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Yield/Revenue Management

Pricing:

Determining the number and type of fares available in each market.

Reservations Control:

Determining how much of each product to sell.
Seat Inventory Control

Traditionally:

Practice of allocating seats to different fare classes.

Benefits:

- Increase LF
- Increase Yields
- Competitive

Need:

- Supply ≠ Demand
  - Probabilistic Demand
  - Scheduling Constraints
Current Approach

Airlines currently control bookings by individual flight legs.

- Manage and maintain seat inventories by fare class.
- Maximize revenue by flight leg.
However, the seat inventory control problem is really a network problem.

- Passenger demand is based on itineraries.
- Flights are scheduled to connect with other flights through a hub and spoke structure or a multi-leg structure.

![Diagram showing a network of cities with connections between them.]
Maximizing flight leg revenue is not necessarily the same as maximizing total network system revenues.

AB $100  
AC $150  
BC $100
The Seat Inventory Control Problem

Not simply allocating seats between fare classes.

Decisions involve allocating seats between single leg itineraries and multi-leg or connecting itineraries.

Problem has grown with development of large hub-and-spoke operations:

- 50 market destinations per flight.
- 10 different fare classes in the coach cabin.
- 2500 flights per day.
- Controls applied beginning 330 days before departure.
Network Seat Inventory Control

Origin-Destination Control
Segment Control
Point-of-Sale Control
Characteristics and Complexities:

Passenger demand is probabilistic.

Demand is dynamic.

Fast solution times are necessary.

Multi-stage problem.

Seat allocations need to be integral.

Nested environment.

Size and complexity of optimal probabilistic, dynamic, nested, network seat inventory control problem is impractical.
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Network Optimization

Using traditional operations research, the problem can be formulated as a mathematical program.

Deterministic Formulation

Maximize $\sum_{ODF} f_{ODF} \cdot x_{ODF}$

subject to:

$\sum_{ODF} x_{ODF} \leq C_j$ for all ODF’s on flight leg $j$, for all flight legs $j$.

$x_{ODF} \leq D_{ODF}$ for all ODF’s.

The solution is a set of distinct seat allocations for each ODF.
In order to take into account the uncertainty of demand, the problem can also be formulated probabilistically.

\[ EMR(i_{ODF}) = f_{ODF} \cdot P(i_{ODF}) \]

Maximize \[ \sum_{ODF} \sum_{i=1}^{C_j} EMR(i_{ODF}) \cdot x_{i,ODF} \]

subject to:

\[ \sum_{ODF} \sum_{i=1}^{C_j} x_{i,ODF} \leq CAP_j \]

for all ODF's on flight leg \( j \),

for all flight legs \( j \).

\[ x_{i,ODF} \leq 1 \]

for all ODF’s,

\( i = 1, 2, ..., C_j \).
Multiple Leg Example

6 OD itineraries: AB, BC, CD
                AC, BD
                AD

4 Fare Classes: Y, M, B, Q
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216.00</td>
<td>203.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
<td>152.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>519.00</td>
<td>344.00</td>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>231.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>582.00</td>
<td>379.00</td>
<td>302.00</td>
<td>269.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440.00</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td>223.00</td>
<td>197.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>485.00</td>
<td>340.00</td>
<td>247.00</td>
<td>209.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>55.70</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td>134.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A-B</th>
<th>B-C</th>
<th>C-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local:</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td>76.17</td>
<td>88.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through:</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>30.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>128.83</td>
<td>118.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Deterministic Network Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Capacity = 90)
Probabilistic Network Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Capacity = 90)
Evaluating
Seat Inventory Control Approaches

Cost of developing new reservations systems, as well as updating support systems, is quite high.

Want to determine realistic revenue expectations in advance.

Modeled booking process of an airline and developed an integrated optimization/booking process simulation:

Network Based
Dynamic
Integrated Optimization/Booking Process Simulation

- Inputs: Network of ODF combinations.
  Fares.
  Incremental means and standard deviations of forecasted demand.
  Aircraft/Cabin capacities.
  Number of revision points.
- ODF seat allocations and booking limits are calculated based on the remaining capacity of each flight leg and the total forecasted demand to come.
- Demand for each ODF is randomly generated for the booking period at hand.
- Demand is booked, given seats are available.
- The booking process is repeated for each booking period.
- The complete booking and revision process for a single network of departures is repeated a number of iterations.
Multi-Leg Flight Simulation Results

Based on real airline data providing both a realistic mix or traffic and a realistic representation of ODF booking profiles.

Demand assumed to follow a Poisson distribution.

Bookings on hand and bookings to come assumed to be independent.

Within each booking period the lowest fare class books first.

15 booking periods.

500 iterations.

Revenue impacts compared to leg-based EMSR fare class control approach.
Distinct Network Methods

Directly applying distinct booking limits can result in negative revenue impacts.
To overcome this problem, and still get the benefits of incorporating network flows, we use the idea from leg-based control methodologies of **nesting**.

Inventories are nested so that as long as there are seats available, a higher revenue, more desirable request will not be denied.

Non-nested, distinct structure:

![Non-nested, distinct structure diagram]

Nested structure:

![Nested structure diagram]
Nesting Possibilities

Fare Classes

• Aggregate ODF allocations back to the fare class level on each flight leg.
• No longer have the control of different itineraries.

Fares

• Nest based on total itinerary fare value.
• Introduces aspect of "greediness" where long-haul itineraries will receive priority over local itineraries.

Shadow Prices

• Use information from the dual, nest based on the shadow price of the demand constraints.
• ODF’s with higher shadow prices have a higher potential value to the network.
# Nesting Deterministic by Shadow Prices

**Leg B-C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODF</th>
<th>Fare</th>
<th>Shadow Price</th>
<th>Reduced Price</th>
<th>Seats Allocated</th>
<th>Booking Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACY</td>
<td>$519</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCY</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADY</td>
<td>$582</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>$344</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDY</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCM</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCB</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>$379</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCQ</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDM</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADQ</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDB</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDQ</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Methods
Nested by Shadow Prices
The partitioned probabilistic optimization approach tends to overprotect seats for the more desirable and higher fare class ODF’s.

**Leg A-B**

### Partitioned Deterministic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partitioned Probabilistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This overprotection of seats is compounded as the booking process proceeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Demand</th>
<th>Deterministic Allocation</th>
<th>Probabilistic Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Bid Price

Bid Price is a Shadow Price for the capacity constraint.

The marginal value of the last seat of a given flight leg.

Bid Prices establish a “cutoff” value for each flight leg, on which decisions can be made whether to accept or reject a given ODF request.

For a single leg itinerary, a fare class is open for bookings if the corresponding fare is greater than the bid price, or shadow price, for the leg.

For a multi-leg itinerary, fares must be greater than the sum of the bid prices of the respective flight legs.
Bid Price Example

Bid Prices

A-B: 65
B-C: 197
C-D: 138

BCY $440  ACY $519  ADY $582
BCM $315  ACM $344  ADM $379
BCB $223  ACB $262  ADB $302
BCQ $197  ACQ $231  ADQ $269
Deterministic Network Methods

![Graph showing Percent Difference from EMSR vs Load Factor]

- NDSP
- DBID
Probabilistic Network Methods

![Graph showing percent difference from EMSR vs load factor for NPSP and PBID methods.](image-url)
Revenue Impacts vs. Revisions
96/97% Load Factor

The Nested Deterministic by Shadow Prices approach allows for better control of bookings
Immediate Problems with Network Optimization Control Methods

Data on the itinerary/fare class level is not currently collected.

