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## Motivation

ACARE (Advisory Council for Aeronautic Research in Europe) has set ambitious objectives for $2020^{1}$ :

- Lower $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions by $50 \%$
- Lower $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ emissions by $80 \%$
- Increase transportation capacity (by 3 times) at lower fares
- Decrease of noise by one half
- Max of 15-30 minutes of delay
- Five-fold reduction in the average accident rate (fatalities)
- To answer all these issues an innovative approach is needed!
${ }^{1}$ European Aeronautics: A vision for 2020 - EU 2001


## X-48B - Boeing/NASA
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## NACRE - Airbus


$(+)$ reduced fuel consumption, because of reduced drag.
Some open issues for cargo (shape), frontal surface still important.

## Outline

## (1) Introduction

## (2) Clip-Air

## 3 Itinerary-Based Fleet Assignment Models

## 4 Results

## Clip-Air

## Key ideas

Mixed air-land transportation system (Passenger Container): A passenger from Lausanne can travel to London without living his/her train wagon

Modular-detachable transportation unit (capsule): flexibility, security, reduced storage and maintenance costs

Carrier unit (wing): Carries the capsules (max 3) and the engines, improved aerodynamic structure and less fuel consumption with decreased total weight

## Clip-Air - Main entities in the system



## Modularity

Enhanced potential in capsule routing:
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## Configuration - Comparison with Airbus A320

|  |  | Clip-Air | A320 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Capacity |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Engines | $3 \times 145(435$ seats) | 150 seats |  |
| Maximum | 1 (plane $/$ capsule) | $\mathbf{3}$ engines | 126 t |
| Aircraft Weight | 2 (planes $/$ capsules) | 153 t | 77.5 t |
|  | 3 (planes $/$ capsules) | 180 t | $2 \times 77.5 \mathrm{t}(155 \mathrm{t})$ |
|  |  |  | $3 \times 77.5 \mathrm{t}(232 \mathrm{t})$ |

When Clip-Air flies with 2 or more capsules it becomes advantageous in terms of weight, therefore fuel consumption.

## Operating Costs

## operatingCostsOfFlight=flightRevenues * (1-profitMargin)

where flightRevenues is average fare times the total number of sold seats.

Operating costs compose of:

- 16\% Fuel
- 14\% Crew cost
- 14\% Aircraft cost
- 11\% Maintenance
- 10\% Airport and Air Nav charges
- 35\% Others
C.J. Smith - Airline operating costs - the variations in Managing airline operating costs - SH\&E (2004)


## Operating costs for Clip-Air

- Based on standard flight operating costs
- Fuel costs (16\%) and Airport and air navigation charges (10\%) are separated for wings and capsules, corrected with the weight differences
- A saving of $1.3 \%$ and $23 \%$ is obtained when Clip-Air flies with 2 and 3 capsules respectively.
- Crew cost ( $14 \%$ ) is separated between wing (flight crew) and capsules (cabin crew):
- Wing (flight crew): 8\%
- Capsules (cabin crew): 6\%

Since for A320 it is found out that flight crew constitutes $60 \%$ of crew cost.
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## Objectives of the study

Comparative analysis of Clip-Air and standard fleet.

- Estimate operating costs: Detailed cost structure for Clip-Air is not yet known $\rightarrow$ advantage standard fleet to have a fair comparison.
- Itinerary based fleet assignment model which minimizes the operating costs and spill costs.
- Analyze demand satisfaction: Demand analysis is needed for the new system.


## Assumptions

- Every capsule has the same capacity
- Fleet's configuration on the airport network is the same at the beginning and end of the period
- All assumptions regarding the operating costs
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## Considered literature

Barnhart and Lohatepanont (2004)
Key concepts:

- Optimizes operational costs and loss of revenue
- Schedule design is modeled with two subsets of mandatory and optional flights (exogenous)
- Itinerary based demand (average unconstrained, exogenous)
- Schedule evaluation model (exogenous)
- Demand adjustment and recapture (deletion and spill)
- Based on time-space network to represent the schedule


## Parameters

| $A:$ | Set of airports indexed by a |
| :--- | :--- |
| $F:$ | Set of all flight legs indexed by $f$ |
| $I:$ | Set of all itineraries indexed by $i$ or $j$ |
| $c_{f}^{k}:$ | Operational cost for a capsule for flight leg $f$ |
| $c_{f}^{w}:$ | Operational cost for the wing for flight leg $f$ |
| $N_{w}:$ | Number of available wings |
| $N_{k}:$ | Number of available capsules |
| $k_{\max }:$ | Capacity of capsule in number of seats available |
| $s^{k}:$ | Number of passengers requesting itinerary $i$ |
| $D_{i}:$ | Number of passengers requesting flight leg $f$ |
| $Q_{f}:$ |  |

