

**PRICING THE FLEXIBILITY OF AIR TICKETS:
GENERATION OF ALTERNATE MODELS AND COMPARISON
OF REVENUE AND RISK**



सिद्धिमूलं प्रबन्धनम्
भा. प्र. सं. इन्दौर
IIM INDORE

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE FELLOW PROGRAMME IN MANAGEMENT
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
INDORE

By
Shripad Lakshmikant Kulkarni

March, 2017

Thesis Advisory Committee

Prof. Vinaysingh J. Chawan
[Chairman]

Prof. U. K. Bhattacharya
[Member]

Prof. L. V. Ramana
[Member]

Abstract

Air-ticket demand for a flight is uncertain whereas air ticket prices are fluctuating. Due to uncertain travel plans, passengers either have to cancel their confirmed bookings or have to postpone their ticket bookings. Passengers' travel uncertainty costs them cancellation penalty when bookings are cancelled or higher fare if bookings are postponed. The travel uncertainty from passengers' side causes revenue uncertainty to airlines. Financial options can work as a price discrimination tool when airlines cannot discriminate between passengers based on their travel uncertainty (Fang & Whinston, 2007). Since options' holders have right but no obligation to exercise, passengers can use this mechanism to hedge against uncertainty in future travel plans. Thus airlines have incentive to offer options-like instruments to passengers with travel uncertainty and can implement it easily via internet (Walker et Al., 1998).

Flexible air tickets are introduced by airlines across the globe. These tickets are comparable to call options as they enable the owner to have a right without obligation to book a seat in future at a fare mentioned while purchasing it. India's private airline company Jet Airways is offering "FareLock" which is a flexible air ticket at a price INR 350 for a domestic flight and INR 700 for an international flight operated by Jet Airways. By treating flexible air tickets as financial options, the first research question provides an approach to check the prices of flexible air tickets. Jet Airways' FareLock is considered for the price checking. The price data for two domestic routes and two international routes of Jet Airways is collected for a period of two months and air ticket price volatility is calculated like stock price volatility as explained by Jain & Cox (2011). One of the standard option pricing method, the Black-Scholes (BS) model for call options is applied to check the pricing of FareLock (for both domestic and international). The actual volatility obtained from two-months price data is compared with the implied volatility obtained from the BS model and appropriateness of pricing is decided. The

results indicate that for passengers, FareLock is in-the-money for international routes and also when purchased within three weeks of date of departure for domestic routes as well. The BS model provides one approach to price the flexible air tickets and airlines can use this approach to implement flexible air tickets policy. The BS pricing approach is also provides insights regarding validity of flexible air tickets.

Financial options can not only be used to book air tickets for a future travel date like in flexible air tickets but can also be used to cancel an air ticket. A financial options-like method is proposed to book as well as cancel an air ticket. Call option-like products can be used to book the air ticket so as to mitigate risk associated with price fluctuations and put option-like products can be used to cancel the air ticket and also reduce the cost of cancelation from passengers' point of view. In the second part of the study the two systems are compared viz Fixed Cancellation Penalty System (FCPS) (similar to practice adapted by various Indian civil aviation companies) and proposed Options-Like Instrument System (OLIS) for their expected revenues. Mathematical models for both the systems are proposed and in contrast to Akgunduz et al., (2007) model, OLIS proposes passengers are options holders and airlines are options issuers. The two systems FCPS and OLIS are compared for various demand scenarios in a simulation based study. The results suggest that the proposed OLIS is yielding 2%-10% more revenue than existing FCPS. The new demand effects like *buy-up*, *stimulation* and *dilution* are studied and it is found that *buy-up* and *stimulation* can slightly increase the expected revenues but *dilution* can cause more dent to expected revenues than the collective incremental effects of *buy-up* and *stimulation*.

The third research question compares revenue risks associated with the proposed OLIS and existing FCPS by using various risk measures such as Value-at-Risk (VaR), Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) and Unit Normal Linear Loss. Inventory theory and revenue management are closely related and both the theories have to deal with the risk related to

perishable inventory (Zhuang & Li, 2011). Hence inventory theory risk measure of Unit Normal Linear Loss is also considered along with VaR and CVaR. The result of risk measurement comparison of OLIS and FCPS suggests that airlines not only gain revenue by implementing OLIS as compared to FCPS but can also reduce their revenue risk. A target revenue is attained with more probability with OLIS as compared to FCPS.

OLIS is an extension to flexible air tickets from the point of view of both bookings and cancellations and this research suggests methods to model, price and measure risks regarding with options-like air tickets. The OLIS provides a comprehensive solution to airlines as it increases revenue, manages revenue risk and improves airlines' seat allocation efficiency. The premium obtained by issuing options can act as a source of riskless revenue for the airlines and option mechanism is appealing to both airlines and passengers as it is voluntary for both of them (Gallego et al., 2008). The passengers can mitigate the uncertainty associated with their travel; and reduce the cost of cancellation and late booking by choosing right type of options. With the type of option chosen by the passenger, airlines can get important information about the travel possibility of the passenger and by offering options, airlines can segment passengers based on their willingness-to-pay for mitigating travel uncertainty. Thus options-like air tickets provide mechanism that allows win-win situation for both passengers and airlines.