The small numbers and large variations of ODF demand forecasts.

Current inventory structures control bookings at the flight leg level.

Communications with computer reservations systems of other airlines.
Leg-Based OD Control Heuristics

Nesting of network allocations is a heuristic in itself.

Use general ideas and concepts from network optimization, but at the leg level, such that:

- Information about passenger demand and traffic flows are taken into account.
- Optimization and control remains at the leg level.
Leg-Based Bid Price

Similar to network bid prices, information at the leg level can be used to determine the marginal value of the last seat on a given flight leg.

\[ EMR(S_i) = f_i \cdot \bar{P}(S_i) \]

\[ EMR(C) \] gives us a "cut-off" value for the flight leg.
The leg-based bid price values can be used in the same manner as network bid prices.

\[ EMR(C_{A-B}) = 214 \]
\[ EMR(C_{B-C}) = 86 \]

Cut-off Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>$214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>$86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leg-Based Bid Price

![Graph showing percent difference from EMSR against load factor.]
Combined Leg-Based Bid Price/Booking Limit Approach

The leg-based bid price acceptance rule is used to assess the approximate value of different ODF's to the network.

\[ f_{ODF} \geq \sum_{j} EMR(C_j) \quad \text{for all flight legs } j \]
\[ \text{over which the ODF traverses.} \]

ODF seat availability is limited by the maximum of the respective fare class booking limits from the appropriate flight legs.

\[ BL_{ODF} = \max(BL_{i,j}) \quad \text{for the respective fare class } i \]
\[ \text{and all flight legs } j \text{ of ODF.} \]
Virtual Nesting on the "Value Net of Opportunity Cost"

The $EMR(C)$ value can also be used as an estimate of a displacement cost, or opportunity cost, in a virtual nesting system.

Under the "greedy" virtual inventory system, total itinerary ticket revenues are used to assign, or map, each ODF to a virtual inventory bucket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABY</th>
<th>ACY</th>
<th>BCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>300-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>250-299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>200-249</td>
<td>ABY $200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>160-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>130-159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A-B</th>
<th>B-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACY $350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>ABY $200</td>
<td>BCY $250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under Virtual Nesting on the “Value Net of Opportunity Cost” approach, each ODF is mapped to the virtual buckets based on total itinerary revenue minus upline and downline displacement costs.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABY</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACY</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCY</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using leg based optimization methods, such as EMSR, booking limits for each virtual inventory bucket are then determined.
Nested Leg Based Itinerary Limits

Based on the EMR Bid Price logic, but using information from the entire EMR curve, leg based itinerary limits can be determined.

- For single leg itineraries, booking limits remain the same.

- For multi-leg itineraries, the EMR curves from the respective flight legs are summed and booking limits determined based on where the itinerary revenue value intersects the total EMR curve for the itinerary.
Sum beginning with the last seat on each flight leg.
Total EMR Curve - AC Itinerary

ACY $450 69 Seats

ACM $350 45 Seats
Leg-Based OD Control Methods

![Graph showing percent difference from EMSR against load factor.
Legend:
- LBID
- LBID/BL
- VNOC
- NLBIL

X-axis: Load Factor
Y-axis: Percent Difference from EMSR

Lines represent the performance of different control methods against the load factor.
Upper Bound

The "upper bound" is the revenue obtained from decisions based on perfect information, i.e. what would we have done in hind sight.

- All requests for the full booking process are randomly generated.

- The optimal combination of ODF requests which maximizes the revenue of the network is booked.

The "upper bound" represents the maximum possible revenue for a particular set of requests across a network.
Summary Comparison for the Multiple Leg Flight

![Graph showing percent difference from EMSR versus load factor]
Hub Network

16 flights in/16 flights out.

Demand exists for 196 of the 272 OD pairs.

10 fare classes.

Base case:

Demand factor on the different flight legs ranges from 0.56 to 1.46, with an overall average demand factor of 0.95.

Incremental ODF demand data for 20 booking periods.
Deterministic Network Methods

NDSP

Base Case: 88% Load Factor
0.3% Improvement
$7500 per day
$2.7 million per year
Aggregated Network Optimization Methods

For a hub-and-spoke network, problems arise with forecasting individual ODF demand due to the small numbers problem.

Aggregating ODF's together on a global level while preserving differences in the level of attractiveness to the network of each ODF is difficult.

However, from the perspective of an individual flight leg, combinations of ODF's that have the same level of attractiveness can be aggregated.

Using the property that the mean value of the sum of two variables is equal to the sum of their mean values:

$$\mu_{(A+B)} = \mu_A + \mu_B,$$

formulating an aggregated deterministic network optimization is a straightforward extension of the full deterministic network model.
Aggregated Deterministic Network Optimization

Mean Demand Fare

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEY</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maximize  
\[ 100x_{ACY} + 150x_{ADY} + 150x_{AEY} + \\
100x_{BCY} + 150x_{BDY} + 150x_{BEY} + 100x_{CDY} + 100x_{CEY} \]

subject to:

\[ x_{ACY} + x_{ADY} + x_{AEY} \leq 100, \]  
\[ x_{BCY} + x_{BDY} + x_{BEY} \leq 100, \]  
\[ x_{ADY} + x_{BDY} + x_{CDY} \leq 100, \]  
\[ x_{AEY} + x_{BEY} + x_{CEY} \leq 100 \]  

\[ x_{ACY} \leq 40, \]  
\[ x_{ADY} + x_{AEY} \leq 70, \]  
\[ x_{BCY} \leq 30, \]  
\[ x_{BDY} + x_{BEY} \leq 30, \]  
\[ x_{CDY} \leq 20, \]  
\[ x_{ADY} + x_{BDY} \leq 40, \]  
\[ x_{CEY} \leq 50, \]  
\[ x_{AEY} + x_{BEY} \leq 60. \]
Aggregated Deterministic Network Methods
Summary Comparison for the Hub Network
Summary

Through the upper bound analysis, the true potential of better seat inventory control is obtained. This maximum potential ranges from 4-8%.

Direct application of traditional network seat inventory control solutions yields significant negative revenue impacts.

By using information from the dual, network solutions can be applied to the seat inventory control problem, providing revenue benefits of approximately 1/2 of the maximum potential.

Due to practical constraints, it is currently difficult to implement such approaches.

By using concepts from the network optimization approaches to develop leg-based heuristics which incorporate information about traffic flows, approximately 1/3 of the maximum potential revenue can be obtained.
Contributions

Developed the theory for a realistic representation of the interaction between airline reservations control and the booking process which is modeled through a computer simulation.

Demonstrated that direct application of traditional network seat allocation solutions provide significant negative results.

Introduced several new practical approaches to network seat inventory control which can provide significant positive revenue impacts over current leg-based approaches:

- Network optimization approaches
- Leg-based heuristics

Showed that using a partitioned probabilistic network solution as the basis for nested control applications is not as effective as a deterministic network solution.