## Parameters

| fare $_{i}:$ |
| :--- |
| $b_{i}^{j}:$ |
| $\delta_{f}^{i}:$ |
| $T:$ |
| $N(a, t):$ |
| $C T:$ |
| $\ln (a, t, f):$ |
| $\operatorname{Out}(a, t, f):$ |
| $\min E_{a}:$ |
| $\max E_{a}:$ |

Average fare for a passenger to fly on itinerary $i$
The rate of passengers that can be redistributed from itinerary $i$ to $j$ when $i$ 's capacity is full 1 if itinerary $i$ includes flight leg $f, 0$ otherwise Sorted set of all events on the time-line, indexed by $t$ Set of nodes in the time-line network Set of flight legs flying through the count time Set of inbound flight legs to node ( $a, t$ ) Set of outbound flight legs from node ( $a, t$ ) First event in the time-line at airport a Last event in the time-line at airport a

## Decision Variables

| $x_{f}^{k}:$ | number of capsules on flight $f, x_{f}^{k} \in\left\{0, \ldots, k_{\max }\right\}$ <br> $x_{f}^{w}:$ <br> $y_{a, t^{+}}^{k}:$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $y_{a, t^{-}}^{k}:$ | number of capsules on the ground <br> at airport a just after time $t$ |
| $y_{a, t^{+}}^{w}:$ | number of capsules on the ground <br> at airport a just before time $t$ <br> number of wings on the ground |
| $y_{a, t^{-}}^{w}:$ | at airport a just after time $t$ <br> number of wings on the ground |
| $t_{i}^{j}:$ | at airport a just before time $t$ <br> number of passengers redirected from itinerary $i$ to $j$ |

## Model

Itinerary based fleet assignment model

- minimizing the operating and spill costs

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { Min } \sum_{f \in F}\left(c_{f}^{w} x_{f}^{w}+c_{f}^{k} x_{f}^{k}\right)+\sum_{i \in I, j \in I} t_{i}^{j}\left(f a r e_{i}-b_{i}^{j} f a r e_{j}\right) & \\
\text { s.t. } x_{f}^{w}=1 & \forall f \in F^{M} \\
x_{f}^{k} \geq 1 & \forall f \in F^{M} \\
x_{f}^{k} \leq k_{\max } x_{f}^{w} & \forall f \in F \\
y_{a, t^{-}}^{w}+\sum_{f \in I(a, t)} x_{f}^{w}=y_{a, t^{+}}^{w}+\sum_{f \in O(a, t)} x_{f}^{w} & \forall[a, t] \in N \\
\sum_{a \in A} y_{a, t_{n}}^{w}+\sum_{f \in C T} x_{f}^{w} \leq N_{w} & \\
y_{a, \min E_{a}^{-}}^{w}=y_{a, \max E_{a}^{+}}^{w} & \forall a \in A
\end{array}
$$

## Model

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
y_{a, t^{-}}^{k}+\sum_{f \in I(a, t)} x_{f}^{k}=y_{a, t^{+}}^{k}+\sum_{f \in O(a, t)} x_{f}^{k} & \forall[a, t] \in N \\
\sum_{a \in A} y_{a, t_{n}}^{k}+\sum_{f \in C T} x_{f}^{k} \leq N_{k} & \\
y_{a, \text { min } E_{a}^{-}}^{k}=y_{a, \max E_{a}^{+}}^{k} & \forall a \in A \\
s^{k} x_{f}^{k} \geq Q_{f}+\sum_{i \in I, j \in I} \delta_{f}^{j} b_{i}^{j} t_{i}^{j}-\sum_{i \in I, j \in I} \delta_{f}^{j} t_{j}^{j} & \forall f \in F \\
\sum_{j \in I} t_{i}^{j} \leq D_{i} & \forall i \in I \\
x_{f}^{w} \in\{0,1\} & \forall f \in F \\
x_{f}^{k} \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, k_{\max }\right\} & \forall f \in F \\
y_{a, t}^{w} \geq 0 & \forall[a, t] \in N \\
y_{a, t}^{k} \geq 0 & \forall[a, t] \in N \\
t_{i}^{j} \geq 0 & \forall i, j \in I
\end{array}
$$
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## Towards Results

