships operation (23). The main duty of the Naval Base is to carry out administrative and logistical support in order to develop the concept of logistics operations support (24). The requirements of Indonesian Naval Base include Port Facility, Maintenance and Repair Facility, Supplies or Logistics Facility, Personnel Care Facility, and Training Base Facility.

**Table 1.** *Indonesian Naval Base Standard Facility*

| No. | Standard Bases of Indonesian Navy | Basic Building Coefficient |
|---|---|---|
| **Port Facility** | Capable in leaning all kinds of warships, at least one task force | 20% |
| **Maintenance and Repair Facility** | Able to carry out maintenance and repairs up to the intermediate level for all types of warships both system, weapons and platform | 10% |
| **Supplies or Logistics Facilitiy** | Able to support Class Logistics (food, individual field equipment, tools, oils, drugs) for at least one task | 10% |
| **Personnel Care Facility** | Support personnel includes: messing, medical facilities/hospital, sports and recreation facilities, religious facilities, and training facilities to at least one task force. | 30% |
| **Training Base Facility** | (1)  The Common Facilities, capable of providing office facilities and infrastructure activities on the base.<br>(2) Freight Services Facilities, able to support the transport and postal personnel by land, sea and air.<br>(3) Defense Base Facilities, capable of providing defense and security against threats from the air, sea and land as well as infiltration / sabotage. | 30% |

The others general environment which includes the socioeconomic, educational, legal– political, and cultural aspects, usually operates within a specific geographic area. The specific environment is comprised of the suppliers, distributors, government agencies, and competitors which a military organization should interact (25), including the effect of the population, political institutions, geo-culture, and others in determining the exact location (26)

## 2.2. SWOT Analysis

SWOT is a method used to analyze operational environment with a systematic approach. This analysis is also utilized for strategic planning (27). SWOT analysis is based on the logic of maximizing the Strength and Opportunities as well as minimizing the Weaknesses and Threats simultaneously (28). SWOT analysis is obtained from the identification of the conditions, potentials

and problems with aspects related to use SO (Strength Opportunity)/ Maxi-Maxi Strategy, WO (Weakness Opportunity)/Mini-Maxi Strategy, ST (Strength Threat)/Maxi-Mini Strategy, WT (Weakness Threat)/Mini-Mini Strategy(29).

**Table 2.** *SWOT Matrix*

| **SWOT Matrix** | **Strength (S)**<br>Positive internal aspects that can be controlled and can be strengthened in the planning. | **Weakness (W)**<br>The strategy of internal negative aspects that can be controlled and can be corrected in the planning. |
|---|---|---|
| **Opportunity (O)**<br>Positive external conditions that can't be controlled and can be taken advantage. | **SO Strategy**<br>Utilizing Internal strength to take advantage of external opportunities. | **WO Strategy**<br>Improving internal weaknesses by taking the clappers of external opportunities |
| **Threat (T)**<br>Negative external conditions that can't be controlled and may be minimized impact. | **ST Strategy**<br>Using force to avoid or reduce the impact of external threats | **WT Strategy**<br>Defensive tactics directed at reducing internal weaknesses and avoid external threats |

## 2.3. Stages of AHP

Additional value from SWOT analysiscanbeachievedbyperforming pair-wise comparisons between SWOT factors and analyzing them by means of eigenvalue technique as applied in AHP means of eigenvalue technique as applied in AHP (29). Relative importance weights of the SWOT factors and sub-factors were obtained by Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) model, as well as the ranking of identified strategies. It was performed by several experts (30). The stages of decision-making with AHP method are as follows:

a. Define problems and determine solutions.

b. Creating a hierarchical structure

c. Pairwise comparison matrix formed by choice or judgment of the decision maker to assess the level of importance of an element than any other element.

d. Normalize the data

e. Calculating eigen values vector and tested for consistency

f. Repeat steps 3, 4, and 5 for all levels of hierarchy.

g. Calculating eigen vector of each pairwise comparison matrix.

h. Test the consistency of the hierarchy in the form of relationship priorities as eigen vector against consistency.

