

MIT International Center for Air Transportation

Recent Developments in Pricing and Revenue Management

Dr. Peter P. Belobaba

Airline Industry Consortium Annual Meeting

November 6, 2008



- Impacts of fare simplification on average fares and load factors
 - Widespread removal of Saturday night minimum stay restrictions in US domestic markets to compete with LCCs (2005)
 - Re-institution of restrictions in some markets to increase revenues as fuel prices surged in 2008
- 10% capacity cuts driven by fuel price increases
 - Impacts on average fares and mix of passengers carried
- Movement toward "fare family" approach to pricing
 - Differentiated products with multiple fare levels
- New developments in RM systems and modeling



- Average fares collected in a market affected by
 - Price levels associated with multiple "fare products"
 - Restrictions on different fare products that affect passenger choice of options during the booking process
 - Revenue Management (RM) systems that control number of seats made available to different fare products
- "Fare simplification" in response to LCC competition led to less restricted fare structures
 - Removal of Saturday night stay restriction allowed business travelers with high willingness to pay (WTP) to buy lower fares
 - US domestic airlines saw dramatic decreases in yields (average fares) and record high load factors



US Airline Yields and Load Factors 1995-2007





- Passenger Origin Destination Simulator (PODS) simulates passenger choice of flights and fares
 - Assumes passengers <u>choose</u> among fare types and airlines, based on schedules, prices, restrictions and seat availability
 - Realistic environment for testing impacts of fare structures and RM systems on average fares, load factors and revenues

PODS experiments show how average fares and load factors change, holding <u>all price levels constant</u>

- Fare simplification and recent return to some restrictions
- Recent capacity reductions in response to higher fuel costs
- New "Fare Families" approach to airline pricing



- Most US domestic markets moved to "simplified fares" with no Saturday night minimum stay requirement
- Advance purchase requirements were also shortened

FARE	ΑΡ	Min Stay	Cancel Fee	Non Refund
\$500	0	NO	NO	NO
\$400	3	NO	YES	NO
\$315	7	YES	YES	YES
\$175	10	YES	YES	YES
\$145	14	YES	YES	YES
\$125	21	YES	YES	YES

2000 RESTRICTED

2005 SIMPLIFIED

FARE	AP	Min Stay	Cancel Fee	Non Refund
\$500	0	NO	NO	NO
\$400	0	NO	YES	NO
\$315	7	NO	NO	YES
\$175	7	NO	YES	YES
\$145	14	NO	YES	YES
\$125	14	NO	YES	YES



- By 2008, surging fuel prices led legacy carriers to re-institute Saturday night minimum stays for lowest fares
- But, less restricted higher fares remained in place

2005 SIMPLIFIED

2008 w/MIN STAY

FARE	AP	Min Stay	Cancel Fee	Non Refund	FARE	AP	Min Stay	Cancel Fee	Non Refund
\$500	0	NO	NO	NO	\$500	0	NO	NO	NO
\$400	0	NO	YES	NO	\$400	0	NO	YES	NO
\$315	7	NO	NO	YES	\$315	7	NO	NO	YES
\$175	7	NO	YES	YES	\$175	7	YES	YES	YES
\$145	14	NO	YES	YES	\$145	14	YES	YES	YES
\$125	14	NO	YES	YES	\$125	14	YES	YES	YES



Simulation Results: Minimum Stays on Lowest Fares Increase Total Revenues





Average Fares and Load Factors





Bookings by Fare Class









Fall 2008: 10% Capacity Reduction





Summary: Impacts of 10% Capacity Cut

	2008 W/MIN STAY	2008 10% CAP CUT	% CHANGE
C ΑΡΑC ΙΤ Υ	100	90	-10%
<u>PASSENGERS</u>	<u>81.6</u>	<u>75.8</u>	-7%
B US INE S S	39.7	38.8	-2%
L E IS UR E	41.8	37.1	-11%
	04 69/	04.20/	20/
LOADFACTOR	81.6%	84.2%	3%
R E VE NUE	\$18,251	\$17,582	-4%
AVE FARE	\$224	\$232	4%

Fewer passengers carried but higher load factors, as expected.

- Large reduction in leisure passengers carried, not much change in business passengers average fare increases.
- Total revenues down 4% (vs. cost savings of 10% capacity cut).







