

IE-468 Case 4 Report NETWORK MANAGEMENT FOR THAI LION AIR

Bilgehan Güçlü Özkan 22003839

Damla Uçar 22103276

Ahmet Sayan 21903426

Before the analysis, an initial breakdown of the flight routings were done to serve as the basis for the questions. The three flights were segmented as shown in the following table, and the questions were answered with reference to these routings.

ODF Routing Breakdown by Flights

| \mathbf{Flight} | Route | ODFs Using This Flight |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| SL1001 | Chiang Mai \rightarrow Suvarnabhumi | 101, 102, 103, 104 |
| SL2002 | Suvarnabhumi \rightarrow Koh Samui | 103, 104, 105, 106, 109, 110 |
| SL3003 | Koh Samui \rightarrow Phuket | 107, 108, 109, 110 |

Question 1

a)

Deterministic Linear Model

For this part, we used the linear programming approach below.

```
n products (origin-destination-fares for airlines) m resources (flight legs for airlines) d_j (mean) demand for product j p_j price for product j C_i capacity for resource i a_{ij} = 1 if product j uses resource i, 0 otherwise x_j capacity allocated for product j (decision variable)
```

$$\max \sum_{j=1}^n p_j x_j$$
 s.t.
$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j \leq C_i, \ i=1,\ldots,m$$

$$x_j \leq d_j, \ j=1,\ldots,n$$

$$x_j \geq 0, \ j=1,\ldots,n$$

Model with Numerical Parameters

$$max 750x_1 + 500x_2 + 1000x_3 + 600x_4 + 650x_5 + 450x_6 + 700x_7 + 350x_8 + 600x_9 + 400x_{10}$$
 s.t.

$$\begin{split} &x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 \leq 30 \\ &x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_9 + x_{10} \leq 30 \\ &x_7 + x_8 + x_9 + x_{10} \leq 30 \\ &x_1 \leq 11, \ x_2 \leq 30, \ x_3 \leq 9, \ x_4 \leq 16, \ x_5 \leq 8, \ x_6 \leq 23, \ x_7 \leq 9, \ x_8 \leq 21, \ x_9 \leq 10, \ x_{10} \leq 13 \\ &x_1 \geq 0, \ x_2 \geq 0, \ x_3 \geq 0, \ x_4 \geq 0, \ x_5 \geq 0, \ x_6 \geq 0, \ x_7 \geq 0, \ x_8 \geq 0, \ x_9 \geq 0, \ x_{10} \geq 0 \end{split}$$

b)

By solving the model above, we obtained the values of x_i as follows:

| | X |
|-----|----|
| 101 | 11 |
| 102 | 10 |
| 103 | 9 |
| 104 | 0 |
| 105 | 8 |
| 106 | 13 |
| 107 | 9 |
| 108 | 21 |
| 109 | 0 |
| 110 | 0 |

and the objective function is **46950**. From the solution, we observed that the capacity allocated as above is for each product. There is no capacity allocated for Suvarnabhumi - Phuket with a connection to Koh Samui because of the lower fare than other flights with the same capacity.

c) This question refers to the shadow price of the capacity constraint for the Suvarnabhumi to Koh Samui route. In this case, the answer is 450, since the capacity constraint is binding and the demand for 106 is not binding.

d) This time we are looking for the Chiang Mai to Koh Samui route. Since this route is the combination of two direct flights we will simply add the shadow prices of the flight capacity constraints. These being the CS and the SK flights.

| | Constraints | | | Shadow Price |
|----|-------------|----|----|--------------|
| CS | 30 | <= | 30 | 500 |
| SK | 30 | <= | 30 | 450 |
| KP | 30 | <= | 30 | 350 |

So the minimum amount the customer will have to pay will be 950.

Question 2

a)

The allocations from the DLP might not be the best solution as the deterministic values for the expected demand do not account for demand uncertainty. This could result in non-optimal allocations as actual demand can deviate from the mean. Furthermore since we're utilizing allocations rather than nesting there is a possibility of denying full-fare customers when we have enough capacity. Without protection levels we might have lower profits due to demand uncertainty.

b)

To determine protection levels for all types of tickets in their respective flights we first used indexing by removing the other legs from connecting tickets and then bucketing them with similarly index valued tickets. The results can be seen below.

| Index CS | Bucket CS | Index SK | Bucket SK | Index KP | Bucket KP |
|----------|------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 750 | B1 | | | | |
| 500 | B2 | | | | |
| 500 | B2 | 550 | B1 | | |
| 100 | B3 | 150 | B2 | | |
| | | 650 | B1 | | |
| | | 450 | B1 | | |
| | | | | 700 | B1 |
| | | | | 350 | B2 |
| | | 250 | B2 | 150 | B2 |
| | | 50 | B2 | -50 | В3 |

To determine the protection levels after forming these buckets, we would need to find the combined distribution of the buckets since they are the combination of multiple demand distributions. Then using their weighted average prices we can use Littlewood's rule to find

the optimal booking limits directly if there are only 2 buckets (virtual fare classes) like the Suvarnabhumi to Koh Samui route.