If that assessment is perfect in any comparison, then $a_{ij} \cdot a_{jk} = a_{ik}$ for all, and A matrix is called consistent (21).

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ \dfrac{1}{a_1} & 1 & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \dfrac{1}{a_{1n}} & \dfrac{1}{a_{1n}} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The values of the comparison matrix A can be expressed into the following forms:

$$a_i = \frac{w_i}{w_j}; \ (i,j = 1,2,3,\cdots,n) \quad (1)$$

$$a_i \cdot \frac{w_j}{w_i} = 1; \ (i,j = 1,2,3,\cdots,n) \quad (2)$$

Consequences:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_i \cdot w_j \cdot \left(\frac{1}{w_i}\right) = 1; \ (i = 1,2,3,\cdots,n) \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_i \cdot w_j = n \cdot w_i; \ (i = 1,2,3,\cdots,n) \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) in the form of a matrix becomes.

$$A \cdot w = n \cdot w \quad (5)$$

If $Z_1$, $Z_2$, $Z_3$, ..., $Z_n$ are numbers that is in accordance with equation $A \cdot w = n \cdot w$ (Z is eigen value of $A$ matrix, and if $a_{ii} = 1$ to $i$) then an equation becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i = n \quad (6)$$

If A is a pairwise comparison matrix, to obtain the priority should be sought $w$ vector satisfying the equation.

$$A = Z_m \cdot w \quad (7)$$

Indicators of consistency measured using Consistency Index (CI) were formulated

$$c = \frac{z_m - n}{n - 1} \quad (8)$$

And for measuring the consistency of assessment is used Consistency Ratio (CR)

$$C = \frac{C}{R} \quad (9)$$

A certain level of consistency is required in determining the priority to obtain valid results. CR value should not be more than 10% or 0.10. If not then need to be revised (21). Random Index (RI) value can be seen in the following table:

**Table 3.** *Random Index (RI)*

| n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| RI | 0 | 0 | 0.58 | 0.9 | 1.12 | 1.24 | 1.32 | 1.41 | 1.45 | +1.49 | 1.51 | 1.54 | 1.56 |

### 3. NUMERICAL CALCULATION RESULT

SWOT data processing in primary data collection is done by interviewing officer of Indonesian Naval Base Facilities Services, Hydro-oceanographic Office and Naval expertise competence. The results of the interview data were processed by Expert Choice Software into criteria and weighting data in accordance with the numerical calculation.

### 3.1. Internal Criteria

**Table 4.** *Primary Data of Strengths and Weaknesses*

| No | Internal Criteria | Total Count |
|----|-------------------|-------------|
| | **Strengths** | |
| S.1 | Policy | 52 |
| S.2 | Main Duties Naval Base | 48 |
| S.3 | General Requirements of Naval Base | 47 |
| S.4 | Availability of Logistics Region | 47 |
| S.5 | Topography | 47 |
| S.6 | Classificationof Naval Base | 47 |
| S.7 | Function of Naval Base | 47 |
| S.8 | Personnel Readiness | 47 |
| | **Weaknesses** | |
| W.1 | Areas of Operation | 44 |
| W.2 | Supporting Facilities | 43 |
| W.3 | Layout Design | 43 |
| W.4 | Geology | 42 |
| W.5 | Availability of Shipyard | 40 |
| W.6 | Availability of Public Facilities | 40 |

