BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS OF AIR CARRIER UNDER THE PASSENGERS' EQUILIBRIUM FLOW IN THE ASIAN-PACIFIC AVIATION NETWORK

Katsuhiko KURODA Professor Department of Civil Eng. Kobe University 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe, 657-8501,JAPAN Fax: +81-78-803-6008 E-mail: kurodak@kobe-u.ac.jp

Kazuto HIRAI Doctoral Course Student Graduate School of Science and Technology Kobe University 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe, 657-8501,JAPAN Mikio TAKEBAYASHI Research Associate Department of Civil Eng. Kobe University 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe, 657-8501,JAPAN Fax: +81-78-803-6017 E-mail: takebaya@kobe-u.ac.jp

Hidehiko SUZUKI Master Course Student Graduate School of Science and Technology Kobe University 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe, 657-8501,JAPAN

Abstract: The present paper aims to analyze the carriers' and the passengers' behavior under the policy of "open sky ", which means the air transportation market is perfectly competitive. Under this assumption, the air carriers' and passengers' behaviors are formulated, respectively, and the Nash type equilibrium conditions of both behavior in the market are given. The model is applied to the East Asian air market in 2010, and the impact of the construction of international hub-airports in the region on the equilibrium solution is numerically discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Deregulation of the international air transportation market is the recent global trend as called as "the Open Sky Policy ". Especially, in the East Asian region, it will be very much concerned corresponding to the rapid growth of air transportation demand, because the market will be expected to become much more competitive and it may give much influence on the airport policy of the countries.

In East Asia, some countries are making efforts to develop the big international hub-airport capable to accept the Boeing 747 type or the much larger aircraft. According to the newspaper, five or six new big airports will be opened until the year of 2010. Those airports are expected to be an international hub-airport. Then, this rush of construction of big airport in East Asian region will invite a significant influence on the air carriers' strategy such as routing, service frequency, air fare and so forth as well as on the route choice behavior of passengers.

Many researches on air demand forecast have been seen in the past, but researches on air carriers' behavior are limited. Kanafani *et al* (1985) showed that ,in the competitive air market, the air carriers will make the hub-and spokes shaped aviation network in order to

minimize their total operation cost. Kobayashi *et al* (1998) also discuss the impact of airport fee on the structure of aviation network. They showed that air carrier's service network changes from a hub and spokes type to a direct connecting type depending on the relative amount of the marginal link cost to the airport fee. These researches are successful in the sense of giving logical bases to consider the network formulation by air carriers. However, they do not take into account of the airport capacity.

Other researches, which treat both behavior of the air carriers and the passengers, are seen in Furuichi *et al* (1993), Morichi *et al* (1993) and Yai *et al* (1998). Most of these researches discuss the interaction of the carriers' behavior and the passengers' behavior and some of them focus on the benefit of airline alliance. However, they disregard the equilibrium in the market of the air carrier's behavior and the passengers behavior.

On the other hand, Kuroda and Takebayashi (1996, 1997 and 1998) treat this equilibrium in the domestic air transportation market as the "Stackelberg Problem" taking the asymmetric information in the market into consideration. Their model, however, does not consider the air fare as a variable. In many researches conducted in the past, the air fare has been treated as a externally given value. The present paper, however, formulates the international air transportation market as the "perfectly competitive market", which will be appeared in the near future when deregulation is progressed. The paper also applies the model to the international air transportation market in the year of 2010, and discusses the influence of the construction of big international airport in the East Asian region.

2. THE MODEL FORMULATION

2.1 Premises and Assumptions

In the present paper, the air transportation market is regarded as the perfectly competitive one. In formulation of the market structure, following premises and assumptions are introduced;

- 1) There are potentially so many competitive carriers in each service route as to make the market perfectly competitive.
- 2) There is no sunk cost for air carriers in each service route.
- 3) The same quality of service is provided in the same service route.
- 4) The flight length of each service route is a priori given and fixed.
- 5) The flight capacity of each airport is given, and airport charges such as landing fee, navigational aids facility fee, terminal cost and so forth are a priori given.
- 6) The fuel cost per gallon is the same price at any airport, and given a priori.
- 7) Only one type aircraft can be served at all service routes. In the present paper, the Boeing 747-400 type aircraft is considered.
- 8) Passengers are assumed to choose the route which gives the minimal generalized cost.
- 9) The O.D. passenger's volume is a priori given, and the carriers are not allowed to shut out from shipment of any passenger.

