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Abstract—Currently, many companies still use manual in doing any one of them is an office job CV. Independent cooperative. Based on the results of research on the CV. Koperasi Mandiri to determine the best customer still does not have a conventional and special methods and are less effective. Based on the results of this research make customer Election Decision Support System Best with ELECTRE method. Where the method ELECTRE perform testing based on criteria sort by value and ranking obtained using pairwise comparison of alternatives based on any appropriate criteria.
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1. Introduction

Advances in information technology is growing in all aspects of life in its application can facilitate the job of man, and the more opportunities and challenges within an organization or company to obtain its objectives. One important factor that is fundamental to achieve the goal of a company is the role of the Human Resources (HR) quality and high performance that was instrumental in the company to achieve the objective, therefore, companies need to know and evaluate how much potential Human Resources owned and continually strive to improve the quality of Human Resources (HR), which can be measured from the performance appraisal customer to choose the best customers.

CV. Koperai Mandirione of the lending and borrowing located at Jl. Pemasyarakat cape gusta Terrain Yang has customers with an unlimited number. In the selection of the best in the Company's customers obtained by the assessment team that is a leader directly based on criteria specified by the Company. The problems that exist in the company to determine client selection best is conventional and does not have special methods to resolve this problem and selection of election nasaah best is still less effective, so the authors would like to help in the process of data processing will be constructed decision support system for client selection the best method ELECTRE.

2. Theory

2.1 Decision Support Systems (DSS)

McLeod DSS is a system producing information aimed at a problem that must be made by the manager, untukkmempermudahpekerjakaryawan. (Dr.Heny Pratiwi 2016). Moore and Chang (2014), CMS can be described as a system capable of supporting the data analysis and decision modeling, decision-oriented, the orientation of future planning and are used at times of unusual .. Radiant and colleagues (2016) DSS is an interactive system which supported the decision in the decision making process through alternatives derived from the processing of data, information and design of the model.

2.2 Methods ELECTRE

ELECTREis one of multiple criteria decision making method based on the concept of outranking using pairwise comparison of alternatives based on any appropriate criteria. (Dr.Heny Pratiwi, 2016). The procedure is done to solve the problem using ELECTRE method is as follows

a. Normalizing the decision matrix.

In this step, each attribute is converted into value xij can be done with the formula:

\[ r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{x_{ij}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} r_{kj}^2}} \]

for i = 1,2,3, ..., m and j = 1,2,3, ..., n.

Thus obtained R result of normalization,

\[ R = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \cdots & r_{1n} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} & \cdots & r_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{m1} & r_{m2} & \cdots & r_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \]
b. Weighted matrix that has been normalized.

Once normalized, each column of the matrix $R$ multiplied by the weights $w$ specified by the decision maker. Thus, the normalized weighted matrix is $V = RW$ written as:

$$
V = RW
$$

Where $W$ is:

$$
W = \begin{bmatrix}
w_1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
0 & w_2 & \ldots & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & w_n
\end{bmatrix}
$$

$c.$ Determining the set of concordance and disordance index.

For each pair of alternatives $k$ and $l$ ($k, l = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, m$ and $k \neq l$) collect $J$ criteria are divided into two subsets, namely concordance and disordance. An alternative criteria in including concordance if:

$$
C_{kl} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } v_{kj} \geq v_{lj} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots n \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

Instead, complementary subsets of concordance is set disordance, namely when:

$$
D_{kl} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } v_{kj} < v_{lj} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots n \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

d. Calculating the matrix concordance and disordance

1) Counting concordance

To determine the value of the elements in concordance matrix is by adding weights are included in the set of concordance, is mathematical is as follows:

$$
C_{kl} = \sum_{j \in C_{kl}} W_j
$$

2) Calculating the matrix disordance

To determine the value of the elements in the matrix disordance is by dividing the maximum difference of criteria which included into subsets disordance with a maximum difference in the value of all the criteria, it mathematically is as follows:

$$
D_{kl} = \frac{\max(\|v_{kj} - v_{lj}\|_{j \in D_{kl}})}{\max(\|v_{kj} - v_{lj}\|_{j})}
$$

3) Determine the dominant matrix of concordance and disordance

e. Calculating the dominant matrix concordance

The matrix $F$ as dominant concordance matrix can be constructed with the aid of a threshold value, ie by comparing each value of the matrix element concordance with the threshold value.

$$
C_{kl} \geq \xi
$$

With a threshold value ($\xi$) are:

$$
C = \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{m} C_{kl}
$$

So that the matrix elements $F$ is determined as follows:

$$
f_{kl} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } C_{kl} \geq C \\
0 & \text{if } C_{kl} < C
\end{cases}
$$

Calculating the dominant matrix disordance

Matrix $G$ sebegai disordance dominant matrix can be constructed with the aid of a threshold value:

$$
D = \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{m} D_{kl}
$$

And elements of the matrix $G$ is determined as follows:

$$
g_{kl} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } D_{kl} \geq d \\
0 & \text{if } D_{kl} < d
\end{cases}
$$

f. Determining aggregate matrix dominance.