- Input: data from a major European airline company
- set of optional and mandatory flights
- set of airports
- set of itinerary demands and fares
- set of aircrafts for the standard fleet
- C++ program to format input data
- data resizing to study specific instances
- operating costs and spill rate computing
- instances generation
- Problem resolution with GLPK+CPLEX solver
- output: an optimized schedule design and fleet assignment for the given instances
- Results comparison


## Instances

- Airport pairs
- Airport hubs
- Special cases
- Larger instance


## Airport Pairs



|  | Standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 85\% | 84\% | 87\% |
| Spill costs | 15\% | 16\% | 13\% |
| Total costs | 160,150 € | +2,678 € | +2,781 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 295 | 295 | 295 |
| Transported passengers | 1,272 | 1,260 | 1,289 |
| Flight count | 9 | 12 | 12 |
| Average pax/flight | 141 | 105 | 107 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h57 | 2h36 | 2h36 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 93\% | 90\% | 94\% |
| Spill costs | 7\% | 10\% | 6\% |
| Total costs | 156,906 € | +2,247 € | +4,226 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 328 | 328 | 328 |
| Transported passengers | 1,118 | 1,085 | 1,118 |
| Flight count | 12 | 14 | 14 |
| Average pax/flight | 93 | 77 | 79 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h56 | 2h15 | 2h15 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 89\% | 88\% | 84\% |
| Spill costs | 11\% | 12\% | 16\% |
| Total costs | 173,556 € | +3,566 € | +4,302 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 380 | 380 | 380 |
| Transported passengers | 1,268 | 1,254 | 1,216 |
| Flight count | 14 | 18 | 16 |
| Average pax/flight | 90 | 69 | 76 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h45 | 2h15 | 2h00 |

## Airport Pairs

| Airports | 2 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Flights | 12 |
| Capsule capacity | 59 |
| Passengers | 1,425 |
| Std Deviation (pax) | 16.9 |
| Av. Pax/Flight | 118.8 |


|  | Standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 85\% | 84\% | 87\% |
| Spill costs | 15\% | 16\% | 13\% |
| Total costs | 160,150 € | +2,678 $€$ | +2,781 $€$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 295 | 295 | 295 |
| Transported passengers | 1,272 | 1,260 | 1,289 |
| Flight count | 9 | 12 | 12 |
| Average pax/flight | 141 | 105 | 107 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h57 | 2h36 | 2h36 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 93\% | 90\% | 94\% |
| Spill costs | 7\% | 10\% | 6\% |
| Total costs | 156,906 € | +2,247 € | +4,226 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 328 | 328 | 328 |
| Transported passengers | 1,118 | 1,085 | 1,118 |
| Flight count | 12 | 14 | 14 |
| Average pax/flight | 93 | 77 | 79 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h56 | 2h15 | 2h15 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 89\% | 88\% | 84\% |
| Spill costs | 11\% | 12\% | 16\% |
| Total costs | 173,556 € | +3,566 € | +4,302 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 380 | 380 | 380 |
| Transported passengers | 1,268 | 1,254 | 1,216 |
| Flight count | 14 | 18 | 16 |
| Average pax/flight | 90 | 69 | 76 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h45 | 2h15 | 2h00 |

## Airport Pairs

Same fleet size

Less flights, smaller costs

More passengers/flight

|  | Standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 85\% | 84\% | 87\% |
| Spill costs | 15\% | 16\% | 13\% |
| Total costs | 160,150 € | +2,678 € | +2,781€ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 295 | 295 | 295 |
| Transported passengers | 1,272 | 1,260 | 1,289 |
| Flight count | 9 | 12 | 12 |
| Average pax/flight | 141 | 105 | 107 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h57 | 2h36 | 2h36 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 93\% | 90\% | 94\% |
| Spill costs | 7\% | 10\% | 6\% |
| Total costs | 156,906 € | +2,247 € | +4,226 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 328 | 328 | 328 |
| Transported passengers | 1,118 | 1,085 | 1,118 |
| Flight count | 12 | 14 | 14 |
| Average pax/flight | 93 | 77 | 79 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1 h 56 | 2h15 | 2h15 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 89\% | 88\% | 84\% |
| Spill costs | 11\% | 12\% | 16\% |
| Total costs | 173,556 € | +3,566 € | +4,302 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 380 | 380 | 380 |
| Transported passengers | 1,268 | 1,254 | 1,216 |
| Flight count | 14 | 18 | 16 |
| Average pax/flight | 90 | 69 | 76 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h45 | 2h15 | 2h00 |
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## Airport Hubs




