

# Optimized Travel Menus with a Flexible Mobility on Demand System

#### Bilge Atasoy, Takuro Ikeda, Moshe Ben-Akiva

July 22, 2015

CASPT



# Agenda



# Motivation and background

# Flexible Mobility on Demand (FMOD) system Concepts Modeling Framework

#### Simulation experiments

Myopic model v.s. Look-ahead model

## Summary and future directions

# Motivation and background



- Conventional public transportation services are not personalized.
  - Fixed route, Fixed schedule, Low frequency etc.
- Most people cannot afford to use taxi service on a daily basis.



ICT has a potential to break the vicious cycle?

# Motivation and background

- Personalized transportation services using mobile apps are emerging
  - Uber, Lyft, GrabTaxi, etc.



Why not apply similar technologies to public transportation services?
 DRT, fixed route bus etc.

# Problem



"How to increase operator profit and user satisfaction?"

**Flexibility** to demand fluctuations is necessary.

Currently, due to lack of the flexibility:

- Off-peak:
- => Drivers cannot find passengers
- On-peak:
- => Passengers cannot find drivers.



Some passengers may give up taking public transportation.

=> Operator lose revenue opportunity.



# What is FMOD?

#### <u>F</u>lexible <u>M</u>obility <u>o</u>n Demand

- Real-time system
- Flexibility to demand fluctuations
- Concepts
  - Dynamic allocation of vehicle to service modes
  - Optimized travel menus are offered to the customer



5

# Concept of FMOD (1/2)



#### Dynamic allocation of vehicle to service modes

Same vehicle is dynamically reassigned to different service modes according to the evolving demand.



Customer





**Taxi:** Flexible route, flexible schedule, private



Shared-taxi: Flexible route, flexible schedule, shared



Mini-bus: Fixed route, flexible schedule, shared



# Concept of FMOD (2/2)

#### **Travel menu** is optimized in order to maximize operator profit / customer surplus



# Example of travel menu (Mobile app)

#### (B) • ((n# 🗭 4 🗐 🛄 100% 🔜 9:19 PM Flexible Mobility On Demand Choose a ride 仲田公園 🔺 甲州街道 Options with different scheduled time and fare 日野市役 Google 06-22 (Mon) Taxi taxi Pickup 21:23 Dropoff 21:28 Fare ¥710 Shared-taxi 06-22 (Mon) shared-taxi Pickup 22:05 Dropoff 22:10 Fare ¥360 Mini-bus 06-22 (Mon) mini-bus Pickup 22:05 Dropoff 22:09 Fare ¥300 Cancel Back Choose döcomo

FUĴÎTSU

# **Dynamic allocation (Simulation)**

FUJITSU

#### Red: Taxi, Green: Shared taxi, Blue: Mini-bus, Yellow: empty



#### Off-peak (AM 6:00) Taxi mode is dominant



#### On-peak (AM 8:00) Shared taxi / Mini-bus mode is dominant

# Modeling framework



#### **Product** $p_{n,m,l}$

■ A service  $(m \in M)$  on a vehicle  $(n \in N)$  departing at a certain time period  $(l \in L)$ 

N:set of vehicles,

*M*:set of service modes

L: set of time periods

#### **Feasible product** $p_{n,m,l} \in F$

- A product that satisfies the capacity and scheduling constraints
  - Vehicle capacity
  - No conflict with existing schedules
  - Deviation from preferred time window

#### Assortment

A list of feasible products on the travel menu

# Modeling framework (cont.)



Feasible products set are generated taking into account:

- Capacity constraints
- Scheduling constraints



#### Phase 2. Assortment optimization

Assortment to be offered to the customer is optimized

- Maximize operator's profit and/or consumer surplus based on a choice model

# Choice model



Logit model is used for estimating the choice probabilities for each product and the reject option

#### Utility functions are defined by:

Price

- In-vehicle travel time
- Out-vehicle travel time (for mini-bus)
- Schedule delay

$$\operatorname{Prob}_{n,m,l}(x) = \frac{x_{n,m,l} \exp(\mu V_{n,m,l})}{\exp(\mu V_{\text{reject}}) + \sum_{n' \in N} \sum_{m' \in M} \sum_{l' \in L} x_{n',m',l'} \exp(\mu V_{n',m',l'})}$$

# Assortment optimization model

#### Myopic model

Consider the current request only

max  $R_{current}(X)$ 

#### Look-ahead model

Take into account future demand

$$max \quad R_{current}(X) + R_{future}(X)$$

$$X = \{x_{n,m,l} \mid x_{n,m,l} \in \{0,1\}\}$$
 Decide which feasible products  
are included in the assortment