Specifying $E$ as aggregate dominance matrix is a matrix which each element is the multiplication between the matrix elements $F$ with the corresponding elements of the matrix $G$, mathematically can be expressed as:

$$
e_{kl} = f_{kl} g_{kl}
$$

g. The elimination of the less favorable alternative.

The matrix $E$ gives the preferred order of each alternative, namely when $e_{kl} = 1$ then the alternative is better than the alternative. Thus, rows in a matrix $E$ which has the fewest number $= 1$ can be eliminated. Thus, the best alternative is that dominates other alternatives.$A_k A_l e_{kl}$
3. Analysis

Client selection best discussion stage on the CV. Koperasi Mandiri, first is to determine and plan the criteria for the selection of the best customers in accordance with the respective alternatives.

ELECTRE method considers all the criteria are criteria of profit, therefore, in this case, then all the criteria considered criteria profits. Here are the best customer criteria shown in Table 1.

| No. | Code | Criteria name   |
|-----|------|----------------|
| 1   | C1   | Net of credit  |
| 2   | C2   | Total loans    |
| 3   | C3   | Income         |
| 4   | C4   | security       |

Rating determine the suitability of each alternative on each criterion, rated with one to five, namely: 1 = very poor 2 = 3 = 4 = Pretty Good 5 = Very good. The table below shows the rating the suitability of each alternative on each criterion. rating suitability for each criterion are shown in Table 2 to Table 6.

| No. | Scale | Score | Information |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|
| 1   | 0-45  | 1     | Very bad    |
| 2   | 46-55 | 2     | Bad         |
| 3   | 56-65 | 3     | Enough      |
| 4   | 66-75 | 4     | Well        |

| No. | Scale | Score | Information |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|
| 1   | 0-45  | 1     | Very bad    |
| 2   | 46-55 | 2     | Bad         |
| 3   | 56-65 | 3     | Enough      |
| 4   | 66-75 | 4     | Well        |
| 5   | 76-100| 5     | Very good   |

| No. | Scale | Score | Information |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|
| 1   | 0-45  | 1     | Very bad    |
| 2   | 46-55 | 2     | Bad         |
| 3   | 56-65 | 3     | Enough      |
| 4   | 66-75 | 4     | Well        |
| 5   | 76-100| 5     | Very good   |

| No. | Scale | Score | Information |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|
| 1   | 0-45  | 1     | Very bad    |
| 2   | 46-55 | 2     | Bad         |
| 3   | 56-65 | 3     | Enough      |
| 4   | 66-75 | 4     | Well        |
| 5   | 76-100| 5     | Very good   |
In this study, the sample data used as an alternative best prospective customer to perform manual calculations with ELECTRE methods. In the selection of the best customers and showed the value of each alternative on the criteria of each sample are shown in Table 7.

Table 7.

| Alternatives | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 A1         | 5  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 2  |
| 2 A2         | 4  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4  |
| 3 A3         | 4  | 4  | 3  | 3  | 4  |
| 4 A4         | 2  | 4  | 3  | 3  | 4  |

The stages in the process of ELECTRE are steps in the run using ELECTRE methods are:

a. **Normalization Decision Matrix**

At this stage of the normalization of the decision matrix as in equation (2.1).