Generated realistic estimates of the revenue impacts of controlling seat inventories at the network level.
Future Work

• Extensions of leg-based heuristics to virtual nesting.
• Value definitions for virtual inventory buckets.
• Most efficient mathematical algorithms for network approaches.
• Compound Poisson distribution.

• Effects on revenue impacts of ODF forecasting accuracy.
• Effects on revenue impacts other airline computer reservations systems.

• Including first class cabin in network seat inventory control problem.
• Incorporating overbooking.
• Practical dynamic programming approaches.
• Full integration of reservations control with pricing and scheduling.
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Individual Passenger Demand

Individual Passenger Demand Is Subject To Many Sources Of Variability.

(Time Of Day, Day Of Week, Season)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORD–BOS</td>
<td>12 FEB 92</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD–BOS</td>
<td>12 FEB 92</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD–BOS</td>
<td>13 FEB 92</td>
<td>TUE</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD–BOS</td>
<td>11 AUG 92</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Random)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORD–BOS</td>
<td>12 FEB 92</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD–BOS</td>
<td>19 FEB 92</td>
<td>MON</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Account For Such Variability, Most Airlines Employ A Normal Distribution Assumption When Forecasting Demand.

Empirical Results Support Such An Assumption
Group Passenger Demand

How Is Group Passenger Demand Different From Individual Passenger Demand?

- Groups Negotiate For A Lower Than Published Fare (Bulk Pricing)

- Group Demand Is Realized Many Months In Advance Examples: Carnaval, Olympics, Oktoberfest ...

- Unused Bookings Are Absent From Seat Inventory For Months, Potentially Displacing Individual Passengers

- Cancellation Penalties Often Difficult To Enforce Due To Competitive Environment
Group Demand Decomposition

Forecasting Group Passenger Demand Using The Normal Assumption May Be Inappropriate:

- Number Of Groups On A Given Flight Is Relatively Small
- Spikes Occur At "Popular" Group Sizes, Skewing The Distribution
- Significant Cancellations Occur Throughout The Booking Period

Question: What Is The Appropriate Model For Group Passenger Demand?

To Forecast Group Demand, We Look At Three Constituent Components Separately:

1) Number Of Group Requests, \( n \)
2) Size Of Any Single Group Request, \( s \)
3) Utilization Rate Of Any Single Request, \( u \)
Number Of Group Requests (n)

The Number Of Group Requests, \( n \), For A Particular Flight Can Be Modeled As A Probability Mass Function:

\[
p_n(n_0)
\]

From Above ...

Historically, 35% Of Departures Had Two Group Requests

- or -

The Probability Of Receiving Two Group Requests For This Flight Is \( .35 \)
Size Of Any Single Request (s)

Similarly, Size Of Any Individual Request, \( s \), Also Modeled As A PMF:

\[
p_s(s_0)
\]

But ...  
- Bounds On \( s \) : [0, \text{CAP}]
- Missing Values Easily Misinterpreted

Aggregation Yields

\[
p_{s'}(s'_0)
\]

Advantages  
- Reduces Number Of Observations
- Eliminates "Absence" Problems
Utilization Of A Group Request (u)

Utilization Rate, \( u \), Also Modeled As A PMF:

\[ p_u(u_0) \]

There are at least three separate utilization rates, with associated costs corresponding to three distinct time periods during the group booking process:

1) Time between negotiation and placement of non-refundable deposit (\( c_1 \))

2) Time between placement of deposit and actual purchase of tickets (\( c_2 \))

3) Time between actual ticket purchase and date of departure (\( c_3 \))

We believe:

\[ c_2 >> c_3 > c_1 \]
Group Demand Model

Discrete Transform Analysis:

Discrete Random Variables With Only Non-Negative, Integer Values Can Be Completely Defined By A Discrete Or z-Transform,

\[ p_x^T(z) = E(z^x) = \sum_{x_i=0}^{\infty} z^{x_0} \cdot p_x(x_0) \]

Furthermore, It Is Possible To Determine The Individual Terms Of A PMF From Its Transform By:

\[ p_x(x_0) = \frac{1}{x_0!} \left[ \frac{\partial^{x_0}}{\partial z^{x_0}} p_x^T(z) \right]_{z=0} \quad x_0 = 0, 1, 2 \ldots \]
Group Demand Model

The Distribution For The Sum Of A Random Number Of Independent, Identically Distributed Random Variables Can Be Determined Using Transform Analysis.

Let \( r \) Be The Sum Of \( n \) (A Random Variable) Independent Values Of Random Variable \( x \).

The \( z \)-Transform For The PMF Of \( r \) Is:

\[
p_r^T(z) = p_n^T[p_x^T(z)]
\]

Using The Chain Rule For Differentiation, We Can Obtain Expressions For The Expectation And Variance For \( r \):

\[
E(r) = E(n) \cdot E(x)
\]

\[
\sigma_r^2 = E(n) \cdot \sigma_x^2 + [E(x)]^2 \cdot \sigma_n^2
\]
Group Demand Model

Distribution Of Group Booking Requests \( r \)

Assume The Number Of Group Requests And The Size Of Any Individual Request Are Statistically Independent.

The Distribution Of Total Group Seats Requested \( r \) Is Described By:

\[
 p_r^T(z) = p_n^T[p_s^T(z)]
\]

The Expressions For The Expectation And Variance Are:

\[
 E(r) = E(n) \cdot E(s)
\]

\[
 \sigma_r^2 = E(n) \cdot \sigma_s^2 + [E(s)]^2 \cdot \sigma_n^2
\]
Group Demand Model

Distribution Of Group Passengers (g)

Incorporating The Utilization Rate Into Our Model Involves A Random Sum Of The Random Variable r.

The Distribution For g, The Level Of Group Passenger Demand Can Be Expressed By The Transform:

\[ p_g^T(z) = p_u^T[p_r^T(z)] \]

Expressions For The Expectation And Variance Of g Are:

\[ E(g) = E(u) \cdot E(r) \]

\[ \sigma_g^2 = E(u) \cdot \sigma_r^2 + [E(r)]^2 \cdot \sigma_u^2 \]
Group Demand Forecast Application

Ability To Forecast Group Passenger Demand Allows Application Of Results To Seat Inventory Control Models:

Types Of Models:

Planning:

Used In Advance Of Demand Realization. Allocates Seats To The "Optimal" Mix Of Passengers To Come.

Decision Making

"Yes" Or "No" Result For Actual Request. Can Use Planing Model To Determine Revenue Potential With Or Without Request.