However if there are more than 2 buckets we will need to use a heuristic like ESMRa or ESMRb first to find protection levels.

Question 3

a)

The problem was solved using the following model.

$$H^{t}(d^{t}) = \max \sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{j} x_{j}$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} x_{j} \leq C_{i} \qquad i = 1, \dots, m$$

$$x_{j} \leq d_{j}^{t} \qquad j = 1, \dots, n$$

$$x_{j} \geq 0 \qquad j = 1, \dots, n$$

The number of samples T was set to 10. For each of the 10 samples, demands were generated from the given distributions of each Origin-Destination-Fare (ODF) pair. These determined values can be seen in the table below.

| n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 101 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 12 |
| 102 | 32 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 33 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 29 |
| 103 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 11 |
| 104 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 18 |
| 105 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 10 |
| 106 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 21 | 26 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 23 |
| 107 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 10 |
| 108 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 24 | 21 | 26 | 17 | 28 | 23 | 16 |
| 109 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 11 |
| 110 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 17 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 15 | 16 | 9 |

Each of these scenarios was solved using the deterministic linear program defined in Question 1. The allocations (x) found for the samples can be seen in the table below. The average for the x values from x101 to x110 was also computed to be used in the model.

| Sample | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
|--------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------|
| x101 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 10.7 |
| x102 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 10.2 |
| x103 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 11 | 9.1 |
| x104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| x105 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 8.3 |
| x106 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 5 | 10 |
| x107 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 8.1 |
| x108 | 16 | 20 | 15 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 17 | 23 | 23 | 16 | 19.3 |
| x109 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2.6 |
| x110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

b)

To calculate the shadow price for a new customer from Suvarnabhumi to Koh Samui, we used the following formula:

$$\pi_j^{RLP} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \pi_j^t(d_t)$$

 $\pi_j^t(d_t)$ was found as 450 for each sample, therefore the minimum price that we would like to charge for this new request would be 450.

c)

Since we do not have the direct flight from Chiang Mai to Koh Samui, the shadow price is calculated as the summation of the shadow prices of the flights SL1001 and SL2002. The same calculations were done as in part b. For the flight SL2002, it was calculated as 500, and SL1001 was previously determined as 450. Therefore, the minimum price that we would like to charge for this new request would be 950.

Question 4

a)

The following model was used to solve the problem using the Probabilistic Non-Linear Program.

$$\max \sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{j} \sum_{d=1}^{M_{j}} z_{jd} P(D_{j} \geq d)$$

s.t.

$$x_{j} = \sum_{d=1}^{M_{j}} z_{jd}$$
 $j = 1, ..., n$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} x_{j} \leq C_{i} \qquad i = 1, \dots, m$$

$$x_{j} \geq 0 \qquad j = 1, \dots, n$$

$$0 \leq z_{jd} \leq 1 \quad j = 1, \dots, n, d = 1, \dots, M_{j}$$

b)

After solving the probabilistic non-linear program, we obtained the following results for decision variables

| j | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------------|---------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|---------|------|-----|-----|
| x | 10 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| $z_jd*P(D_j>=d)$ | 9.57143 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 6.8 | 17 | 8.57143 | 18.6 | 0 | 0 |
| р | 750 | 500 | 1000 | 600 | 650 | 450 | 700 | 350 | 600 | 400 |

The objective value from the solution is:

| Obj= | 44758.6 |
|------|---------|
|------|---------|

c)

In previous cases, we could assign the shadow price by simply checking whether the price or demand constraints were tight. However, in this case, since the acceptance of bookings depended on probability, we did not have a binding capacity constraint. Therefore, we manually re-solved the model by adding one more booking and observed which additional ticket was accepted. The resulting increase in expected revenue was 450, which came from ODF 106. Thus, the minimum price we would like to charge for the new request is 450.

d)

Similarly, the same process was applied for each flight. For the request from Chiang Mai to Koh Samui, two connecting flights are required: Chiang Mai to Suvarnabhumi and Suvarnabhumi to Koh Samui. We manually re-solved the model for each leg to observe the additional accepted ticket and determine the corresponding increase in expected revenue. The shadow prices were found to be 450 for the Chiang Mai to Suvarnabhumi leg and 500 for the Suvarnabhumi to Koh Samui leg. Therefore, the minimum price we would like to charge for this new request is 950.

The solutions obtained from re-solving the model are presented in the table below. The table indicates which ODF would be used for the additional booking in each case, which we used to determine the shadow price.

| | x | CS | SK | KP |
|-----|----|----|----|----|
| 101 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 102 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| 103 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 105 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 106 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 |
| 107 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| 108 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |