* 1. A/B test

On first stage of A/B testing I would like to consider 5 approaches:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Approach | Price-based | Time-based | Rating-based | Car-based | Loyalty-based |
| Process | Sorting prices in ascending order | Sorting arrival time in ascending order | Sorting driver rating in descending order | Sorting car class in descending order | Sorting previously preferred companies in descending order |

All mentioned approaches have consistent pros and cons: they define the most important parameter and don’t really take in account other(but there might be a dependence some of them – e.g. driver rating and car model). The main criteria for approach selection is answering the question: “What is the most common expectation from taxi service”? In table I’ve stated answers in descending order due to my opinion. These days many people perceive taxi as a way to get from A to B, that mean they don’t care about comfort as much as price(the most popular feature between aggregators) and time. That leave us only with two ways which we need to test in order to find the best-performing feature.

First hypothesis: Price-based approach works better than time-based

Test group selection via regional A/B test approach: since different cities may have different dynamics in multiple parameters(e. g. demand), we going to form control and test groups of cities by minimizing variance of daily ratio(#A/#B) of one parameter in previous 30 days. In my opinion metric should be rather simple because there are many fluctuations that may influence result and it would hard to interpret result.

I suggest two metrics: in first experiment average place of selected order in queue(or average number of swipes before order), in second experiment number of app-openings(A/B groups will be different). First metric describes user experience in moment(our aim is to guess user’s desires) and second describes consequences of this experience in some way.

Experiment should take at least a week in a regular days(better not to include holidays since they make things unpredictable), at best 3 weeks. Having this length, users will have time to estimate changes.

After we’ve received results first thing to do is check their significance. Using retrospective AA-test we would define it and get a current best approach. Next step would be accurate testing of other three ideas. Since they are more risky, we would select groups carefully in order not to lose loyal clients.

* 1. Future orders communication

1)First of all, I would add an option to select preferrable timing during making the order. As default I would set a 7 minute gap. if pick-up spot is a hub(train station, airport) the most reasonable timing is 15-20 minutes before trip – passenger is probably waiting for the luggage or have several minutes before arriving to the train station.

2)First of all, there should be a rating system, which should reduce significantly if driver failed to make a pre-ordered ride. Secondly we should make everything to keep client loyalty: some kind of compensation should be given, may be a promocode for the next ride or free upgrade in class if there is nearby car(price difference should be paid by company). And lastly, nearby driver’s caution should be attracted at this order – e. g. with additional rating points

3)I think this gap should be at least 7 minutes and 15 if it is a hub. But we need to deal with driver’s interests – for example if pick up point and drop off point are near to the order, we may allow to make the ride if there is enough time.

4)First metric is share of cancelled orders. Second is ratio of pre-orders and regular orders. Third is average delay in pick-up point