Accept/Reject Accordingly
Group Demand Forecasting

In General, Much Easier To Forecast Each Of The Three Constituent Components Individually, Using Historical Data:

\[ p_n(n_0) \]
\[ p_s(s_0) \]
\[ p_u(u_0) \]

Combine These Three Distributions Using Discrete Transforms To Obtain A Forecast For Group Passenger Demand
Group Demand Forecast Application

Extend Traditional Math Programming Techniques For Seat Inventory Control To Include A G-Class:

Maximize

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} F_i \cdot x_i + F_g \cdot \mu_g \cdot x_g
\]

Subject to

\[
x_i \leq \mu_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, k
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i + (\mu_g \cdot x_g) \leq C
\]

\[
x_i \geq 0 \quad \text{and integer} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, k
\]

\[
x_g = 0 \text{ or } 1
\]
Group Demand Forecast Application

Can Also Be Applied To Probabilistic Integer Programming Model (Group Demand Deterministic)

Maximize

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{C} \left[ EMR_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j} \right] + F_g \cdot \mu_g \cdot x_g
$$

Subject to

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{C} x_{i,j} + x_g \cdot \mu_g \leq C
$$

$$
x_{i,j}, x_g = 0,1
$$
Group Demand Forecast Application

With A Completely Defined Distribution Of Group Demand, We Can Include Expected Revenues From "Group" Seats As Well:

Maximize

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{g} \left[ EMR_{i,j} \cdot x_{i,j} \right]$$

Subject to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{g} x_{i,j} \leq C$$

$$x_{i,j}, x_{g,j} = 0, 1$$
Conclusions

- Group Demand Differs Significantly From Individual Passenger Demand

- Differences Motivate A Different Distribution Assumption

- Demand Decomposition Into

  - Number Of Requests
  - Size Of Individual Request
  - Utilization Rate Of Request

- Discrete Transform Analysis To Obtain Distribution

- Use In Group Demand Forecasting

- Application To Seat Inventory Control Techniques

Further Research

- Empirical Testing

- Incorporation Into Nested Inventory Environments

- Fare Structure Issues
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Observations:

1. Lack of capacity for runway operations
2. Effects of bad weather on hourly capacity
3. Slots established only at 4 airports
4. Delays occur primarily at major hub airports
5. Airlines are deliberately scheduling hourly peaks
6. Inadequate construction of new airports at major cities
STUDY FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENTS IN TECHNOLOGY ARE NEEDED IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

1. NOISE

Reduction of jet transport and Tilt Rotor noise on takeoff and departure to assist in gaining community acceptance of new airports, runways, and vertiports.

2. PRECISION FLIGHT PATH CAPABILITY

To increase bad weather capacities, it is necessary to reduce the ATC separations between aircraft during arrival and departure at busy terminal areas. This requires increased precision in defining and flying 3-D and 4-D profiles.

3. CIVIL TILT ROTOR SHORT HAUL AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM

An efficient, environmentally acceptable, short haul air system for business travellers can divert perhaps 50% of current demand from current conventional airports.
OBSERVATION 1

1. The problem is a lack of traffic flow capacity in terms of runway approach and departure operations per hour at major airports, not a lack of capacity in Enroute airspace.
2. The inadequacy is a lack of capacity at times of bad weather. There usually is sufficient runway capacity in good weather to meet scheduled traffic at major US airports.
Airport hourly capacity varies strongly with weather.

There is a 3/1 or 2/1 ratio between good weather/bad weather capacities.

Capacity coverage curve — Boston Logan airport

- **Marginal VFR/IFR**:
  - Ceiling: 800-2500 ft
  - Visibility: 2.5-5.0 mi

- **Good VFR — 80% Time**:
  - Ceiling > 2500 ft
  - Visibility > 5 nautical miles

- **Poor IFR**:
  - Ceiling: 200-800 ft
  - Visibility: 0-2.5 mi

Average % of time
OBSERVATION 3

3. In the 1980's, to minimize the costs of the lack of airport capacity, US airlines correctly reversed their prior policy of limiting schedules to bad weather capacities to ensure all weather reliability. Bad weather slots now exist only at four major US airports - LGA, JFK, ORD, DCA
4. Today, the problem exists at the top US "hub" airports where, since deregulation, major airlines have expanded into new markets by offering competitive connecting services using smaller jet transport aircraft.
MAJOR AIRLINE HUBS
PRIOR TO 1978

- Denver
- Dallas/Ft. Worth
- Chicago (O'Hare)
- Atlanta
% OF DOMESTIC CAPACITY RELATED TO HUBS

U.S. Major Carriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of ASM's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. There is deliberate peaking of daily schedules by airlines at these hub airports to create "connecting complexes" which causes hourly demand to exceed good weather hourly capacities for short periods.
PASSENGER AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS
DELTA AIR LINES - ATLANTA
AUGUST 1988

FRIDAY AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS

TIME OF DAY

NET
IN JET
IN FEEDER
OUT FEEDER
OUT JETS

CB1287.15
OBSERVATION 6

6. There has been inadequate construction of new airport and runway capacity to serve major US cities in the last 30 years due to local airport community objections to the noise of jet transport aircraft on approach and departure operations.
THERE ARE 6 ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION
(for the Air Transport Industry, federal and local governments)

A-1. Increase AIRCRAFT SIZE as number of carriers is reduced
A-2. Create NEW HUBS at secondary airports
G-1. Impose SLOTS at congested airports

G-2. Increase BAD WEATHER CAPACITIES at hub airports
G-3. Construct NEW AIRPORTS near hub cities
G-4. Construct new CIVIL TILT ROTOR short haul air system
Topics for Noise Research

TOPIC N-1  Transient Annoyance to Short Term Noise Exposure
TOPIC N-2  Incorporate "Intrusion" into Airport Annoyance Measures
TOPIC N-3  Establish Takeoff and Sideline Goals for Stage 4, Stage 5
TOPIC N-4  Decelerating, Low power Approach Paths for CTR
TOPIC N-5  Noise-Oriented Maneuver Departure Paths
TOPIC N-6  Active Suppression for Fan Engine Noise
TOPIC N-7  Novel Suppression Techniques for Propellor, Rotor Noise
Topics for Precision Flight Path Research

TOPIC H-1 Monitoring & Intervention of Abnormal Divergences
TOPIC H-2 Precision Guidance in the Departure Area
TOPIC H-3 Deviation Detection, Oceanic Parallel Track Systems
TOPIC H-4 Airborne Surveillance, Random Oceanic Tracks
TOPIC H-5 Hybrid Navigation Management Systems
TOPIC H-7 Trajectory Prediction for Climb/Descend
TOPIC L-1 Airborne Wake Vortex Prediction on Final Approach
TOPIC L-2 Reduction of In-Trail Separations on Final Approach
TOPIC L-3 Integration of Voice/Digital Clearances
Topics for Civil Tilt Rotor Research

**TOPIC T-1**  
Precision Guidance for Decelerating Approach Transitions

**TOPIC T-2**  
Wake Effects from Simultaneous Operations at a Vertiport

**TOPIC T-3**  
CTR Approach and Departure Noise for Vertiport Operations

**TOPIC T-4**  
Improved Rotor Performance and Noise

**TOPIC T-5**  
Evaluation of Acquisition and Operational Costs for CTR System
On the final stabilized segment, the CTR would turn to the westbound departure direction, from the FAF, and initiate a climb. The single-engine capabilities of the CTR allow a climb-out angle of 7° at 40 knots, while turning within a 525-foot radius. The single-engine climb rate would be better than 500 feet per minute, and the normal climb rate could be much higher. Upon reaching 500 feet, the CTR could be cleared to return to the final stabilized portion (perhaps on the opposite approach), or could continue its climb to clear other arriving traffic by at least 500 feet, and then proceed down the Hudson towards a CTR holding pattern established at the Statue of Liberty above 2,200 feet. The CTR would transition to conventional mode at roughly 180 knots. Holding could be done within the New York harbor area while awaiting sequencing back into any other CTR traffic flow. Alternatively, a diversion to one of the regional airports could be planned. The harbor holding pattern is also shown in Figure 2.11.