10) All passengers make a round trip by using same route. Then, the flight frequency of a certain route is same as that of the return route.

In the present paper, since the air transportation market is regarded as the perfectly competitive one, the equilibrium solution between carriers and air passengers is given by the Nash type equilibrium.

2.2 Air Carriers' Behavior

The air carriers aims to maximize their net revenue through their strategic behavior in the market. However, since the perfectly competitive market is assumed, the air carrier can not take any surplus, that is, their net revenue may become infinitely equal to zero even if they make efforts to minimize their operation cost. This means the air fare of each service route is realized by the carriers' operation cost which is determined from the equilibrium of the carriers' operational strategy and the passengers' route choice behavior. The carriers' operation cost is consisted of the aircraft operational cost (henceforth, called as the linehaul cost) and airport charge which includes the landing fee, the navigational aids facility fee, the terminal operation cost and so forth. Therefore, in the perfectly competitive market, the air carriers' behavior can be formulated as follows;

$$MinC(f_l) = \sum_{h \in L} f_l (AC_l + \delta_h^l LC_h)$$
(1)

Sub. to

$$\sum_{h \in I_{h}} \delta_{h}^{l} f_{l} \le CA_{h} \tag{2}$$

$$p_{l}(x_{l} + x_{l'}) = f_{l}(AC_{l} + \delta_{h}^{l}LC_{h}) + f_{l'}(AC_{l'} + \delta_{h}^{l'}LC_{h})$$
(3)

$$x_l \le \omega_l C P_l f_l \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_l &= f_{l'} \tag{5} \\ f_l &\ge 0 \tag{6} \end{aligned}$$

$$C_l \ge 0$$
 (6)

...h

where,	
$C(f_l)$; total operation cost (US\$ per week).
l	; a service route with a direction.
ľ	; same service route as l with opposite direction.
f_l	; flight frequency at the service route l (flights per week).
AC_{l}	; linehaul cost at the service route l (US\$ per flight).
LC_h	; airport charge at the airport h (US\$ per flight per carft).
δ'_{h}	; Cronecker's delta (=1.0 when the airport is included in the route l , otherwise
zero).	
CA_h	; flight capacity of the airport h (flights per week).
x_l	; air passengers' volume using the route l (person per week).
p_l	;air fare of the route l (US\$ per person per flight).
CP_l	; load capacity of the aircraft on the route l (person per flight).
ω,	; average load factor on the route l.

; a set of service routes. L

In the above, Eq.(1) means the objective function of air carriers and f_i is the optional variable for the air carriers. Eq.(2) is the constraint for the airport capacity, and Eq.(3)gives the necessary condition for the equilibrium price of air fare. Eq.(4) is the constraint for the load capacity of each service route and Eq.(5) means the symmetric condition of the the flight frequency of a route based on the assumption (10).

2.3 Air Passengers' Behavior

Most of air passengers may hope to minimize the total travel cost and the travel time when

Katsuhiko KURODA, Mikio TAKEBAYASHI, Kazuto HIRAI and Hidehiko SUZUKI

they choose their travel route. Then, in the present model, the generalized cost is introduced to consider the value of travel time. Only air fare is considered as the travel cost, but the access and egress travel costs are not considered in the present model because the O.D. passengers volume is a priori given for each combination of two airports. The travel time is consisted of the line-hall flight time and the average waiting time at the departure airport and the transit airport if necessary. Denoting the generalized cost for the passenger travelling on the route l by u_b , it is given by

$$u_l = p_l + \alpha (t_l + \delta_l^h OT_h / 2f_l) \tag{7}$$

and the air passengers' behavior can be formulated as

$$\underset{x^{k}}{\min} \sum_{l} \sum_{k} \delta_{k}^{l} u_{l} \tag{8}$$

Subject to

$$\sum_{k} x_{ij}^{k} = X_{ij} \tag{9}$$

$$x_l = \sum_i \sum_j \sum_k \delta_k^l x_{ij}^k \tag{10}$$

$$x_l \le \omega_l f_l C P_l \tag{11}$$

$$x_{ii}^k \ge 0 \tag{12}$$

in which

 δ_k^l ; Cronecker's delta (=1.0 when the route *l* is included the *k* th path, otherwise zero).

- t_l ; linehaul time of the route l (minutes).
- OT_h ; service time at the airport h (minutes).
- δ_{h2}^{l} ; Cronecker's delta (=1.0 when the airport h₂ is the departure airport of the route l, otherwise, zero).
- α ; value of travel time (US\$ per minute).

 x_{ii}^{k} ; passengers' volume at kth path (person).

 X_{ii} ; passengers' O.D. volume from zone *i* to zone *j* (person).

In the present paper, it is assumed that each air passenger chooses his optimal (minimal generalized cost) route deterministically, but not probabilistically. Therefore, when there are more than two routes between a certain pair of origin and destination, a rule of passenger's route choice behavior is necessary. For this passengers' behavior, the equal generalized cost principle is introduced, that is, " the generalized costs of all routes for each pair of O.D. are same and equal to the minimal generalized cost of the route if and only if those routes are chosen by passengers, but the generalized costs of the routes are greater than the minimum if they are not chosen." This principle is given by J.G. Wardrop as the user optimizing assignment rule in traffic engineering. This can be mathematically expressed as

if
$$x_{ij}^k > 0$$
 then $\sum_k \delta_k^l u_l = u_{ij}^*$ (13)

Behavior Analysis of Air Carrier under the Passengers' Equilibrium Flow in the Asian-Pacific Aviation Network

if
$$x_{ij}^k = 0$$
 then $\sum_k \delta_k^l u_l > u_{ij}^*$ (14)

213

where u_{ij}^* is the minimum generalized cost of the route *l* connecting the zone *i* with the zone *j*.

3. APPLICATION TO EAST ASIAN AVIATION NETWORK IN THE YEAR OF 2010

According to the discussion in Introduction, it is thought that "the open sky" deregulation policy is the global tendency as well as in East Asian countries. Then, if the perfectly competitive market will be appeared in the near future, it is necessary, for the effective management of international airports of each country, to predict which airport will be used as the international hub-airport. And most of airport planners may have great interest in the necessary conditions for the international hub-airport.

In this chapter, numerical applications of the present model to the international aviation network in the year of 2010 are carried out in order to know the necessary conditions for the international hub-airport focussing on the East Asian region.

3.1 Numerical Conditions

O.D. Zones and O.D. Volume

In numerical application in the year of 2010, O.D. zones are defined with following rules:

- 1) East Asian region except Japan is divided into ten zones as listed in Table 1. Japan is divided into five zones. Others are Oceania, North America, West Europe and East Europe.
- 2) West Asia, Africa and South America are not taken into consideration because of small demand comparing with the other zones.
- 3) The international airports in Eastern Asia considered in the numerical application are shown in Figure 1.
- 4) Each zone has its representative airport as shown as Table 1. Therefore, the access and the egress to or from the airport are neglected.
- 5) Los Angels Airport represents North America.
- 6) West Europe and East Europe are represented by London Airport and Frankfurt Airport, representatively.

The O.D. air passenger volume in 2010 is estimated based on a gravity type model as shown in Eq. (15), but the detail is omitted because of limited pages.

$$V_{ij} = K \frac{(G_i G_j)^{\alpha} (p_i p_j)^{\beta} D_1^d D_2^{d_2} \cdots D_n^{d_n}}{R_{ij}^{\gamma}}$$
(15)

where

 G_{i} , G_{j} ; GDP of the zone i and j, respectively (1,000US\$/ person/ year).

 P_{ν} , P_{j} ; population of the zone i and j, respectively (1,000 person).

 R_{ij} ; distance between the representative airport of the zone *i* and *j* (*km*).

D. ; dummy variables

K, α , β , γ , d.; regression coefficients.

The regression coefficients of Eq.(15) are shown in Table 2. Using Eq.(15), the O.D. passengers' volume in 2010 are estimated. This is shown in Table3. The air carriers can serve any route linked with two airports, but they can not serve between Japanese airports.



Figure 1 Airports in Eastern Asia in 2010

Airport	Hinterland Zones
1. Sapporo	Hokkaido (Japan)
2. Tokyo	Kanto, Tohoku and Hokuriku (Japan)
3. Chubu	Chubu and Hokuriku (Japan)
4. Osaka	Kinki ,Chugoku and Sikoku (Japan)
5. Fukuoka	Chugoku, Shikoku and Kyushu (Japan)
6. Seoul	Korea and North China
7. Shanghai	Central China
8. Hong Kong	South China
9. Taipei	Taiwan
10. Manila	Philippines
11. Bangkok	Thailand,
12. Kuala Lumpur	Malaysia
13. Singapore	Singapore
14. Jakarta	Indonesia
15. Oceania	Australia and New Zealand
16. Los Angels	U.S.A. and Canada
17. London	West Europe
18 Frankfurt	East Europe and Russia

Table 1 O.D. Zones and Their Representative Airports

Table 2 Regression Coefficients of Eq.(15)

	LnA	α	β	γ	d_1	• <i>d</i> ₂	<i>d</i> 3	d_4	d 5	d ₆	r²	sample
Intra-Asia	2.49	0.46	0.85	0.88	0.23	-0.56	0.15	0.52	0.16	0.70	0.877	33
Asia-N.A Europe. Oceania	18.11	0.41	0.12	1.08	0.84	-0.43	1.01	-1.29	0.30		0.839	31

Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol.3, No.2, September, 1999

Table 2	OD	Volume of Air Passengers in 2010	

	Sannoro	Tokyo	Chubu	Kansai	Fku	oka	Seou	ıl	Shnghi	H.K.	Taipei	Manila
Samoro	Sapporo	TORYO	-	-			47	41	8013	662	3 357	3 1369
Talana					-		379	29	64104	5298	0 2829	9 10955
Chubu			-	-		-	161	20	27244	2251	7 1202	7 4656
Kansai			-	-	-		28,4	46	48,078	39,73	5 21,22	4 8,217
Fulmoka			-	-			7.5	586	12,821	10,59	6 5,66	0 2,191
Fukuoka	4 741	37 020	16 120	28 446	5 7	.586	-		50,921	35,11	3 17,12	2 5,730
Shonghai	8 013	64 104	27 244	48.078	3 12	.821	50,9	21	-	72,94	1 42,45	3 6,336
Jianghai	6,013	52 080	22 517	39 734	5 10	596	35.1	113	72,941	-	99,22	1 28,228
Kong	0,020	52,700	22,311	0,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		,	,					
Tainei	3 537	28 299	12.027	21.224	1 5	,660	17,1	122	42,453	99,22	- 1	20,069
Mapila	1 360	10,955	4.656	8.21	7 2	.191	5,7	730	6,336	5 28,22	8 20,06	- 19
Dangkok	3,510	28 080	11,034	21.06) 5	.616	14,2	295	18,711	49,44	9 45,32	5 7,495
Lakorta	1 860	14 956	6 356	11.21	7 2	.991	6,9	957	8,346	5 22,79	7 17,33	4,096
Vuselmo	1 304	11 156	4 741	8.36	7 2	2.231	5,4	415	6,745	5 18,20	0 14,93	3,112
KuraLinp	1,574	11,150	1,7.12			,						
Snapore	2 4 3 9	19,516	8.294	14.63	7 3	3,903	8,	700	21,513	3 29,43	34 23,76	50 10,515
Oceania	2,078	16.624	7,065	12,46	8 3	3,325	6,	906	4,89	7 15,54	2 7,87	78 1,559
N Amrca	4,498	35,982	15,293	26,98	7 7	7,196	14,	531	15,098	8 23,37	12,53	36 1,553
WErope	2.286	18,289	7,773	13,71	7 3	3,658	8,	895	7,51	1 16,51	16 7,91	17 931
E Europe	1,966	15,731	6,686	11,79	8 3	3,146	7,	749	6,60	8 14,18	33 7,09	98 818
TOTAL	44.323	354,601	150,706	265,95	1 70	0,920	277,	156	422,34	0 557,45	52 386,39	97 117,830
TOTAL	UTAL 44,523 334,001 136,766 206,562 7,777 7											
	Bangkok	Jakarta	KraLm	npr Sn	gpor	Oce	ana	N.A	mrca	W.Erpe	E.Erpe	TOTAL
Sapporo	Bangkok 3,510	Jakarta	KraLm 9 1.3	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439	Oce	ana 2,078	N.A	mrca 4,498	W.Erpe 2,286	E.Erpe 1,966	TOTAL 44,323
Sapporo	Bangkok 3,510 28,080	Jakarta 1,86 14.95	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516	Oce	ana 2,078 5,624	N.A	4,498 35,982	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731	TOTAL 44,323 354,601
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7	npr Sn 394 156 1 741	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294	Oce	ana 2,078 5,624 7,065	N.A 3	4,498 35,982 5,293	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3	npr Sn 394 156 1 741 367 1	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468	N.A	4,498 4,498 35,982 5,293 26,987	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 1 2,2	npr Sn 394 1 156 1 741 367 231 1	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325	N.A 3 1 2	amrca 4,498 5,982 5,293 26,987 7,196	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 1 2,2 67 5,4	npr Sn 394 156 1 741 231 415	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906	N.A 3 1 2 1	amrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 277,156
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,5 11 2,7 77 5,6 16 6,7	npr Sn 394 56 1 741 367 1 231 415 745 2	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897	N.A 3 1 2 1	amrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531 15,098	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 77 5,4 66 6,7 17 5,4 16 6,7 17 18,5	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542	N.A 3 1 2 2 1	amrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 44,531 15,098 23,377	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 77 5,6 66 6,7 18,7	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542	N.A 3 1 2 2 1	Amrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531 15,098 23,377	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,008	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 49,449	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 91 2,2 77 5,4 76 6,7 77 18,2 32 14,9	npr Sn 394 1 156 1 741 1 367 1 231 1 415 1 745 2 939 2	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878	N.A	mrca 4,498 35,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531 15,098 23,377 12,536	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,920
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 45,325 7,495	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,09	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 17 5,4 16 6,7 17 5,4 16 6,7 17 18,2 18,2 14,9 10 3,	npr Sn 394 - 156 1 741 - 367 1 231 - 415 - 745 2 200 2 939 2 112 -	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 822,225	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 45,325 7,495	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,00 16,42	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 17 5,4 16 -6,7 17 5,4 16 -6,7 17 18,2 18,2 14,9 20 3,2 21 20,2	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531 12,536 1,553 31,417	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1224	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 100,401
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,00 16,42	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 91 2,2 77 5,4 66 6,7 77 5,4 77 5,4 77 5,4 77 5,4 77 5,4 77 18,2 92 14,9 96 3,2 106 20,2 11 20,2 13,2 13,3	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219		xana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 14,531 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,618 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967 1,374	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,224	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,00 16,42 - 7 13,55	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 15 -6,7 16 -6,7 17 5,6 -6,7 18,7 12 14,9 14 20,9 12 13,3	npr Sn 1994	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219 95,039		xana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991 2,277	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 7,196 4,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp r	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,00 16,42 - 7 13,55	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 7 5,4 6 -6,7 11 2,2 14 2,6 15 -6,7 16 -6,7 17 5,4 18,2 -14,9 32 14,9 32 14,9 32 14,9 33 -	npr Sn 1994	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219 95,039		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991 2,277	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 7,196 4,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706 14,112	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072 425,686
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp r Sngpore	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 - - - 16,421 20,547 56,751	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,09 16,42 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 7 8,3 11 2,3 12 14 13 6,7 14 2,3 15 6,7 16 6,7 17 5,4 66 6,7 18,2 14,9 96 3, 20 13, 53 - 19 95,	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219 95,039		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991 2,277 0,570	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 66,987 7,196 4,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736 23,416	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967 1,374 1,914	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706 14,112	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072 425,686 126,518
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp r Sngpore Occania	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 - - - - 16,421 20,547 - 56,751 23,338	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,00 16,42 	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 14 2,6 66 6,7 18,7 18,2 12 14,9 96 3,2 12 14,9 96 3,2 13,3 - 10 95,9 91 2,2	npr Sn 394	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219 95,039		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991 2,277 0,570	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 66,987 7,196 44,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736 -	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967 1,374 1,914 15,868 -	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706 14,112 -	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072 425,686 126,518 216,412
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp r Sngpore Oceania N.Amrca	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,00 16,42 - 13,55 13,55 1,57,22 3 1,99 7 1,77	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 4,7 7 8,3 11 2,2 14 2,6 6 6,7 18,7 18,7 12 14,9 14 20,9 15 14,9 16 6,7 18,7 18,7 12 14,9 14 20,9 13,7 53 19 95,9 10 2,9 20 2,9	npr Sn 1994	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219 95,039 - - - - - - - - - - - -		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991 2,277 0,570 - -	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 44,531 15,098 23,377 1,2536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736 23,416 -	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967 1,374 1,914 15,868 -	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706 14,112 -	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072 425,686 126,518 216,412 131,615
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp r Sngpore Oceania N.Amrca W.Erope	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 - - 16,421 20,547 56,751 23,338 31,417 24,967	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 4,09 16,42 - 1,57,22 3,1,99 7,1,77 7,1,3	KraLm 9 1,3 6 11,1 6 11,2 7 8,3 91 2,2 10 2,5 11 2,3 12 14,9 13 3 14 20,3 15 13,3 16 - 19 95,9 91 2,2 2,7 1,1	npr Sn 1994	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 21,513 29,434 23,760 10,515 56,751 57,219 95,039 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		ana 2,078 3,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,5906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,991 2,277 0,570 - - - - -	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 44,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736 23,416 - -	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,773 13,717 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967 1,374 1,914 15,868 - -	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706 14,112 - -	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072 425,686 126,518 216,412 131,616 115,150
Sapporo Tokyo Chubu Kansai Fukuoka Seoul Shanghai Hong Kong Taipei Manila Bangkok Jakarta KuraLmp r Sngpore Oceania N.Amrca W.Erope E.Europe	Bangkok 3,510 28,080 11,934 21,060 5,616 14,295 18,711 49,449 45,325 7,495 - 16,421 20,547 56,751 23,338 31,417 24,967 22,325	Jakarta 1,86 14,95 6,35 11,21 2,99 6,95 8,34 22,79 17,33 1,05	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline KraLm \\ \hline 9 & 1,3 \\ \hline 6 & 11,1 \\ \hline 6 & 4,7 \\ \hline 7 & 8,3 \\ \hline 7 & 8,3 \\ \hline 7 & 13,7 \\ \hline 7 & 5,4 \\ \hline 7 & 18,7 \\ \hline 7 & 10,7 \\ \hline 7 & 10$	npr Sn 1994	gpor 2,439 9,516 8,294 4,637 3,903 8,700 20,515 56,751 57,219 95,039 - - 20,570 23,416 15,868 14,112		ana 2,078 5,624 7,065 2,468 3,325 5,5906 4,897 5,542 7,878 1,559 3,338 1,991 2,277 0,570 - - - - - - - - - -	N.A	mrca 4,498 55,982 5,293 26,987 7,196 4,531 15,098 23,377 12,536 1,553 31,417 1,792 2,736 2,736 - - - - -	W.Erpe 2,286 18,289 7,731 3,658 8,895 7,511 16,516 7,917 931 24,967 1,374 1,914 15,868 - - -	E.Erpe 1,966 15,731 6,686 11,798 3,146 7,749 6,608 14,183 7,098 818 22,325 1,224 1,706 14,112 - - - - - - - - -	TOTAL 44,323 354,601 150,706 265,951 70,920 277,156 422,340 557,452 386,397 117,830 401,241 190,491 214,072 425,686 126,518 216,412 131,616 115,150