## Airport Hubs

| Airports | 4 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Flights | 45 |
| Capsule capacity | 39 |
| Passengers | 3,511 |
| Std Deviation (pax) | 37 |
| Av. Pax/Flight | 78.0 |


|  | Standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 82\% | 73\% | 75\% |
| Spill costs | 18\% | 27\% | 25\% |
| Total costs | 406,188 € | +7,016 € | +7,882 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 858 | 858 | 858 |
| Transported passengers | 2,876 | 2,593 | 2,642 |
| Flight count | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Average pax/flight | 89 | 81 | 82 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h44 | 1 h 44 | 1h44 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 83\% | 81\% | 77\% |
| Spill costs | 17\% | 19\% | 23\% |
| Total costs | 280,487 € | +10,562 € | +11,646 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 540 | 540 | 540 |
| Transported passengers | 1,836 | 1,811 | 1,746 |
| Flight count | 22 | 26 | 26 |
| Average pax/flight | 83 | 69 | 67 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h48 | 2h07 | 2h07 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 85\% | 83\% | 83\% |
| Spill costs | 15\% | 17\% | 17\% |
| Total costs | 359,696 € | +5,021 € | +4,789 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 713 | 713 | 713 |
| Transported passengers | 2,077 | 2,062 | 2,068 |
| Flight count | 33 | 36 | 36 |
| Average pax/flight | 62 | 57 | 57 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h57 | 2h06 | 2h06 |

(
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## Airport Hubs

Same fleet size

Less flights, smaller costs

More passengers carried
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## Airport Hubs - Separated costs for wing and capsules

Higher improvement in cost

Less flights

More transported passengers

|  | Standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 82\% | 73\% | 75\% |
| Spill costs | 18\% | 27\% | 25\% |
| Total costs | 390,956 € | +22,248 $€$ | +23,114 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 858 | 858 | 858 |
| Transported passengers | 2,807 | 2,593 | 2,642 |
| Flight count | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Average pax/flight | 88 | 81 | 82 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h44 | 1 h 44 | 1 h 44 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 83\% | 81\% | 77\% |
| Spill costs | 17\% | 19\% | 23\% |
| Total costs | 269,132 € | +21,917 € | +23,001 $€$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 540 | 540 | 540 |
| Transported passengers | 1,836 | 1,811 | 1,746 |
| Flight count | 22 | 26 | 26 |
| Average pax/flight | 83 | 69 | 67 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 1h48 | 2h07 | 2h07 |
|  |  | Standard |  |
|  | Clip-Air | 6 aircrafts | 3 aircrafts |
| Operating costs | 85\% | 83\% | 83\% |
| Spill costs | 15\% | 17\% | 17\% |
| Total costs | 349,460 € | +15,257 $€$ | +15,025 $€$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 713 | 713 | 713 |
| Transported passengers | 2,110 | 2,062 | 2,068 |
| Flight count | 35 | 36 | 36 |
| Average pax/flight | 60 | 57 | 57 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 2h04 | 2h06 | 2h06 |

## Special Case



|  |  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |  |
|  | Operating costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ |  |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $67 \%$ |  |
| Total costs | $\mathbf{3 , 4 2 0 , 4 0 3} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |  |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |  |
| Transported passengers | 1,501 | 1,508 | 1,501 |  |
| Flight count | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Average pax/flight | 187 | 188 | 187 |  |
| Flight Hours / cap unit |  | $4 h 32$ | $4 h 32$ |  |

## Special Case



|  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
|  | Operating costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $67 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spill costs |  | $\mathbf{3 , 4 2 0 , 4 0 3 €}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |  |  |  |  |
| Transported passengers | 1,501 | 1,512 | 1,512 |  |  |  |  |
| Flight count | 8 | 1,508 | 1,501 |  |  |  |  |
| Average pax/flight | 187 | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 4 h 32 | 188 | 187 |  |  |  |  |

## Special Case

| Airports | 5 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Flights | 8 |
| Capsule capacity | 126 |
| Passengers | 2,025 |
| Std Deviation (pax) | 88.49 |
| Av. Pax/Flight | 253.1 |


|  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
| Total costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | $3,420,403 €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |
| Transported passengers | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |
| Flight count | 1,501 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Average pax/flight | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 187 | 188 | 187 |

## Special Case

Unable to use capsule's modularity

|  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
|  | Operating costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $67 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $3,420,403 €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total costs | 1,512 | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,501 | 1,512 | 1,512 |  |  |  |  |
| Transported passengers | 8 | 8 | 1,501 |  |  |  |  |
| Flight count | 187 | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Average pax/flight | $4 h 32$ | $4 h 32$ | 187 |  |  |  |  |
| Flight Hours / cap unit |  |  | 4 h 32 |  |  |  |  |