2.3.5 Spacing on Final Approach

Under current Instrument Flight Rules (IFR), successive aircraft conducting approaches to the same runway/landing area must be separated by 3 to 6 miles (depending on the aircraft mix) if radar is used. Without radar, the standard separation is 2 to 3 minutes between successive approaches, again depending on the aircraft mix. These rules are designed for fixed-wing operations, however, and do not consider the

---

* When smaller aircraft follow larger, heavier aircraft, the standard radar separation of 3 miles or non-radar separation of 2 minutes is increased to allow for wake turbulence.
2.3.3 Final Approach Segment

The proposed final approach segment for a CTR consists of two portions as described in Section 2.1.2. In Figure 2.11, the FAF is shown 3.4 nm from the vertiport. As can be seen in the figure, the southern FAF is at the Statue of Liberty while the deceleration segment and its Obstacle Free Zone (OFZ) are over an industrial area along the western shore of the Hudson River. The northern FAF is centered in the Hudson River near West 135th Street, and its OFZ is contained within the river edges. Both deceleration segments specify the beginning of the stabilized portion of the final approach at 500 feet above the center of the Hudson River, followed by a 45 degree turn at 30 knots towards the vertiport. There is approximately 30 seconds of flight in the stabilized portion before the 200 foot decision height and visual acquisition of the vertiport surface.

2.3.4 Missed Approach Segment

Missed approaches will occur rarely, but must be provided for by ATC procedures. They can be caused by several factors; inability to acquire visual contact at the decision height; mechanical/electrical problems with the CTR while on approach; landing surface obstructions (e.g. staked vehicle, CTR, or personnel in the touchdown zone). An escape from the approach at any point is possible by climbing. With radar coverage, the CTR would then be vectored to maintain safe separation from other CTR or conventional traffic.
Figure 2.12 Vertiport Operations
1. Community reactions to noise around airports and vertiports is the long term barrier to increasing the capacity of the nation's air transport system. More airports or vertiports must be built around major cities to accommodate the long term growth expected in air transport. Noise Research is needed to understand community long term and transient annoyance to quieter operations.

2. There are valuable returns from exploiting existing technology to reduce current ATC separation criteria used in Oceanic and Terminal areas. To demonstrate safe reductions, it is necessary to introduce the capability for Precision Flight along 3-D and 4-D paths to a majority of aircraft in the traffic flow.

3. There is a need to provide evidence of the economic, environmental, and operational viability of a CTR Short Haul Air Transport System to support decisions by federal and local government, and aviation industry to embark on a long term development program.
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Background Information

- **Problem Statement** - There is a mounting safety concern related to the increasing use of non-standard phraseology in ATC communications.

- **Study Goal** - This study will attempt to determine the associated error rates due to grouped versus serial presentation of numerical information of varying complexity.

  **Grouped Form** - Similar to normally spoken language
  
  Example - 125 as One-Hundred Twenty Five

  **Serial Form** - Strict Numerical Presentation by Digit
  
  Example - 125 as One Two Five
Background Information

The concern for safety emerges when, for example, "30" is communicated as thirty and interpreted as thirteen. Some reasons for this are:

1. Obvious similarity in the pronunciation of words

1. Inability to distinguish message because of noisy radio channel/speed of information delivery

2. Pilot workload too high for careful monitoring

Basic Ground Rules for This Study:

- Only current commercial pilots will be tested
- Audio tapes containing instructions to pilots will be recorded by certified controllers
- Instructions will be random in nature (i.e. a real ATC environment will not be simulated)
- No side task involved
- No artificial background noise will be present nor will there be any visual stimuli
Data Collection

- Elements of messages may require change of instrument settings for items such as:
  - Radio Frequency
  - Heading
  - Speed
  - Altitude
  - Crossing Points, Transponder, etc.
- A readback of information from the subject will be required. An observer will note accuracy of readback.
- Timed reading/storage of instrument settings will show whether required action carried out correctly.
Protocol

- Each pilot will participate in four separate tests - length of each test has not been determined.
- Messages will be transmitted at the rate of 162 per hour.
- The subject will be required to act upon 54 (33%) of the messages.
- Of the 54 messages, there will be 18 each in:
  - Sequential form
  - Grouped form
  - Partially Restated form
- In each group of 18 messages, 6 each will contain:
  - 3 Pieces of numerical information
  - 4 Pieces
  - 5 Pieces
Experimental Set-Up

- Data Acquisition Equipment
- Observer
- Blank Wall
- Readback Recorder
- ATC Tape Player
- Pilot
- Instrument Panel
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Integration of FMS into Advanced ATC

Emerging Technology - #1 - Flight Management Systems & Digital Avionics

Functions of a FMS

a) Flight Planning
b) Navigation
c) Guidance
d) Performance Management
e) Display
f) Aircraft Database Management

Transport Aircraft with Flight Management Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boeing</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>Airbus</th>
<th>Fokker</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>737-300</td>
<td>MD82</td>
<td>A-300</td>
<td>F-100</td>
<td>ATR-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737-400</td>
<td>MD-88</td>
<td>A-310</td>
<td>F-130</td>
<td>G-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737-500</td>
<td>MD-90</td>
<td>A-320</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAE-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>MD-11</td>
<td>A-330</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citation3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>MD-12</td>
<td>A-340</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadair RJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% of the world's fleet is now FMS equipped
50% will be equipped by 1995
Emerging Technology - #2 - Digital Data Link for Advanced ATC Systems

There is a commitment to introducing digital data link systems into newer forms of ATC

Digital Data Links for ATC

- VHF data links (ACARS) already here
- Mode S - SSR surveillance system is a world standard and provides a digital data link
- ICAO has agreed that digital SATCOM will be part of the Future Air Navigation System
Emerging Technology - #3 - Improved Weather Data Gathering Systems

- it appears that there will be a significant improvement in the collection of weather data by satellites, aircraft, and remote sensing earth stations in coverage and in frequency

- and hopefully an improvement in weather forecasting accuracy

- NEXRAD weather radar network
- Weather Profiler network
- aircraft datalinked winds, temperatures, turbulence
- FAA's aviation weather program
Emerging Technology - #4 - Automated Airline Flight Operation Centers

- airlines are automating the flight planning, dispatch, and in-flight monitoring of progress of all aircraft

- introduction of centralized dispatch center
- introduction of electronic flight plans loaded directly into the FMS
- introduction of paperless cockpits
- real time communications with the cockpit at all times and at all points in the world
The Generic Objectives of the FAA's FTMI Project

(Flight Operations and Air Traffic Management Integration)

1) define extended functionalities for an AFMS which is compatible with future automated ATM environments worldwide.

2) define the specific nature of the datalink messages between the AFMS, AOCC and various ATM facilities.

3) define new operational applications for Oceanic, Enroute and Terminal Area airspace based on the extended functionalities.