### 3.2. External Criteria

**Table 5.** *Primary Data of Opportunities and Threats*

| No | External Criteria | Total Count |
|----|-------------------|-------------|
| | *Opportunities* | |
| O.1 | Regional Spatial | 48 |
| O.2 | Availability of Land | 47 |
| O.3 | Oceanography | 47 |
| O.4 | Sedimentation | 47 |
| O.5 | Geostrategic and Geo-economy | 47 |
| O.6 | Unit Support | 45 |
| O.7 | Availability of Public Pier | 44 |
| | *Threats* | |
| T.1 | Community Support | 38 |
| T.2 | Sailing Volume | 38 |
| T.3 | Road Access | 38 |
| T.4 | Supporting Facilities | 36 |
| T.5 | Level of Insecurity | 28 |

### 3.3. Weight Determination and Critical Value

Data processing in Critical Weight Determination and Value at AHP SWOT performed using Expert Choice Software. Furthermore, the data was presented in Excel format to determine the criteria for scale rating score.

**Table 6.** *Critical Value Weighting of SWOT Criteria*

| SWOT GROUPS | Importance of the SWOT Criteria | SWOT sub-criteria | Local importance of SWOT sub-criteria | Weight Total (N) | Score (J) | Rating score (N) x (J) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Strengths* (S) | 0.337 | 1  Policy | 0.239 | 0.081 | 52 | 4.19 |
| | | 2  Main Duties Naval Base | 0.157 | 0.053 | 48 | 2.54 |
| | | 3  General Requirements Naval Base | 0.147 | 0.050 | 47 | 2.33 |
| | | 4  Availability of Logistics Region | 0.123 | 0.041 | 47 | 1.95 |
| | | 5  Topography | 0.109 | 0.037 | 47 | 1.73 |
| | | 6  Classification of Naval Base | 0.087 | 0.029 | 47 | 1.38 |
| | | 7  Function of Naval Base | 0.081 | 0.027 | 47 | 1.28 |
| | | 8  Personnel Readiness | 0.058 | 0.020 | 47 | 0.92 |
| | | Total | 1.00 | 0.337 | | |
| *Weaknesses* (W) | 0.295 | 9  Areas of Operation | 0.244 | 0.072 | 44 | 3.17 |
| | | 10  Supporting Facilities | 0.202 | 0.060 | 43 | 2.56 |
| | | 11  Layout Design | 0.182 | 0.054 | 43 | 2.31 |
| | | 12  Geology | 0.140 | 0.041 | 42 | 1.73 |
| | | 13  Availability of Shipyard | 0.122 | 0.036 | 40 | 1.44 |
| | | 14  Availability of Public Facilities | 0.111 | 0.033 | 40 | 1.31 |
| | | Total | 1.00 | 0.295 | | |
| *Opportunities* (O) | 0.223 | 15  Regional Spatial | 0.228 | 0.051 | 48 | 2.44 |
| | | 16  Availability of Land | 0.214 | 0.048 | 47 | 2.24 |
| | | 17  Oceanography | 0.142 | 0.032 | 47 | 1.49 |
| | | 18  Sedimentation | 0.126 | 0.028 | 47 | 1.32 |
| | | 19  Geostrategic and Geo-economy | 0.123 | 0.027 | 47 | 1.29 |
| | | 20  Unit Support | 0.085 | 0.019 | 45 | 0.85 |
| | | 21  Availability of Public Pier | 0.083 | 0.019 | 44 | 0.81 |
| | | Total | 1.00 | 0.223 | | |
| Threats (T) | 0.146 | 22  Community Support | 0.291 | 0.042 | 38 | 1.61 |
| | | 23  Volume Sailing | 0.246 | 0.036 | 38 | 1.36 |
| | | 24  Road Access | 0.206 | 0.030 | 38 | 1.14 |
| | | 25  Supporting Facilities | 0.152 | 0.022 | 36 | 0.80 |
| | | 26  Level of Insecurity | 0.104 | 0.015 | 28 | 0.43 |
| | | Total | 1.00 | 0.146 | | |