 $x_{n,m,l} = 0$   $\forall p_{n,m,l} \notin F$  Only feasible products are included





# Look-ahead model

Maximize expected profit from current customer and expected future profit

$$max R_{current}(X) + \sum_{l \in L} \tilde{r}_{l} \tilde{z}_{l}$$
s.t. 
$$\sum_{n \in N} \sum_{l \in L} x_{n,m,l} = 1$$

$$z_{n,m,l} \leq Cap_{n,m,l} - x_{n,m,l}$$

$$\tilde{z}_{l} \leq \sum_{n \in N} \sum_{m \in M} z_{n,m,l}$$

$$\tilde{z}_{l} \leq \Phi^{-1} \sum_{m \in M} z_{n,m,l}$$

$$\tilde{z}_{l} \leq \Phi^{-1} \sum_{m \in M} z_{n,m,l}$$
Reserved capacity is limited by percentile  
of the future demand distribution  

$$\tilde{r}_{l}$$
Average future profit in time period l  
 $\tilde{z}_{l}$ 
Total reserved capacity in time period l  
 $z_{n,m,l}$ 
Reserved capacity of  $p_{n,m,l}$   
 $Cap_{n,m,l}$ 
Capacity of  $p_{n,m,l}$   
 $Dem_{l}$ 
Future demand in time period l

## **Simulation Experiment - Conditions**

#### Network

- Hino city in Tokyo (approx. 9km × 8km)
- Simulation horizon: 4 hours
- Supply
  - Fleet size: 12 (8 seats)
  - Bus line: actual route
- Demand
  - OD: From Hino station to arbitrary location (based on population density)

#### Fare

- Taxi: \$5 (base) + \$0.5 (per 320m)
- Shared-taxi: 65% of taxi fare
- Bus: \$4 (flat rate)
- Operation Cost
  - Variable cost \$0.2 / km
  - Fixed cost \$200 / day / vehicle







(Yellow: Bus line)

# **Simulation Experiment - Scenarios**

- Optimization models
  - Myopic
  - Look-ahead
- Objective functionProfit maximization
- Demand
   200, 400, 800 requests

# Results



- In all cases, look-ahead model improves the profit compared to the myopic model.
- As demand increase, improvement in profit increase,

		% change in profit	% change in cons. surplus	# of served pax.	# of no- offers
200 requests	myopic	reference		170	0
	look-ahead	+2.92%	-0.55%	200(+30)	0
400 requests	myopic	reference		269	20
	look-ahead	+30.8%	+16.4%	304(+35)	7(-13)
800 requests	myopic	reference		335	145
	look-ahead	+85.8%	+2.00%	356(+21)	112(-33)

# Results



In all cases, look-ahead model accommodates more passengers compared to the myopic model

		% change in profit	% change in cons. surplus	# of served pax.	# of no- offers
200 requests	myopic	reference		170	0
	look-ahead	+2.92%	-0.55%	200( <mark>+30</mark> )	0
400 requests	myopic	reference		269	20
	look-ahead	+30.8%	+16.4%	304( <mark>+35</mark> )	7(-13)
800 requests	myopic	reference		335	145
	look-ahead	+85.8%	+2.00%	356( <mark>+21</mark> )	112(-33)





#### Look-ahead model decrease the number of no-offers.

		% change in profit	% change in cons. surplus	# of served pax.	# of no- offers
200 requests	myopic	reference		170	0
	look-ahead	+2.92%	-0.55%	200(+30)	0
400 requests	myopic	reference		269	20
	look-ahead	+30.8%	+16.4%	304(+35)	7( <b>-13</b> )
800 requests	myopic	reference		335	145
	look-ahead	+85.8%	+2.00%	356(+21)	112( <mark>-33</mark> )

# Conclusions



- Flexible Mobility on Demand (FMOD)
  - Dynamic allocation of vehicle to service modes
  - Optimized travel menus are offered to the customer
- We have developed and compared two optimization models.
  - Myopic model, Look-ahead model
- Look-ahead model improves the profit and accommodates more passengers compared to the myopic model
  - Especially in high demand scenarios.

# Future research directions

Test with different scenarios

- Robustness for poor demand estimation
- Field test (Singapore, Japan etc.)
  - Dedicated + non-dedicated fleet
- Real world conditions
  - Traffic congestion, Cancelation / No show, Behind schedule
- Learning the behavior of customer through repeated usage

FUITSU

Online calibration of demand model parameters



# Thank you for your attention!

# ikeda.takuro@jp.fujitsu.com



# FUJTSU

# shaping tomorrow with you