4) provide evidence from various demonstrations to support international adoption of standards for an AFMS, and adoption of operational procedures for its applications.
There is a need for a Systems Integration Effort by Civil Aviation Agencies to determine the best way to use these emerging Technologies

Diagram:

- Flight Crew
- FMS
- AOC
- ATM
- Voice Link
- Computer to Computer, Human-Centered Dialogue Via Data Link:
  - VHF
  - Mode-S
  - Satellite
- Airlines Dispatch and Flight Operations Personnel
- Air Traffic Management Personnel
Integration of FMS into Advanced ATC

Examples of Extended Functionalities of an AFMS (EFFs)

- Mid-Flight Refiling of flight plans
- accept a updated weather forecast for rest of flight
- accept and fly tactical modifications of SIDS/STARS
- accept and fly a "Digital Vector"
- accept and fly a "Required Time of Arrival"
- fly a Digital Holding Pattern
- accept and fly a "Stationkeeping Clearance"
- send next waypoints/altitudes on intended path
- send current track, groundspeed, vertical speed
- send windspeed, direction, temperature, turbulence at requested points or frequency
- send best estimate for intended climb/descent profiles
- send earliest/latest possible times at future waypoints
- send flight plan request for rest of trip
Examples of New Operational Applications (NOAs)

Oceanic Fixed Track System
- Longitudinal Stationkeeping
- Same Track Passing and Step Climbs
- Oceanic Track - Required Entry Time
- Mid-Flight Refiling of flight plans
- Emergency Diversion

Oceanic Free Tracks
- Conflict Identification and Local Resolution
- Cruise-Climb Paths
Integration of FMS into Advanced ATC

Examples of New Operational Applications (NOAs)

Domestic Enroute Airspace

- Conflict Free Climbs and Descents
- Digital Resolution Advisories from AERA

Extended Terminal Area Airspace

- Complex Precision Paths for Arrival and Departure
- Paired Stationkeeping Departures
- RTAs at Metering Fixes
Integration of FMS into Advanced ATC

Planning a Systems Integration Project - FTMI

There are many activities to be defined and funded over the next several years

1. Set Detailed Objectives
2. Develop a Project Plan
3. Establish Liaison with On-going FAA R&D Projects
4. Study Specific Applications (NOAs)
   - establish Technical Requirement
   - establish Operational requirements
   - conduct simulations, demonstrations, validation tests
   - conduct Cost/Benefit studies
5. Generate Operational Specifications
6. Facilitate International Agreement
AIRCRAFT GROUND MOVEMENT SIMULATOR
A TESTBED FOR RESEARCH IN AIRPORT
PLANNING AUTOMATION

Dr. D. F. X. Mathaisel
Dr. J. D. Pararas
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OVERVIEW

1. The Mission of GMS
2. Planning Airport Surface Traffic
3. Overall System Design
4. Operational Characteristics
5. Software Design Characteristics
6. Future Work
THE MISSION OF GMS

- Real-time man-in-the-loop simulation

- Realistic simulation of surface traffic at major airports
  - Current control environments
  - Future planning

- Stand-alone (conventional) operation. Controllers & pseudopilots manually control traffic

- Automated control: interfaces to planning systems.

- Manage traffic scenarios that insure repeatability of experiments
PLANNING AIRPORT SURFACE TRAFFIC

- Scheduling the Runways
- Scheduling Pushbacks
- Managing taxipaths: Rwy->Gate, Gate->Rwy
- Vehicle traffic
- Challenges
  - Unpredictable traffic behavior
  - Interface to airline operations
  - No "real world" system to simulate.
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

- Aircraft Position Generator
  - Detailed motion models: taxi, turns, takeoff, landing
  - Generates traffic situation broadcasts
  - Accepts messages to perform specific tasks
    - generate new aircraft
    - assign new path to aircraft
    - aircraft status queries
- Controller Stations

- High resolution plan-view displays of traffic situation

- "Tower Simulator" provides out-the-window displays similar to cockpit simulators.

- Voice link to pseudopilots

- Interfaces to planning systems
- Pseudopilot Stations
  - High Resolution plan view display
  - Path editing capability
  - Menu driven or function key based command generation
  - Voice link to controllers
- Experimenter's Station
  - Plan view display
  - Experiment control panel
  - Monitoring capability via repeaters
  - Traffic scenario control
SOFTWARE DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS

- Distributed architecture: allows expansion and flexible interfaces to new systems.

- Unix - XWindows - TCP / IP based
  Allows porting to most modern workstation platforms

- Object - oriented approach allows easy adaptations to future needs
FUTURE WORK

- Extension to full mission (air & ground) simulator

- Incorporate voice recognition to alleviate man-power needs for conducting experiments

- Automation Research

  - Landing - takeoff coordination (Runway scheduling)

  - Managing takeoff queues and pushbacks

  - Management of taxiways and intersections.

  - Low visibility traffic management research
Policy Level Decision Support
For Airport Passenger Terminal Design

Prepared For The
MIT Cooperative Research Meeting
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Problem Statement
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Research Initiative

To Provide Real-Time Policy Level Decision Support For Airport Passenger Terminal Design.

Current Support Exists In The Form Of Detailed, "Micro" Simulations.

- Presuppose A Given Configuration
- Require Large Amounts Of Detailed Input Data
- Changes Require Lengthy Setup Times
- Design-Simulate-Redesign Process Ultimately Produces "Best" Layout For Given Configuration

No Guarantee Initial Configuration Was Most Appropriate
Airport Performance

Expected Walking Distances

Congestion

Capacity

Safety

Signage (Way Finding)

Cost

Concession Revenues
Airport Terminal Types

- Linear Box Terminal
- Parallel Box
- Satellite
- Finger-Pier
- Remote Terminal
Passenger Types

1) Originating - Begin Trip At Airport Under Consideration. Distance Walked Is Modeled As Distance From Entrance To Departure Gate.

2) Terminating - Complete Trip At Airport Under Consideration. Distance Walked Is Modeled As Distance From Arrival Gate To Exit.

3) Transfers - Arrive And Depart From Gates Within Airport Under Consideration. (Direct and Indirect)

The Overall Expected Walking Distance Model Is:

$$\overline{D} = p_{ot} \cdot \overline{d}_{ot} + p_{dt} \cdot \overline{d}_{dt} + p_{it} \cdot \overline{d}_{it}$$

Where:

$$\overline{D} = \text{Overall Expected Walking Distance}$$

$$p_{i} = \text{Fraction Of Total Traffic That Is } i$$

$$\overline{d}_{i} = \text{Expected Walking Distance For Population } i$$
Estimating Expected Walking Distances
(Direct Transfer Passengers - Terminal 1)

Gate 1 Arrivals Can Depart From Any One Of Three (Terminal 1) Gates. If Assumed That Each Departure Gate Is Equally Likely ...

\[ \bar{d}_{dt_1} = (.33)(0) + (.33)(30) + (.33)(20) = 16.7 \]
Intelligent Scheduling

Airport Owners/Airlines Have Control Over Flight To Gate Assignments. Thus, We Might Expect Them To Schedule Connecting Flights Closer Together.