## 3.3.1. Internal Factors Evaluation (IFE) Matrix Analysis

**Table 7.** *IFE Analysis*

| SWOT GROUPS Level 1 | Internal SWOT sub-criteria | Local importance | Rating | Score (2)x(3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| *Strengths (S)* | 1  Policy | 0.239 | 4.19 | 1.00 |
| | 2  Main Duties Naval Base | 0.157 | 2.54 | 0.40 |
| | 3  General Requirements of Naval Base | 0.147 | 2.33 | 0.34 |
| | 4  Availability of Logistics Region | 0.123 | 1.95 | 0.24 |
| | 5  Topography | 0.109 | 1.73 | 0.19 |
| | 6  Classification of Naval Base | 0.087 | 1.38 | 0.12 |
| | 7  Function of Naval Base | 0.081 | 1.28 | 0.10 |
| | 8  Personnel Readiness | 0.058 | 0.92 | 0.05 |
| | Total | 1.00 | | 2.45 |

| SWOT GROUPS Level 1 | Internal SWOT sub-criteria | Local importance | Rating | Score (2)x(3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Weaknesses (W) | 9  Areas of Operation | 0.244 | 3.17 | 0.77 |
| | 10 Supporting Facilities | 0.202 | 2.56 | 0.52 |
| | 11 Layout Design | 0.182 | 2.31 | 0.42 |
| | 12 Geology | 0.140 | 1.73 | 0.24 |
| | 13 Availability of Shipyard | 0.122 | 1.44 | 0.18 |
| | 14 Availability of Public Facilities | 0.111 | 1.31 | 0.15 |
| | Total | 1.00 | | 2.27 |

From the analysis above, the score of 4.72 was relatively obtained. This result was ranging in the scale of 4 and indicates that these factors are very strong in influencing internal factors of Naval Base relocations.

### 3.3.2. External Factors Evaluation (EFE) Matrix Analysis

**Table 8.** *EFE Analysis*

| SWOT GROUPS Level 1 | External SWOT sub-criteria | Local importance | Rating | Score (2)x(3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Opportunities (O) | 1  Regional Spatial | 0.228 | 2.44 | 0.56 |
| | 2  Availability of Land | 0.214 | 2.24 | 0.48 |
| | 3  Oceanography | 0.142 | 1.49 | 0.21 |
| | 4  Sedimentation | 0.126 | 1.32 | 0.17 |
| | 5  Geostrategic and Geo-economy | 0.123 | 1.29 | 0.16 |
| | 6  Unit Support | 0.085 | 0.85 | 0.07 |
| | 7  Availability of Public Pier | 0.083 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
| | Total | 1.00 | | 1.71 |
| Threats (T) | 8  Community Support | 0.291 | 1.61 | 0.47 |
| | 9  Sailing Volume | 0.246 | 1.36 | 0.33 |
| | 10 Road Access | 0.206 | 1.14 | 0.23 |
| | 11 Supporting Facilities | 0.152 | 0.80 | 0.12 |
| | 12 Level of Insecurity | 0.104 | 0.43 | 0.04 |
| | Total | 1.00 | | 1.20 |

From the analysis above, the score of 2.91 was obtained. This result is ranging in the scale of 3, indicating that these factors had a higher response above than the average in influencing external factors of Naval Base relocation..

### 3.4. Sensitivity Analysis

A sensitivity AHP analysis on the weight of the priority criteria can determine the order of priority strategy. Dynamic graph sensitivity can also be characterized as the table below.

**Fig. no. 3.** *Dynamic Graph Sensitivity to Goal*



**Fig. no. 4** *Performance Graph Sensitivity To Goal*

From the condition above, the priority Strength was 33.7% and in those conditions, the global priorities of Strength was 33.7%, then Weaknesses 29.5%, Opportunities 22.3% and Threats 14.6%.

## 4. DISCUSSION

The formulation of the Strategic Priorities from IFE and EFE matrix results, it is showed that the intersection of the four lines namely Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats factor are as follows.