- \( R_{11} = \frac{10}{11} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{1i} = \frac{5}{5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{1i} = 0.6402 \)
- \( R_{21} = \frac{10}{21} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{2i} = \frac{4}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{2i} = 0.5121 \)
- \( R_{31} = \frac{10}{31} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{3i} = \frac{4}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{3i} = 0.5121 \)
- \( R_{41} = \frac{10}{41} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{4i} = \frac{2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{4i} = 0.2561 \)
- \( R_{12} = \frac{10}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{5i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{5i} = 0.3974 \)
- \( R_{22} = \frac{10}{22} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{6i} = \frac{4}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{6i} = 0.5298 \)
- \( R_{32} = \frac{10}{32} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{7i} = \frac{4}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{7i} = 0.5298 \)
- \( R_{42} = \frac{10}{42} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{8i} = \frac{4}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{8i} = 0.5298 \)
- \( R_{13} = \frac{10}{13} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{9i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{9i} = 0.5 \)
- \( R_{23} = \frac{10}{23} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{10i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{10i} = 0.5 \)
- \( R_{33} = \frac{10}{33} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{11i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{11i} = 0.5 \)
- \( R_{43} = \frac{10}{43} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{12i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{12i} = 0.5 \)
- \( R_{14} = \frac{10}{14} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{13i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{13i} = 0.4575 \)
- \( R_{24} = \frac{10}{24} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{14i} = \frac{4}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{14i} = 0.610 \)
- \( R_{34} = \frac{10}{34} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{15i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{15i} = 0.4575 \)
- \( R_{44} = \frac{10}{44} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{16i} = \frac{3}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{16i} = 0.4575 \)
- \( R_{15} = \frac{10}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{17i} = \frac{2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{5} X_{17i} = 0.2774 \)
R25 = \( \frac{X_{25}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i5}} = \frac{4}{721} = 0.5475 \)

R35 = \( \frac{X_{35}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i5}} = \frac{4}{721} = 0.5475 \)

R45 = \( \frac{X_{45}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i5}} = \frac{4}{721} = 0.5475 \)

From the above calculation matrix obtained as follows:

\[
R = \begin{bmatrix}
0.64020,39740,50,45750,2774 \\
0.51210,52980,5,0.61,0.5475 \\
0.25610,52980,50,45750,5475
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Table 8

| No. | Alternative | C1   | C2   | C3   | C4   | C5   |
|-----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1   | A1          | .6402| .3974| 0.5  | .4575| .2774|
| 2   | A2          | .5121| .5298| 0.5  | 0.61 | .5547|
| 3   | A3          | .5121| .5298| 0.5  | .4575| .5547|
| 4   | A4          | .2561| .5298| 0.5  | .4575| .5547|

Then the user will be determining the weights for each criterion. Examples of weight values that the user entered example is as follows:

Table 9

| Criteria | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|
| weight   | 5  | 2  | 4  | 2  | 5  |

b. Weighting On That Has Normalized Matrix

Unknown Weight possessed of every individual - each criterion with equation (2.2) are:

\[
W = (5, 2, 4, 2, 5)
\]

\[
V11 = R \times W = 0.6402 \times 5 = 3,2009
\]

\[
V21 = R \times W = 0.5121 \times 5 = 2,5607
\]

\[
V31 = R \times W = 0.5121 \times 5 = 2,5607
\]

\[
V41 = R \times W = 0.2561 \times 5 = 1,2804
\]

\[
V12 = R \times W = 0.3974 \times 2 = 0.7947
\]

\[
V22 = R \times W = 0.5298 \times 2 = 1.0596
\]

\[
V32 = R \times W = 0.5298 \times 2 = 1.0596
\]

\[
V42 = R \times W = 0.5298 \times 2 = 1.0596
\]

\[
V13 = R \times W = 0.5 \times 4 = 2
\]

\[
V23 = R \times W = 0.5 \times 4 = 2
\]

\[
V33 = R \times W = 0.5 \times 4 = 2
\]

\[
V43 = R \times W = 0.5 \times 4 = 2
\]

\[
V14 = R \times W = 0.4575 \times 2 = 0.915
\]

\[
V24 = R \times W = 0.61 \times 2 = 1.220
\]

\[
V34 = R \times W = 0.4575 \times 2 = 0.915
\]

\[
V44 = R \times W = 0.4575 \times 2 = 0.915
\]

\[
V15 = R \times W = 0.2774 \times 5 = 1.3868
\]

\[
V25 = R \times W = 0.5547 \times 5 = 2.7735
\]

\[
V35 = R \times W = 0.5547 \times 5 = 2.7735
\]

\[
V45 = R \times W = 0.5547 \times 5 = 2.7735
\]

From the above calculation matrix obtained as follows:

\[
V = \begin{bmatrix}
3,20090,794720,9151,38681 \\
2,56071,059620,1220,7735 \\
2,56071,059620,9152,7735 \\
1,82041,059620,9152,7735
\end{bmatrix}
\]

c. Determine the Association of Concordance and Discordance on Index
1) **Concordance**
   An alternative criteria in including a concordance to the equation (2.3):
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   C_{12} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{1, 3\} \\
   C_{13} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{1, 3, 4\} \\
   C_{14} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{21} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{23} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{24} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{31} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{32} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{1, 2, 3, 5\} \\
   C_{34} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{41} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   C_{42} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 3, 5\} \\
   C_{43} &= \{j, j \succ v_1 \succ v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 3, 4, 5\} \\
   \end{align*}
   \]

