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## Revenue Management In an Airline

- What is Revenue Management? An introduction to Revenue Management Systems


## Optimization in Revenue Management

- The OR techniques behind the screens


## Revenue Management In an Airline

- What is revenue management? An introduction to Revenue Management Systems


## A first example of Revenue Management

The value of a seat to go from Paris to Rome depends on the departure date

Your departure flight: Paris to Rome

| Friday 18 <br> November | Saturday 19 <br> November | Sunday 20 <br> November | Monday 21 <br> November | Tuesday 22 November | Wednesday 23 <br> November | Thursday 24 <br> November |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { From } \\ & 283 € \end{aligned}$ | From 76 € | From 76 € | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From } \\ & 192 € \end{aligned}$ | From 76 € | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From } \\ & 102 € \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From } \\ & 102 € \end{aligned}$ |

Your return flight: Rome to Paris

| Sunday 27 |
| :---: |
| November |
| From |
| $64 €$ |
|  |


| Monday 28 |
| :---: |
| November |
| From |
| $90 €$ |
| 0 |


| Tuesday 29 <br> November |
| :---: |
| From |
| $64 €$ |
| $\odot$ |


Saturday 3
December
From
$\mathbf{6 4}$ €
0

$$
\text { Total amount including taxes for } 1 \text { Adult passenger(s) : }
$$

140 €

## A second example of Revenue Management

 Even on the same flight prices may differ| Op. Flights | Depart |  | Aircraft | Tango Plus | Latitude | $\frac{\text { Esecutive First }}{\text { Lowest }}$ | Executive First Flexible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direct Flights |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) AC871 | 13:25 | 14:50 | 77w | $\bigcirc ¢ 215$ | O€ 1125 | ¢ $£ 1556$ | $\bigcirc ¢ 2677$ |
| Cabin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any time change fee |  |  |  | will apply | may apply | may apply | free |
| Same day airport change fee |  |  |  | \$100 CAD | free | free | free |
| Miles accumulated |  |  |  | 100\% | 100\% | 125\% | 150\% |
| Priority check-in |  |  |  |  | applies | applies | applies |
| Access to airport lounge |  |  |  | \$65 CAD | \$55 CAD | applies | applies |

Products offered by Air Canada to go from Paris to Montreal on November 21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$
Source: Air Canada website, request made on November 11 ${ }^{\text {th }} 2011$

## Revenue Management objective and means

Selling the right seat, to the right person at the right moment

Revenue Management determines product availability

- How many seats to protect on each flight, for each product, against what price, at each point in time?

To maximize network-wide revenue

- Protect seats for business passengers who bring high value and book late
- A connecting passenger brings a lower value than two non-stop passengers
- One connecting passenger brings another value than another connecting

Dealing with uncertainty

- Seats correspond to a fixed amount of perishable resources
- Demand is uncertain and each empty seat will be a loss of revenue (spoilage)

Operations Research models are needed to solve this complex problem


Global net profit of commercial airlines, in billions USD, and EBIT margin Source: ICAO data

Price elasticity in demand
By offering only one fare, some revenue potential is lost


AF/ KLim

Segmentation of demand
By offering several fares, revenue can be increased



59 arrivals (medium haul) \& 21 departures (long haul)

$$
I
$$

1319 possible Origin-Destination paths
$\Rightarrow$ To which paths should seats be offered and by which quantity?


The bid-price is a financial quantity: it represents the minimum value required to book the next sellable seat on any given flight


| Network | Deciding airline schedule: destinations, frequencies, timetable |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pricing | Defining fares and restriction |
| Distribution sales | Developing markets and sales |
| Revenue Mngt | Optimizing revenue obtained from the seat inventory |

## Reservation and inventory systems

Complex systems are needed to answer customer requests in real-time

Customers book through reservation systems (like www.airfrance.fr)

- These reservation systems must offer fares in a split second to every request

A centralized inventory system answers availability requests


## 15 <br> A Revenue Management System in an airline <br> A quick overview



## Optimization in Revenue Management

- The basic techniques behind the screens



A319 «La Navette»
Capacity $=142$ seats

Without RM: « $1^{\text {st }}$ come $1^{\text {st }}$ served » Revenue = $10224 €(142 \times 72)$

Simple RM: « Protect 40 Y seats »
Revenue $=16264 €(40 \times 223+102 \times 72)$

But in real life demand is not deterministic...

Sensitivity to restrictions:
$\rightarrow$ Advance Purchase
$\rightarrow$ Non Refundable Fare
$\rightarrow$ Week-end Stay...
=> independant demand model


Demand distribution can be Poisson or Gaussian...

## Demand unconstraining

Demand observation is incomplete because of class closures



## 21 <br> Optimization - static single-resource models

## Main assumptions

- Demands for different classes are independent
- Demand for different classes arrives in non-overlapping intervals
- Demand arrives in order of increasing class prices
- Demand for given class does not depend on availability of other classes
- No group bookings


## 22

## Littlewood's model

Optimal solution for two classes

## Littlewood hypothesis

- Static single resources hypothesis
- Capacity is C
- There are two products with associated prices $p_{1}>p_{2}$ and demands $D_{1} \& D_{2}$


## Littlewood's model

- Expected revenue of seat $x$ if we sell it to class 1 is: $p_{1} . P\left(D_{1} \geq x\right)$
- So the protection level $y_{1}$ for class 1 should be such that:
- $p_{2}<p_{1} \cdot P\left(D_{1} \geq y_{1}\right)$
- $p_{1} \cdot P\left(D_{1} \geq\left(y_{1}+1\right)\right) \leq p_{2}$