Keywords: *Airline Revenue Management, Risk Management, Call Option, Put Option, Flexible Air-tickets, Price Volatility, Risk-Measure, Value-at-Risk, Conditional Value-at-Risk, Unit Normal Linear Loss.*

Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Figures.....	ix
List of Tables	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1 Overview of Airline Revenue Management.....	1
1.1.1 History of ARM	3
1.1.2 Single-leg Capacity allocation/ Seat Inventory Control	4
1.1.3 Overbooking	10
1.2 Research Questions	12
Research Question: 1	13
Research Question: 2	13
Research Question: 3	13
1.3 Organization of Thesis.....	13
2. Pricing of Flexible Air Tickets	15
2.1 Introduction.....	15
2.2 Literature Review	16
2.3 Flexible Air Tickets.....	20
2.3.1 Flexible Air Tickets in India: Jet Airways FareLock	20
2.4 Volatility of Air Ticket Prices	23
2.5 Flexible Air Ticket Pricing.....	24
2.5.1 FareLock Price Testing	24
2.5.2 Assumptions of Black-Scholes model	31
2.5.3 Histograms of log-prices of Jet Airways Routes	32

2.5.4 Alternative models of pricing flexible air tickets	34
2.6 Summary of Results	34
3. Bookings and Cancellations of Air Tickets with O.L.I.S.....	35
3.1. Introduction.....	35
3.2 Literature Review	36
Financial Options in Air Ticket Bookings	36
3.3 Characteristics of Akgunduz Model.....	40
3.3.1 Critical Analysis of Akgunduz Model	43
3.4 Airline Ticket Booking and Cancellations.....	45
Models of Demand.....	46
Models of Cancellation	46
Poisson model as a limit of Bernoulli process	47
Cancellation Penalties in Indian Civil Aviation Sector	47
3.5 Fixed Cancellation Penalty System (FCPS).....	51
3.5.1 Fixed Cancellation Penalty System (Simulation)	54
3.6 Options-like Instrument System (OLIS).....	57
3.6.1 OLIS Model (Simulation)	62
3.7 Effect of New Demand Situations: Stimulation, Buy-Up, Dilution	79
3.8 Discussion of OLIS as its Relation with Financial Options	80
3.9 Limitations of OLIS.....	87
3.10 Summary.....	87
4. Comparison of Revenue Risks of O.L.I.S. and F.C.P.S.....	89
4.1 Introduction.....	89
4.2 Literature Review	90
4.3 Risk Measures for Revenue Management	97

4.3.1 Value-at-Risk	97
4.3.2 Conditional Value-at-Risk	97
4.3.3 Unit Normal Linear Loss	98
4.3.4 Fishburn Risk Measure	98
4.4 Calculations of Risk measures	99
4.4.1 VaR calculation.....	99
4.4.2 CVaR calculation.....	99
4.4.3 UNLL calculation	99
4.5 Comparison of Revenue Risk Based on Various Risk Measures	100
Diagrammatic Representation of Various Risk Measures	108
Diagrammatic Representation of Various Risk Measures	111
4.6 Summary.....	112
5. Conclusion	114
5.1 Conclusion	114
5.2 Managerial Implications	116
5.3 Limitations.....	118
5.4 Future Scope.....	120
References.....	122

List of Figures

Figure 1 : Jet Airways FareLock	21
Figure 2 : Fare-Lock	22
Figure 3 : Jet Airways Fare-Lock T&C	22
Figure 4 : Histogram Mumbai-London 9W-120, 02:25 AM, Departure Date - 25 Dec.....	32
Figure 5 : Histogram Mumbai-Toronto 9W-232+234, 02:45 AM, Departure Date - 25 Dec.	33
Figure 6 : Histogram Delhi-Indore 9W-797, 06:05 AM, Departure Date - 25 Dec	33
Figure 7 : Histogram Delhi-Chennai 9W-821, 06:45 AM, Departure Date - 25 Dec.....	33
Figure 8 : Timeline for fixed cancellation penalty model.....	53
Figure 9 : Options-Like Instrument System: Timeline	62
Figure 10 : Demand Redistribution.....	66
Figure 11 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 25, Cancellations = 20)	70
Figure 12 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 25, Cancellations = 10)	71
Figure 13 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 25, Cancellations = 30)	72
Figure 14: Comparison of Revenue (V= 40, Cancellations = 20)	73
Figure 15 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 40, Cancellations = 10)	74
Figure 16 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 40, Cancellations = 30)	75
Figure 17 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 15, Cancellations = 20)	76
Figure 18 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 15, Cancellations = 10)	77
Figure 19 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 15, Cancellations = 30)	78
Figure 20 : OLIS Histogram for V 25 Cancellation 20 Demand 75, 25.....	108
Figure 21 : FCPS Histogram for V 25 Cancellation 20 Demand 75, 25	109
Figure 22 : OLIS Histogram for V 40, Cancellation 10, Demand 60, 10.....	109
Figure 23 : FCPS Histogram for V 40, Cancellation 10, Demand 60, 10	110
Figure 24 : OLIS Histogram for V 15, Cancellation 30, Demand 65, 15	110

Figure 25 : FCPS Histogram for Cancellation 30 Demand (65, 15)..... 111

Figure 26 : Diagrammatic Representation of VaR 111

Figure 27 : Diagrammatic Representation of CVaR..... 111

Figure 28 : Diagrammatic Representation of VaR & CVaR Deviations 112

Figure 29 : Diagrammatic Representation of VaR & CVaR Combined..... 112

List of Tables

Table 1 : Overview of survey papers in ARM.....	4
Table 2 : Summary of seat allotment literature.....	8
Table 3 : Future of ARM	12
Table 4 : Developments in European option pricing theory	17
Table 5 : Developments in American option pricing theory.....	19
Table 6 : FareLock Analysis for Mumbai-London Route	27
Table 7 : Descriptive Statistics Mumbai-London 9W-120, 02:25 AM	27
Table 8 : FareLock Analysis for Mumbai-Toronto Route	28
Table 9 : Descriptive Statistics Mumbai-Toronto 9W-232+234, 02:45 AM.....	28
Table 10 : FareLock Analysis for Delhi - Indore Route	29
Table 11 : Descriptive Statistics Delhi-Indore 9W-797, 06:05 AM	29
Table 12 : FareLock Analysis for Delhi - Chennai Route	30
Table 13 : Descriptive Statistics Delhi-Chennai 9W-821, 06:45 AM	30
Table 14 : Assumptions of Black-Scholes model	31
Table 15 : Literature regarding non-satisfaction of assumptions of BS model	32
Table 16 : Overview of literature on options in ARM.....	39
Table 17 : Cancellation Penalty Comparison.....	48
Table 18: Jet Airways Cancellation Penalty	48
Table 19 : List of notations for existing model.....	53
Table 20 : Notations for Cancellation Penalty Model Simulation.....	55
Table 21 : Protection Limit = 25, Cancellations = 20.....	55
Table 22 : Protection Limit = 25, Cancellations = 10.....	55
Table 23 : Protection Limit = 25, Cancellations = 30.....	56
Table 24 : Protection Limit = 40, Cancellations = 20.....	56

Table 25 : Protection Limit = 40, Cancellations = 10.....	56
Table 26 : Protection Limit = 40, Cancellations = 30.....	56
Table 27 : Protection Limit = 15, Cancellations = 20.....	56
Table 28 : Protection Limit = 15, Cancellations = 10.....	56
Table 29 : Protection Limit = 15, Cancellations = 30.....	57
Table 30: Comparison of Cost of Cancellations	59
Table 31 : Summary of notations used in option like instrument model	62
Table 32 : Low-Fare Demand Redistribution on O.L.I.S.	66
Table 33 : Summary of notations of proposed model.....	69
Table 34 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 25, Cancellations = 20).....	70
Table 35 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 25, Cancellations = 10).....	71
Table 36 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 25, Cancellations = 30).....	72
Table 37 : Comparison of Revenue (V=40, Cancellations = 20).....	73
Table 38 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 40, Cancellations = 10).....	74
Table 39 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 40, Cancellations = 30).....	75
Table 40 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 15, Cancellations = 20).....	76
Table 41 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 15, Cancellations = 10).....	77
Table 42 : Comparison of Revenue (V= 15, Cancellations = 30).....	78
Table 43 : Effect of Simulation on Revenue.....	79
Table 44 : Effect of Simulation on Buy- up.....	79
Table 45 : Effect of Simulation on Dilution	79
Table 46 : Call Option Comparison in Financial Market and Proposed Model	82
Table 47 : Put option Comparison in Financial Market and Proposed Model.....	83
Table 48 : Rationale for Put Options	84
Table 49 : Risk in ARM.....	91

Table 50 : Risk in PRM	92
Table 51 : Risk in QRM.....	96
Table 52 : Comparison of Risk Measures VaR (V=40).....	100
Table 53 : Comparison of Risk Measures VaR (V=25).....	101
Table 54 : Comparison of Risk Measures VaR (V=15).....	102
Table 55 : Comparison of Risk Measures CVaR (V=40)	103
Table 56 : Comparison of Risk Measures CVaR (V=25)	104
Table 57 : Comparison of Risk Measures CVaR (V=15)	105
Table 58 : Comparison of Risk Measures UNLL (V=40)	106
Table 59 : Comparison of Risk Measures UNLL (V=25)	107
Table 60 : Comparison of Risk Measures UNLL (V=15)	108