## Special Case

Unable to use capsule's modularity

|  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
| Total costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | $3,420,403 €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |
| Transported passengers | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |
| Flight count | 1,501 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Average pax/flight | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 187 | 188 | 187 |

Cost separation between wing and capsules

Better but still higher costs

|  |  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |  |
|  | Operating costs | $66 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
|  | Spill costs | $34 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Total costs |  | $\mathbf{3 , 3 3 1 , 8 4 3} €$ | $-\mathbf{4 1 , 9 8 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 2 2 , 5 3 7} €$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |  |
| Transported passengers |  | 1,414 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Flight count | 6 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Average pax/flight |  | 236 | 188 | 187 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 3 h 43 | 4 h 32 | 4 h 32 |  |
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## Special Case

Unable to use capsule's modularity

|  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
| Total costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | $3,420,403 €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |
| Transported passengers | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |
| Flight count | 1,501 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Average pax/flight | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 187 | 188 | 187 |

Cost separation between wing and capsules

Less flights

|  |  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
|  | Operating costs | $66 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
|  | Spill costs | $34 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Total costs |  | $\mathbf{3 , 3 3 1 , 8 4 3 €}$ | $-\mathbf{4 1 , 9 8 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 2 2 , 5 3 7} €$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |  |
| Transported passengers |  | 1,414 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Flight count | 6 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Average pax/flight |  | 236 | 188 | 187 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 3 h 43 | 4 h 32 | 4 h 32 |  |
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## Special Case

Unable to use capsule's modularity

|  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |
| Total costs | $69 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | $3,420,403 €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 0 , 5 4 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 1 , 0 9 7} €$ |
| Transported passengers | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |
| Flight count | 1,501 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Average pax/flight | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 187 | 188 | 187 |

Cost separation between wing and capsules

More passengers per flight

|  |  | Standard |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Clip-Air | $\mathbf{6}$ aircrafts | $\mathbf{3}$ aircrafts |  |
|  | Operating costs | $66 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
|  | Spill costs | $34 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Total costs |  | $\mathbf{3 , 3 3 1 , 8 4 3} €$ | $-\mathbf{4 1 , 9 8 0} €$ | $\mathbf{- 2 2 , 5 3 7} €$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | 1,512 | 1,512 |  |
| Transported passengers |  | 1,414 | 1,508 | 1,501 |
| Flight count | 6 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Average pax/flight | 236 | 188 | 187 |  |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 3 h 43 | 4 h 32 | 4 h 32 |  |
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## Illustration: if we confine standard fleet

1 type of aircraft for standard fleet (126 seats)

|  |  | Standard <br> 1 aircraft |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Operating costs | $69 \%$ |
| Spill costs | $31 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Total costs |  | $3,420,403 €$ |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | $+84,989 €$ |
| Flight count | 1,501 | 1,512 |
| Transported passengers | 8 | 1008 |
| Flight Hours pax/flight cap unit | 187 | 8 |

Cost separation between wing and capsules

Improvement is more

|  | Clip-Air | Standard 1 aircraft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operating costs | 66\% | 58\% |
| Spill costs | 34\% | 42\% |
| Total costs | 3,331,843€ | +173,549 € |
| Fleet size (in seats) | 1,512 | 1,512 |
| Transported passengers | 1,414 | 1,008 |
| Flight count | 6 | 8 |
| Average pax/flight | 236 | 126 |
| Flight Hours / cap unit | 3h43 | 6h49 |
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## Larger Instance



## Larger Instance



## Conclusion \& Future Work

- The results give idea about the potential in decreasing the operating costs with Clip-Air.
- The aim of increasing the capacity seems to work with more number of transported passengers with less number of flights.
- $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions will be studied to be able to assess the potential reduction.
- Improve operating cost function
- Cost separation between wing and capsule
- Scenario analysis for the operating cost
- Improve spill rate function (Discrete Choice Analysis)
- Extension of the model
- Multi-modal transportation (passenger container)
- Mixed passenger and cargo


## Thanks

## Any question?

## Spill factor Approximation

Computing the spill factor from itinerary it1 to it2, 2 factors :

- Fare difference
fareRatio $=\frac{\text { fare }_{i t 2}}{\text { fare }_{i t 1}}$
- Time gap
timeGapRatio $=10 \% \times \frac{\mid \text { dep }_{i t 1}-\text { dep }_{i t 2}\left|+\left|a r r_{i t 1}-\operatorname{arr}_{i t 2}\right|\right.}{2}$
spillRatio $=$ fareRatio $\times$ timeGapRatio


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ European Aeronautics: A vision for 2020 - EU 2001