## EMSRa heuristic

## Computing seat protections using Littlewood's model

- Class 1 from class $2\left(\mathrm{~S}_{12}\right)$
- Class 1 from class $3\left(\mathrm{~S}_{13}\right)$ \& class 2 from class $3\left(\mathrm{~S}_{23}\right)$
- Class 1 from class $N\left(S_{1 N}\right) \& \ldots$ \& class $N-1$ from class $N\left(S_{N-1 N}\right)$


## Sum protections and deduce booking limits

- $\mathrm{BL}_{1}=$ capacity
- $\mathrm{BL}_{2}=$ capacity $-\mathrm{S}_{12}$
- $\mathrm{BL}_{3}=$ capacity $-\left(\mathrm{S}_{13}+\mathrm{S}_{23}\right)$
- $B L_{N}=$ capacity $-\left(\sum_{(i<N)} S_{i N}\right)$


## EMSRa is a heuristic

- It ignores the statistical averaging effect obtained by aggregating demand across classes

Define joint classes

- Class 1 mean $m_{1}$ with standard deviation $\sigma_{1}$ and fare $F_{1}$
- Classes 1 to $2 \quad m_{1.2}=m_{1}+m_{2} ; \sigma_{1.2}=\sqrt{ }\left(\sigma^{2}{ }_{1}+\sigma^{2}{ }_{2}\right) ; F_{1.2}=\left(m_{1} F_{1}+m_{2} F_{2}\right) / m_{12}$
- Classes 1 to N-1 $\quad m_{1 . . \mathrm{N}-1}=\sum_{(i<N)} m_{i} ; \sigma_{1 . . \mathrm{N}-1}=\sqrt{ }\left(\sum_{(i<N)} \sigma_{1}^{2}\right) ; F_{1 . . \mathrm{N}-1}=\left(\sum_{(i<N)} m_{i} F_{i}\right) / m_{1 . . \mathrm{N}-1}$

Computing seat protections using Littlewood's model

- Classes 1 to $k-1$ from class $k\left(S_{1 . k-1 / k}\right)$

Deduce booking limits

- $B L_{k}=$ capacity $-S_{1 . . k-1 / k}$

EMSRb is also a heuristic

- The weighted average revenue is an approximation


## Optimization - network model

## Definition of variables

$X_{j} \quad$ allocation of capacity for O\&D fare class $j$
$r_{j} \quad$ price for fare class $j$
$d_{j} \quad$ mean demand for fare class $j$
$c_{k} \quad$ capacity of leg $k$
$\partial_{j, k} \quad 1$ if O\&D fare class $j$ uses leg $k$

## Writing down the Linear Program

- Objective: maximize revenue
- Constraints: capacity and demand constraints

$$
\begin{array}{ccl}
\operatorname{Max} & \sum_{j} r_{j} * X_{j} \\
\text { s.t. } & \left\{\begin{array}{ccl}
\sum_{j \in k} \partial_{j, k} X_{j} \leq c_{k}, & \forall k & \begin{array}{l}
\text { The bid-prices are the dual values } \\
\text { corresponding to the capacity contraints }
\end{array} \\
0 \leq X_{j} \leq d_{j}, & \forall j
\end{array}\right.
\end{array}
$$

## 26

Dynamic Programming models for the single-resource problem
The decision are taken on very small time-frames


Time to departure is divided in many small time-frames

- such that the probability of having more than one request per time frame is negligible

The maximal expected revenue can be computed for each time-frame

- Say $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the maximal revenue the company can expect when there are $\mathbf{x}$ seats remaining in time frame $t$
- As shown next, if $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{t}-1}(\mathrm{x})$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{t}-1}(\mathrm{x}-1)$ are known, it is possible to compute $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathrm{x})$. It is therefore possible to recursively compute $V_{t}(x)$ for any given ( $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{x}$ ).


The Bellman equation

| Fare Class | $P_{\mathrm{j}}$ Prob. of request in $\mathrm{FC} \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{TF} \mathrm{t}$ | Revenue if request is accepted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{P}_{1, \mathrm{t}}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{t}}$ |
| f | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}, \mathrm{t}}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{0, \mathrm{t}}$ |
| 0 | $V_{t}(x)=\sum_{f=1}^{N} p_{f, t} \max \left\{V_{t-1}(x-1)+r_{f} ; V_{t-1}(x)\right\}+p_{0, t} V_{t-1}(x)$ |  |



$$
V_{t}(x)=\sum_{f=1}^{N} p_{f, t}{\max \left\{V_{t-1}(x-1)+r_{f} ; V_{t-1}(x)\right\}+p_{0, t} V_{t-1}(x)}_{\substack{\text { Probability of request } \\ \text { \& no arri } \\ \text { in class } f \text { at time } t}}^{\longrightarrow \text { Revenue for class } f}
$$



## 30 <br> Dynamic Programming models for the network problem The curse of dimensionality

Exact problems are hard to solve at network level...

$$
\begin{aligned}
& V(X, t)=\sum_{f=1}^{N} p_{f, t} \max \left\{V\left(X-A_{f}, t-1\right)+r_{f} ; V(X, t-1)\right\}+p_{0, t} V(X, t-1) \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { Vector of remaining } \\
\text { capacities on each } \\
\text { flight leg }
\end{array}
\end{aligned} \longrightarrow \begin{gathered}
\text { Flight leg utilization } \\
\text { of O\&D product } f
\end{gathered}
$$

...so decomposition heuristics are used instead.

1200 aircraft movements / day (2000 cabins) 300 seats per cabin 500 timeframes Problem size $=500$ * $300^{2000}$ states

# Thank you for your attention 

Thierry Vanhaverbeke
thvanhaverbeke@airfrance.fr