Scores Strengths - Weaknesses score = 2.45 to 2.27 = 0.17

Scores Opportunity - Threat Score = 1.71 to 1.20 = 0.51

In the chart above, the data were obtained through EFI and EFE matrix. The strength comparison stands in Quadrant I and it supports The Aggressive Strategy. It is depicted in the graph below:

**Fig. no. 5.** *SWOT Analysis Graph*

## 4.1. SWOT Matrix Analysis Priority Based on AHP

**Table 9.** *SWOT Matrix Research*

| INTERNAL FACTOR / EXTERNAL FACTOR | STRENGTHS (S)<br>1. Policy<br>2. Main Duties Naval Base<br>3. General Requirements Base<br>4. Availability of Logistics Region<br>5. Topography<br>6. Classification of Naval Bases<br>7. Function of Naval Base<br>8. Personnel Readiness | WEAKNESSES (W)<br>1. Areas of Operation<br>2. Supporting Facilities<br>3. Layout Design<br>4. Geology<br>5. Availability of Shipyard<br>6. Availability of Public Facilities |
|---|---|---|
| OPPORTUNITIES (O)<br>1. Regional Spatial<br>2. Availability of Land<br>3. Oceanography<br>4. Sedimentation<br>5. Geostrategic and Geo- economy<br>6. Unit Support<br>7. Availability of Public Pier | SO STRATEGY<br><br>1. Preparation of the administration of relocation<br>2. Design Plan of Naval Base<br><br>(S1)(S2)(S5)(O2)(O3)(O4) | WO STRATEGY<br><br>1. Cooperation of area development<br>2. The establishment of economic centers<br><br>(W2)(W3)(O1)(O2)(O5) |
| THREATS (T)<br>1. Community Support<br>2. Sailing Volume<br>3. Road Access<br>4. Supporting Facilities<br>5. Level Of Insecurity | ST STRATEGY<br><br>1. Empowerment of maritime potency<br>2. Development of the surrounding area<br><br>(S2)(S7)(O1)(O2) | WT STRATEGY<br><br>1. Cooperation with local companies<br>2. Utilization of the existing contour<br>3. Implementation of routine operations.<br><br>(W2)(W3)(W6)(T1)(T2) |

## 4.2. Matrix Internal - External (I-E) Analysis



**Fig. no. 6.** *I-E Matrix*

### 4.3. Priority Strategies

S-O Strategy was selected as a priority strategy to relocate the Naval Base. This strategy can succeed by preparing the location details in advance. Furthermore, the implementation of the relocation of the Naval Base implemented according to plan with the support of local topography and oceanography state.



**Fig. no. 7.** *SWOT Hierarchy of the Priority Strategies*

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have determined the strategic factors significant to relocate Naval Base by combining the SWOT method with AHP technique. Strength and Opportunities (S-O) strategy is a strategic priority to support the relocation of the Naval Base. So that the main duties of the Naval Base can be successful, especially for warships operation in the Indonesian territory. Chart analysis of IFE and EFE matrix shows that the strategy is in Quadrant I, which supports an aggressive strategy by leveraging existing strengths and opportunities. Expectations of future research on any MCDM techniques also can use CBA (Cost Benefit Analyze) method to determine the cost of relocating Naval Base.

### Acknowledgement

### REFERENCES

[1] Tumonggor, Meryanne K, et al., et al. (2013), *The Indonesian Archipelago: An Ancient Genetic Highway Linking Asia And The Pacific,* Journal of Human Genetics, pp. 165–173;

[2] RSIS Indonesia Programme. *Indonesia's Naval Development and Maritime Cooperation,* Singapore: RSIS Policy Report (2014);

[3] Goztepe, Kerim, Dizdaroğlu, Vural and Sağıroğlu, Şeref (2015), *New Directions in Military and Security Studies: Artificial Intelligence and Military Decision Making Process.* Istanbul: International Journal of Information Security Science, pp. 69-80;

[4] Russell, Dr. James A., et al., et al. (2015), *Navy Strategy Development: Strategy in the 21st Century,* California: Naval Research Program;

[5] Santoso, Pudji, et al., et al. (2013), *The Implementation of Multi-Attribute Approach in Decision Making for Defense Sea Region Models,* Surabaya: Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology, pp. 134-141;

[6] Párragaa, Mariela Macías, Gonzalez-Cancelasa, Nicoletta and Soler-Floresa, Francisco (2014), *DELPHI- SWOT tools used in strategic planning of the Port of Manta*, ScienceDirect, pp. 129-138;

[7] Rech, Matthew, et al., et al. (2014), *Geography, military geography, and critical military studies.*, Taylor & Francis, pp. 47-60;

[8] Kuzik, Michael (2011), *A Race to the Top: Oil & Gas Exploration in the Canadian Arctic,* Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, pp. 1-24;

[9] Manhas, Parikshat S. (2010), *Strategic Brand Positioning Analysis through Comparison of Cognitive and Conative Perceptions*, Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science, pp. 15-33;

[10] Papadakis, Vassilis M., Lioukas, Spyros and Chambers, David (1998), *Strategic Decision-Making Processes: The Role Of Management And Context*, Strategic Management Journal, pp. 115-147;

[11] Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. and Zbaracki, Mark J. (1992), *Strategic Desicion Making*, Strategic Management Journal, pp. 17-37;

[12] Lark, John. (2009), *Risk management — Guidance for the implementation of ISO 31000*, Switzerland: International Trade Centre, International Organization for Standardization, United Nations Industrial Development Organization;

[13] Triantaphyllou, E., et al., et al. (1998), *Multi-Criteria Decision Making: An Operations Research Approach*, Encyclopedia of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, pp. 175-186;

[14] Yavuz, Fadim and Baycan, Tüzin (2013), *Use of SWOT and Analytic Hierarchy Process Integration as A Participatory Decision Making Tool in Watershed Management*, Procedia Technology, pp. 134 – 143;

[15] Bin, Yu. (2014), *A Novel Method of Real Estate Development Project's Feasibility Research Based on SWOT Method and Analytic Hierarchy Process*, International Journal of Business and Social Science, pp. 233-237;

[16] Kangas, Jyrki, et al., et al. (2016), *Incorporating MCDS And Voting Into SWOT – Basic Idea*, Serbian Journal of Management, pp. 1-13;

[17] Elsheikh, Yousef and Azzeh, Mohammad (2017), *Prioritize E-Government Strategies Using SWOT-Ranked Voting Analysis Technique: The Case of Jordan*, International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security, pp. 1-7;

[18] Saaty, R. W. (1987), *The Analytic Hierarchy Process-What It Is And How It Is Used*, Pergamon Journals Ltd, pp. 161-176;

[19] Saaty, Thomas L. (1990), *How to make a decision: The Analytic Hierarchy Process*, Pittsburgh: European Journal of Operational Research, pp. 9-26;

[20] Ghorbanian, Mohammad Reza, Amini, Jafar and Saboorifard, Mohammad (2015), *Evaluating and prioritizing the aspects of SWOT matrix using the statistical methods and the analytical hierarchy process (AHP) (case study: Iranian oil pipeline and telecommunication company, northwest region)*,

Journal of Scientific Research and Development, pp. 270 - 280;

[21] Gorener, Ali, Toker, Kerem and Ulucay, Korkmaz (2012), *Application of Combined SWOT and AHP: A Case Study for a Manufacturing Firm*, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, pp. 1525 – 1534;

[22] Kangas, Jyrki, et al., et al. (2001), *A'WOT: Integrating The AHP With SWOT Analysis*, Berne, Switzerland: ISAHP, 2001, Proceedings – 6th ISAHP, pp. 189 - 198;

[23] Hozairi, et al., et al. (2012), *Implementation of Intelligent Control for Optimization of Fleet Placement TNI AL Ships Using Genetic Algorithm*, Academic Research International, pp. 17- 30;