New Pricing Developments – Product Differentiation and "Fare Families"





Fare Families on Air Canada Web Site

Day's lowest fare→		<u>Sun</u> 03-Feb \$98	<u>Mon</u> 04-Feb \$98	<u>Tue</u> 05-Feb \$98	0 <u>Wed</u> 0 <u>6-Feb</u> \$98	<u>Thu</u> <u>07-Feb</u> \$220	Fri 08-Feb \$220	<u>Sat</u> 09-Feb \$118	<u>Sun</u> <u>10-Feb</u> \$98	<u>Mon</u> <u>11-Feb</u> \$118	<u>Tu</u> <u>12-F</u> \$9	<u>e</u> <u>Wed</u> Feb <u>13-Feb</u> 8 \$220	
From: Toronto, Pearson Int'l, ON (YYZ) To: Fort Lauderdale, Fll Int'l, FL (FLL) Compare our fare options										fare options			
Op.	Flights	Dep	oart	Arrive	Aircraft	Stops	Connection	15]	lango	<u>Tanqo</u> <u>Plus</u>	Latitu	<u>ide</u>	Executive Class
Direct Fi	AC938	07:	15	10:25	<u>320</u>	0		0	\$307	O \$343	O \$5	83	○ \$1048
۲	AC1216	10:	10	13:20	<u>321</u>	0		0	\$358	0 \$394	○ \$6	34	O \$1048
۲	AC900	14:	45	17:55	320	0		0	\$419	O \$454	○ \$6	94	O \$1048
۲	AC932	21:	00 +	00:10 · 1 day	<u>321</u>	0		0	\$220	O \$256	O \$4	96	○ \$1048
Connecti	ing Flights												
۲	AC480	06:	30	07:45	<u>E90</u>	0	Montreal (YUL)	0	\$358	\$394	O \$6	34	O \$1048
۲	AC924	08:	45	12:20	<u>320</u>	0		Ŭ		÷ + ·	- + -		O 7
۲	AC480	06:	30	07:45	<u>E90</u> ★	0	Montreal (YUL)	0	\$358	\$394	0 \$6	34	\$1048
۲	AC928	11:	00	14:36	<u>319</u>	0		Ŭ	+	0 4000	Ŭ + 0	-	0 110.0
۲	AC400	07:	00	08:15	<u>767</u>	0	Montreal (YUL)	0	\$358	0 \$394	() ¢6	34	\$1048
۲	AC928	11:	00	14:36	<u>319</u>	0		Ĭ	2000	U 4004	- \$0		J 21010



- Two or more "fare families" with explicit differences in amenities and restrictions
 - Reduced emphasis on "lowest available fare" on web sites
 - Passengers choose based on both price levels and differences in product characteristics and restrictions
- Preliminary PODS simulations of Fare Family concept:
 - Both families can be booked right up until departure day

FARE	ΑΡ	Min Stay	Cancel Fee	Non Refund
\$500	0	NO	NO	NO
\$400	7	NO	NO	NO
\$315	14	NO	NO	NO
\$175	0	YES	YES	YES
\$145	7	YES	YES	YES
\$125	14	YES	YES	YES



Fare Families Can Increase Revenues





Average Fares and Load Factors





Fare Families Capture More Sell-up and Late Booking Leisure Passengers





- Forecasting and optimization methods to maximize revenues in evolving fare structures
 - RM forecasting models must be changed to reflect passenger willingness to pay (WTP)
 - RM optimization models must incorporate likelihood of passenger sell-up when lower classes closed
 - Both forecasting and optimization require estimates of WTP and/or sell-up rates ("elasticity")

Methods developed and/or tested in MIT PODS research consortium

- Funded by seven large international airlines
- Passenger Origin Destination Simulator used to evaluate revenue impacts of RM models in competition markets



- Fare structures and RM systems have important impacts on average fares and total revenues
 - Segmentation restrictions contribute to revenue maximization
 - RM systems protect seats for late-booking high-fare passengers
- Most important recent developments include
 - Fare simplification, followed by a return to more restrictions
 - Movement toward "fare families" and product differentiation

• RM challenges with changing fare structures

- "Simplified" and changing fare structures make RM more difficult
- Development of new models for forecasting, optimization and estimation of willingness to pay