(Intelligent Scheduling)

Returning To Our Example ...

d_{11} = 0
d_{12} = 30
d_{13} = 20

Assume 40% Of Passengers Stay On Board (Through Pax)

\[ t_{11} = .40 \] (Given)
\[ t_{12} = (.60) \times (1 - 30/50) = .24 \]
\[ t_{13} = (.60) \times (1 - 20/50) = .36 \]

Expected Distance For Gate 1 Arrivals (Terminal 1)

\[ \bar{d}_{a_t} = 14.4 \]
Aircraft Effects

Two Universal Truths

- Large Aircraft Carry More Passengers Than Small Aircraft
- Small Aircraft Can Be Turned Around Faster Than Large Aircraft

The Model

Load Factor On All Aircraft = 67%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size (Seats)</th>
<th>Turnaround Time</th>
<th>Ops/Day</th>
<th>Pax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>45 min.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Types Of Gates

Terminal 1 – Medium Gates
Terminal 2 – Large Gates

Gate Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>Large Gate</th>
<th>Med Gate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demand Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Pax/Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Pax/Day</th>
<th>7799</th>
<th>6593</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total For Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total For Airport</th>
<th>35376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Combining Gate Affinity With Demand Rate

"Affinity" Transition Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gate Affinity</th>
<th>Demand Rate</th>
<th>Weighted Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Combined Transition Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absolute Transfer Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Complete Model

The Dot Product Of Transition and Distance Matrices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gate</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>P(Arrival)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demand Rate (Symmetric)

Overall Expected Direct Transfer Distance = 53.2

Similar Analysis For Indirect Transfers = 147.6

Originating/Terminating Passengers = 74.25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pax Type</th>
<th>Pax Mix</th>
<th>Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org−Term</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>147.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Expected Walking Distance = 69.6
Characteristic Demand Patterns

Demand Pattern A
High / Low Split = 75 / 25

Demand Pattern B
High / Low Split = 40 / 60

In Periods of Low Demand, Only Terminal 2 Is Used ...
The Big Picture

Demand

Traffic Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Org-Term</th>
<th>D. Trans</th>
<th>I. Trans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74.3 53.2 147.6

Traffic Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Org-Term</th>
<th>D. Trans</th>
<th>I. Trans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105.0 6.0 200.0

69.6 73.2

70.6
Sensitivity To Percent Transfers

By Varying Percent Transfer Assumption, We Can Assess "Robustness" To Passenger Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Transfer</th>
<th>High Config</th>
<th>Low Config</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assume Constant Demand Pattern (75/25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Trans</th>
<th>Comb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivity To Transfers
Sensitivity To Demand Pattern

By Varying Percent High/Low Assumption, We Can Assess "Robustness" To Demand Pattern

Assume 80% Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Overall Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivity To Demand
Conclusions

- Estimates For Overall Expected Walking Distances Obtained Through A Series Of Simple Calculations

- Calculations Very "Fast", Thus Sensitivity Analyses Very Practical

- Methodology Very General, Any Terminal Configuration Can Be Tested

Further Research

- Extensive Sensitivity Analyses To Determine "Most Robust" Configurations Under Varying Conditions

- Model Can Be Used To Test Several Different Low Demand Policies Under Different Conditions

- Model Can Be Used To Determine Overall Walking Distances For A Particular Airline Or "Passenger Cluster"
Joint Price Level/Seat Allocation Optimization for Airlines

Theodore C. Botimer
MIT Flight Transportation Laboratory
Presentation to the MIT/Industry Cooperative Research Program Annual Meeting
May 22, 1992
Research Motivation

I. Revenue management work has focused on optimal seat allocations with fixed price levels

1) Marginal seat revenue methods
   • Belobaba, 1987

2) Network optimization methods
   • Glover et al., 1984

3) Optimal single leg seat allocations
   • Brumelle et al., 1990
   • Curry, 1990
   • Wollmer, 1990

II. This research seeks to include price level as a decision variable seat allocations
Joint Price Level/Seat Availability Optimization Problem

Simplistic Seat Allocation Optimization

Max \( R = \sum_{n=1}^{N} P_n Q_n \)

Subject to:

\[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} Q_n \leq \text{Cap} \]

\( Q_n \geq 0 \quad \text{for } n = 1, \ldots, N \)

\( Q_n = f(P_n) \)

where

- \( R \) = total revenue
- \( Q_n \) = seats allocated to fare class \( n \)
- \( P_n \) = average fare charged to fare class \( n \)
- \( N \) = total number of fare classes
- \( \text{Cap} \) = total aircraft capacity
Joint Optimization (con’t)

Optimization Formulation Assumptions

- Single leg/OD pair
- N independent fare classes
- N distinct fare class seat allocations
- Fixed capacity aircraft
- Deterministic demand
- Case I : Separate Linear Demand Curves
- Case II : Single Linear Demand Curve
Two Fare Class Case

Separate Linear Demand Curve Formulation:

\[
\text{Max } R = P_Y Q_Y + P_Y Q_B
\]

Subject to:
\[
Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap}
\]
\[
Q_Y \geq 0
\]
\[
Q_B \geq 0
\]
\[
P_Y = P_{Y0} - a_Y Q_Y
\]
\[
P_B = P_{B0} - a_B Q_B
\]

Substituting Demand Curves into Objective:

\[
\text{Max } R = P_{Y0} Q_Y - a_Y Q_Y^2 + P_{B0} Q_B - a_B Q_B^2
\]

Subject to:
\[
Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap}
\]
\[
Q_Y \geq 0
\]
\[
Q_B \geq 0
\]
Two Fare Class Case

Single Linear Demand Curve Formulation:

\[
\text{Max } R = P_Y Q_Y + P_B Q_B
\]

Subject to:

\[
Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap}
\]

\[
Q_Y \geq 0
\]

\[
Q_B \geq 0
\]

\[
P_Y = P_0 - aQ_Y
\]

\[
P_B = P_0 - a[Q_Y + Q_B]
\]

Substituting Demand Curve into Objective:

\[
\text{Max } R = P_0 Q_Y - aQ_Y^2 + P_B Q_B - aQ_B^2 - aQ_Y Q_B
\]

Subject to:

\[
Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap}
\]

\[
Q_Y \geq 0
\]

\[
Q_B \geq 0
\]
Two Fare Class Case Optimality Conditions

Separate Linear Demand Curve Formulation

Capacity Constrained Optimal Price Levels:

\[ P_Y^* = \left[ \frac{(a_Y+2a_B)}{(a_Y+a_B)} \right] \left[ \frac{P_{Y0}}{2} \right] + \left[ \frac{a_Y}{(a_Y+a_B)} \right] \left[ \frac{P_{B0}}{2} \right] - \left[ \frac{2a_B}{(a_Y+a_B)} \right] \left[ \frac{a_Y \text{ Cap}}{2} \right] \]

\[ P_B^* = \left[ \frac{(2a_Y+a_B)}{(a_Y+a_B)} \right] \left[ \frac{P_{B0}}{2} \right] + \left[ \frac{a_B}{(a_Y+a_B)} \right] \left[ \frac{P_{Y0}}{2} \right] - \left[ \frac{2a_Y}{(a_Y+a_B)} \right] \left[ \frac{a_B \text{ Cap}}{2} \right] \]

Capacity Unconstrained Optimal Price Levels:

\[ P_Y^* = \frac{P_{Y0}}{2} \]

\[ P_B^* = \frac{P_{B0}}{2} \]
Two Fare Class Case Optimality Conditions

Single Linear Demand Curve Formulation

Capacity Constrained Optimal Price Levels:

\[ P_Y^* = P_0 - \frac{a\text{Cap}}{2} \]
\[ P_B^* = P_0 - a\text{Cap} \]

Capacity Unconstrained Optimal Price Levels:

\[ P_Y^* = \frac{2}{3} P_0 \]
\[ P_B^* = \frac{1}{3} P_0 \]
BOS - LAX Case Study

- Friday, 6:00 P.M. Departure
- 150 & 200 Seat Aircraft

Dual Demand Curve Formulation:

\[ P_Y = 1500 - 15Q_Y \]
\[ P_B = 500 - 2Q_B \]

Single Demand Curve Formulation:

\[ P_Y = 1000 - 3.33Q_Y \]
\[ P_B = 1000 - 3.33(Q_Y + Q_B) \]
BOS - LAX: Dual Demand Curve Formulation
BOS - LAX: Single Demand Curve Formulation
**BOS - LAX Example**

Single Demand Curve Formulation Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity Unconstrained</th>
<th>Capacity Constrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y Class Fare</strong></td>
<td>666.67</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Class Fare</strong></td>
<td>333.33</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y Class Pax</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Class Pax</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>93750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Y Elasticity vs. B Elasticity
Dual Demand Curves

Elasticity vs. Capacity

- Y Elasticity
- B Elasticity
**BOS - LAX Example**

Dual Demand Curve Formulation Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity Unconstrained</th>
<th>Capacity Constrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Fare</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>794.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Fare</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>294.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Pax</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pax</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>68750</td>
<td>67647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Y Elasticity vs. B Elasticity

Single Demand Curve

Elasticity vs. Capacity

- Y Elasticity
- B Elasticity
Sell-Up Probability

Definition:

The probability that a B Class Passenger makes a booking for a seat in Y Class

In this formulation:

\[ p_s = P[a \text{ B Class Pax books in Y Class} \mid Q_B^A \geq Q_B^{BL}] \]
\[ \times P[Q_B^A \geq Q_B^{BL}] \]

where

\[ Q_B^A = \# \text{ of B Class Pax booked} \]
\[ Q_B^{BL} = \text{B Class Booking Limit} \]

If we assume that the \( P[a \text{ B Class Pax books in Y Class}] \) is not correlated with B Class Pax arrival time, the relationship becomes:

\[ p_s = P[a \text{ B Class Pax books in Y Class}] \times P[Q_B^A \geq Q_B^{BL}] \]
Diversion Probability

Definition:

The probability that a Y Class Passenger makes a booking for a seat in B Class

In this formulation:

\[ p_d = P[a \text{ Y Class Pax books in B Class} | Q_B^A < Q_B^{BL}] \times P[Q_B^A < Q_B^{BL}] \]

If we assume that \( P[a \text{ Y Class Pax books in B Class}] \) is not correlated with B Class passenger arrival time, the relationship becomes:

\[ p_d = P[a \text{ Y Class Pax books in B Class}] \times P[Q_B^A < Q_B^{BL}] \]
On Board Percentages

Definition:

\[ Q_{Y}^{OB} = \text{actual number of Y Class bookings} \]
\[ Q_{B}^{OB} = \text{actual number of B Class bookings} \]

Sell Up:

\[ Q_{Y}^{OB} = p_s Q_B + Q_Y \]
\[ Q_{B}^{OB} = (1-p_s)Q_B \]

Diversion:

\[ Q_{Y}^{OB} = (1-p_d)Q_Y \]
\[ Q_{B}^{OB} = p_d Q_Y + Q_B \]

Sell Up & Diversion:

\[ Q_{Y}^{OB} = p_s Q_B + (1-p_d)Q_Y \]
\[ Q_{B}^{OB} = p_d Q_Y + (1-p_s)Q_B \]
Variable Definitions Under Sell-Up & Diversion

\[ Q_Y = \text{# of Y Class Pax arrivals expected at the prevailing Y Class Price level (} p_s = p_d = 0 \) \]

\[ Q_B = \text{# of B Class Pax arrivals expected at the prevailing B Class Price level (} p_s = p_d = 0 \) \]

\[ P_Y = \text{Price level for each Y Class seat} \]

\[ P_B = \text{Price level for each B Class seat} \]
Incorporating Sell-Up

Two Fare Class Formulation:

Max $R = P_Y Q_Y + P_Y p_s Q_B + P_B (1-p_s) Q_B$

Subject to:

$Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap}$

$Q_Y \geq 0$

$Q_B \geq 0$

$P_Y = P_{Y0} - a_Y Q_Y$

$P_B = P_{B0} - a_B Q_B$
Incorporating Diversion

Two Fare Class Formulation:

Max $R = P_Y(1-p_d)Q_Y + P_BQ_B + P_Bp_dQ_Y$

Subject to:

$Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap}$

$Q_Y \geq 0$

$Q_B \geq 0$

$Q_n = f(P_n)$
Incorporating Sell-Up & Diversion

Two Fare Class Formulation:

\[ \text{Max } R = P_Y (1-p_d) Q_Y + P_Y p_s Q_B + P_B (1-p_s) Q_B + P_B p_d Q_Y \]

Subject to:

\[ Q_Y + Q_B \leq \text{Cap} \]

\[ Q_Y \geq 0 \]

\[ Q_B \geq 0 \]

\[ P_Y = P_{Y0} - a_Y Q_Y \]

\[ P_B = P_{B0} - a_B Q_B \]
## Return to BOS - LAX Example with Sell-Up & Diversion

**Single Demand Curve Formulation**  
**Capacity Unconstrained Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$P_d = 0$</th>
<th>$P_d = .1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y Class Fare</strong></td>
<td>666.67</td>
<td>677.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Class Fare</strong></td>
<td>333.33</td>
<td>354.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y Class OnBoard</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Class OnBoard</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y Class Pax</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Class Pax</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>96774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOS - LAX Example

Single Demand Curve Formulation
Capacity Constrained Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P_d = 0</th>
<th>P_d = .1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Class Fare</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Class Fare</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Class OnBoard</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Class OnBoard</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Class Pax</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Class Pax</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>93750</td>
<td>91875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOS - LAX Example

Dual Demand Curve Formulation
Capacity Unconstrained Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ps = 0</th>
<th>P_s = 0</th>
<th>Ps = .1</th>
<th>P_s = .1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pd = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd = .1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y Fare</th>
<th>B Fare</th>
<th>Y OnBoard</th>
<th>B OnBoard</th>
<th>Y Pax</th>
<th>B Pax</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>68750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>735.83</td>
<td>255.09</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>66275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>861.70</td>
<td>202.13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>76596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>860.62</td>
<td>206.92</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>73799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


BOS - LAX Example

Dual Demand Curve Formulation
Capacity Constrained Results :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$P_s = 0$</th>
<th>$P_s = 0$</th>
<th>$P_s = .1$</th>
<th>$P_s = .1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_d = 0$</td>
<td>794.12</td>
<td>779.41</td>
<td>904.41</td>
<td>901.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_d = .1$</td>
<td>294.12</td>
<td>296.08</td>
<td>279.41</td>
<td>279.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Fare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Fare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y OnBoard</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B OnBoard</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Pax</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pax</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>67647</td>
<td>65309</td>
<td>73621</td>
<td>71140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Directions

- Further Computational Testing
- Generalized Sensitivity Analysis
- Test Different Booking Limit Control Policies
- Test Model With Varying Pax Arrival Pattern