2) **Discordance**
   An alternative criteria in including Discordance in equation (2.4).
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   D_{12} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 4, 5\} \\
   D_{13} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 5\} \\
   D_{14} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = \{2, 5\} \\
   D_{21} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (1) \\
   D_{23} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (0) \\
   D_{24} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (0) \\
   D_{31} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (1) \\
   D_{32} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (4) \\
   D_{34} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (0) \\
   D_{41} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (1) \\
   D_{42} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (1, 4) \\
   D_{43} &= \{j, j \prec v_1 \prec v_2 j\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5 = (1) \\
   \end{align*}
   \]

\[d.\] **Calculating Matrix Concordance and Discordance**

1) **Calculating Matrix Concordance**
   Counting concodance matrix in equation (2.5).
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   C_{12} &= w_1 + w_3 = 5 + 4 = 9 \\
   C_{13} &= w_1 + w_3 + w_4 = 5 + 4 + 2 = 11 \\
   C_{14} &= w_1 + w_3 + w_4 = 5 + 4 + 2 = 11 \\
   C_{21} &= w_2 + w_3 + w_5 = 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 13 \\
   C_{23} &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 5 + 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 18 \\
   C_{24} &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 5 + 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 18 \\
   C_{31} &= w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 13 \\
   C_{32} &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_5 = 5 + 2 + 4 + 5 = 16 \\
   C_{34} &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 5 + 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 18 \\
   C_{41} &= w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 13 \\
   C_{42} &= w_2 + w_3 + w_5 = 2 + 4 + 5 = 11 \\
   C_{43} &= w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 2 + 4 + 2 + 5 = 13 \\
   \end{align*}
   \]

From the above calculation matrix obtained as follows:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
9 & 1 & 1 \\
13 & 18 & 18 \\
13 & 16 & 16 \\
13 & 11 & 13 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

2) **Calculating Matrix Discordance**
   Calculating the discordance matrix in equation 2.6.
   \[
   \begin{align*}
   D_{12} &= \max \{0, 0.795 - 1.060; 0.915 - 1.220; 1.387 - 2.774\} \\
   &= 1 \\
   D_{13} &= \max \{0.795 - 1.060; 0.915 - 1.220; 1.387 - 2.774\} \\
   &= 1 \\
   D_{14} &= \max \{0.795 - 1.060; 0.915 - 1.220; 1.387 - 2.774\} \\
   &= 0.722 \\
   \end{align*}
   \]
D21 = \max \{ (2,561-3,201) \}
= 0,462
D23 = \max \{ (2,561-2,561) \}
= 0
D24 = \max \{ (2,561-1,200) \}
= 0
D31 = \max \{ (2,561-3,201) \}
= 0,462
D32 = \max \{ (2,561-2,561) \}
= 1
D34 = \max \{ (2,561-1,200) \}
= 0
D41 = \max \{ (1,280-3,201) \}
= 1
D42 = \max \{ (1,280-2,561) \}
= 1
D43 = \max \{ (1,280-2,561) \}
= 1

From the above calculation matrix obtained as follows:

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 0,772 \\
0,462 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1,1 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

e. Calculating Matrix Dominant Concordance and Discordance

1) Calculating Matrix Dominant Concordance

Concordance Dominant Matrices calculate according to the equation (2.7)

Value Threshold (c) are:

\[
\leq = \frac{9 + 11 + 11 + 13 + 18 + 18 + 13 + 16 + 18 + 13 + 11 + 13}{4(4-1)} = \frac{117}{12} = 13,7
\]

Thus obtained matrix as follows ::

\[
F = \begin{bmatrix}
-0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & -1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

b. Calculating Matrix Dominant Discordance

Calculate Discordance Dominant Matrices according to the equation (2.11) Thus obtained matrix as follows:

\[
\leq = \frac{1 + 1 + 1 + 0,722 + 0,462 + 0 + 0 + 0,462 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1}{4(4-1)} = \frac{7,645}{12} = 0,637
\]

f. Determining aggregate Dominance Matrix

General formula for members of the dominant aggregate matrix according to the equation (2.12).

\[
E12 = FKL \times GKL = 0 \times 0 = 0 \\
E13 = FKL \times GKL = 1 \times 1 = 1 \\
E14 = FKL \times GKL = 1 \times 1 = 1 \\
E21 = FKL \times GKL = 0 \times 0 = 0 \\
E24 = FKL \times GKL = 1 \times 0 = 0 \\
E31 = FKL \times GKL = 0 \times 0 = 0 \\
E32 = FKL \times GKL = 1 \times 1 = 1 \\
E34 = FKL \times GKL = 1 \times 0 = 0
\]
Thus obtained aggregate dominant matrix

\[
E = \begin{bmatrix}
-0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & -0 \\
0 & 0 & -0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

g. **Alternative Elimination Less Favorable**

The matrix \( E \) gives the order of selection of each alternative, i.e., when \( E_{kl} A_k = 1 \) then the alternative is a better alternative than \( A_l \). Thus, rows in a matrix \( E \) which has a number \( E_{kl} = 1 \) at least be in the elimination. Thus the first line, second, and fourth lines can be eliminated and the remaining third. Rated \( E_{32} = 1 \) indicates that the third alternative is better than the alternative of unity, second, and fourth. So that the decision makers will take the third alternative (3).

4. **Design**

![Fig 1. Use Case](image)

5. **Conclusion**

Under the background of the research is to find problems in the CV. Cooperative Independent difficult to determine the best customers. So with that penulisan offers a method of decision-making system with ELECTRE method. Based on the results of the implementation and testing system in ELECTRE Decision Pendukukung able melesaikan problem of selecting the best customers. In this system uses four customers in each test - each acquire a different value - different and still define two customers liveable best customers based on the ranking that was obtained from the calculation system.

6. **Reference**

[1] Deni Adhar. 2014. “Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Pengangkatan Jabatan nasabah pada PT. AYN dengan metode Profile Matching” Jurnal Teknik Informatika dan Sistem Informasi. Vol.2. No.1 September. 2014. STMIK Potensi Utama”. Bandung: Teknik Informatika UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung.

[2] Faisal Faruq. 2017. “Aplikasi Informasi Akademik Berbasis Web di SMP Negeri 2 Baleendah” Journal e-Proceeding of Applied science. Vol.3. No.3. Desember 2017. Universitas Telkom.

[3] Fanny Andalia. Eko Budi. “Pengembangan Sistem Informasi pengelolahan Datya Mencari Kerja pada Dinas Sosial dan Tenaga Kerja kota Padang” Jurnal Ilmiah Komputer dan Informatika. Vol.4. no. 2. Oktober 2015. Universitas Komputer Indonesia

[4] Kusrini. 2007. “Konsep dan Aplikasi Sistem Pendukung Keputusan” Ed.1. Yogyaktra (cv. Andi).
[5]  Linda Marlinda. 2016 “Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Tempat Wisata Yogyakarta menggunakan Metode Elimination Etchoix Traduisant Realita (ELECTRE). Jurnal Teknik Informatika. Amik Bina Sarana Informatika.

[6]  Muchammad Ressa Fariski. 2017. “Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap nasabah Medis” Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen. Vol.6. No.5. Mei 2017.

[7]  Pratiwi, Heny. 2016. “Sistem Pendukung Keputusan” Ed.1. Samarinda. DEepublish (CV.Budi utama).

[8]  Putri Ariani, dkk. 2016. “Pengembangan Sistem Pendukung Keputusan dengan Metode Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) untuk memberikan rekomendasi Properti di kabupaten Buleleng”, kumpulan Artikel Mahasiswa Pendidikan Teknik Informatika (KARMAPATI). Vol. 5. No.2. Tahun 2016. Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

[9]  Radiant V. Imbar, dkk. 2016. “Sistem Pendukung Keputusan penerima beasiswa dengan metode Simple Additive Weighting (Studi Kasus di fakultas Teknologi Informasi U.K.Maranatha)”. Jurnal Teknik Informatika dan Sistem Informasi. Vol.2. No.3. Desember. 2016. Universitas Kristen Maranatha.

[10]  Satriawaty Mallu. 2015. “Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Penentuan nasabah Kontrak menjadi nasabah Tetap Menggunakan Metode Topsis. Jurnal Ilmiah Teknologi Informasi Terapan Vol.1. No. 2. April 2015. STMIK Profesional.

[11]  Wildan Fauzi. 2016. ‘Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Penerima Bantuan Dana Rutilahu dengan menggunakan Metode ELECTRE” Seminar Nasional Teknologi Informatika Informasi dan Komunikasi. Universitas Lendral Jawa Baraty.