[24] Naval Studies Board. *Naval Expeditionary Logistic: Enabling Operational Maneuver From the Sea,* Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1999;

[25] Nikoua, Christodoulos and Moschurisb, Socrates J. (2012), *Final Supplier Selection System in Military Critical Items*, SPOUDAI Journal, pp. 28-46;

[26] Flores, Ricardo G and Aguilera, Ruth V. (2007), *Globalization and Location Choice: An Analysis of US Multinational Firms in 1980 and 2000*, Journal of International Business Studies, pp. 1-24;

[27] Mobaraki, Omid (2014), *Strategic Planning and Urban Development by Using The SWOT Analysis. The Case of Urmia City*, Romanian Review of Region Studies, pp. 47-54;

[28] Ayub, Arslan, et al., et al. (2013), *A Conceptual Framework On Evaluating SWOT Analysis As The Mediator In Strategic Marketing Planning Through Marketing Intelligence*, European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, pp. 91-98;

[29] Wickramasinghe, Vasantha and Takano, Shin-ei. (2009), *Application of Combined SWOT and Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) for Tourism Revival Strategic Marketing Planning: A Case of Sri Lanka Tourism*, Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, pp. 1- 16;

[30] Nikolić, Djordje, et al., et al. (2015), *SWOT - AHP Model for Prioritzation of Strategies of The Resort Stara Planina*, Serbian Journal of Management, pp. 141-150.

# 16. Similarity Feasibility Analysis Of Naval Base Relocation Using Swot And Ahp Method To Support Main Duties Operation

ORIGINALITY REPORT

# 5%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

1   Ibrahim H. Osman, Abdel Latef Anouze. "chapter 1 A Cognitive Analytics Management Framework (CAM-Part 1)", IGI Global, 2014
    Crossref                                                    44 words — 1%

2   "Chapter 3 Multi-Criteria Decision Problems", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2008
    Crossref                                                    35 words — 1%

3   Wen‑Min Lu, Qian Long Kweh, Mohammad Nourani, Jui‑Min Shih. "Major weapons procurement: An efficiency‑based approach for the selection of fighter jets", Managerial and Decision Economics, 2019
    Crossref                                                    34 words — 1%

4   Wong, L.. "Military leadership: A context specific review", The Leadership Quarterly, 200312
    Crossref                                                    30 words — 1%

5   Chang Won Lee. "An international collaboration of technology using a business roadmapping approach", International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, 2010
    Crossref                                                    15 words — < 1%

6   Syuhada A. Umar, M. Edi Armanto, Ari Siswanto, Muhammad Yazid. "Development of
                                                                15 words — < 1%

Food Agriculture Based on Superiority Cultivation Area in Tanjung Api-Api, Banyuasin District", E3S Web of Conferences, 2020
Crossref

7   Yang, Mingli, Yihui Chen, and Mushan Li. "Innovation study of comprehensive evaluation method for the college teacher based on fuzzy theory", 2010 2nd IEEE InternationalConference on Network Infrastructure and Digital Content, 2010.
Crossref

14 words — < 1%

8   Shervin Zakeri, Yingjie Yang, Melika Hashemi. "Grey strategies interaction model", Journal of Strategy and Management, 2018
Crossref

13 words — < 1%

9   Anu Rai. "Chapter 8 Management of Medical Tourism in Kolkata: Strategies and Evaluation", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2019
Crossref

11 words — < 1%

10  Romie Oktovianus Bura, I Nengah Putra Apriyanto, Arica Dwi Susanto. "Analysis of installation of ducted propeller (kort nozzle) on cargo ship after maintenance", International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 2019
Crossref

10 words — < 1%

11  Amin Padash, Ali Rajabzadeh Ghatari. "Toward an Innovative Green Strategic Formulation Methodology: Empowerment of Corporate Social, Health, Safety and Environment", Journal of Cleaner Production, 2020
Crossref

8 words — < 1%