Airport Capacity and Airport Charge

The flight capacity of each airport is listed in Table 4. Most of these capacities are based on the data of the airport plan in 2010, which has been published by their related authorities. In Table 4, it should be notified that the airports of Sydney, Los Angels (LSA),, London(LND), Frankfurt(FKF) are the virtual ones, and their capacities are assumed to be infinite in light of the present purpose of analysis, but their airport charges are employed as the representative airports of zones. Those airport charges are referred to the data of the Airport Statistics by ICAO (1996).

NAME AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY.	THE OWNER DO NOT THE OWNER.	And the second se	-			0			
	SAP	TKY	NCB	KIX	FUK	SEL	SHA	HKG	TPE
Capacity (Flights/Week)	700	2600	2148	2820	700	700	6062	7288	5754
Charge (US\$/Flight)	7338	8954	8654	8654	7338	1992	1594	2826	1962
	MNL	BKK	JKT	KLP	SIN	SDN	LSA	LND	FRF
Capacity (Flights/Week)	2000	5931	1500	8746	11088	+∞	+∞	+∞	+∞

1569

Table 4 Airport Capacity and Charge

The line-hall cost of aircraft is statistically estimated based on the Financial Data of ICAO (1995). The line-hall cost of aircraft is strongly correlated to the flight distance as shown in Figure 2. Thus, in the present numerical computation, the estimated equation of the line-hall cost shown in Figure 2 is employed. In the succeeding analysis, all the costs are used as the present value but not the future value. It is again notified that the aircraft type used in the computation is assumed as Boeing 747-400.

2123

3077

5254

3246

4846

7408



Figure 2 Linehaul Cost of Aircraft

3.2 Equilibrium of Eastern Asian Aviation Market in 2010

1615

1962

The computed equilibrium of the Eastern Asian aviation market in 2010 is discussed in this section. Henceforth this is called as "the basic case". As discussed previously, the equilibrium state is obtained as the Nash type equilibrium in the market between air carriers' behavior and air passengers' behavior.

The computed total volume of passengers at each airport in Eastern Asia is shown in Figure 3. In this figure, the total volume of transit passengers of all the airports is about 8 percent of the total O.D. passengers. Comparing with Table 3 and Figure3, it can be understood that the volume of the direct flight passengers of each airport is proportional to the O.D. volume of its hinterland, but the volume of transit passengers is not proportional. This is understandable to see Figure 4 which shows the detail of the transit passengers of each airport. The remarks in this figure, for example, the transit passengers named "Asia" means the passengers who move intra-Asian countries, while "Europe" means the passengers who travel to Europe from Asian of the vice-versa.

Charge (US\$ / Flight)

217







As can be understood from Figure 4, the passengers who travel intra-Asian countries use the airport of Taipei, Seoul Singapore, and Hong Kong as the transit airport, while those of "Oceania" use the airport of Hong Kong or Singapore. It should be noticed that the transit passengers of "Oceania" do not include the passengers from or to Europe and North America. The passengers bound for or from Europe use the airport of Seoul, Singapore and Taipei, respectively. However, the passengers to or from North America use the airport of New Chubu, Singapore or Tokyo as the transit airport. These passengers flow largely depends upon the passengers volume from or to Japan because the O.D. passengers' volume of Japan is relatively quite large comparing with those of other Asian countries as Thus it may be easily understood that the management policy of shown in Table 3. Japanese airports will give a great influence on the equilibrium passengers' flow and the air carrier's behavior. This is also anticipated from Figure 5 which shows the flight occupancy ratio of each airport which is defined as the ratio of the service flight's number per week at each airport provided by the air carriers to its flight capacity per week. As can be seen in this figure, the occupancy ratio of Japanese airports is much larger than that of other Asian airports.



Figure 5 Occupancy Ratio of Each Airport

Surveying Figure 3 and Figure 5, it is understood that the Japanese airports are mainly used by the direct flight which is served for the passengers from or to Japan. This is the reason why the Japanese airports can not invite the enough number of flights for the transit passengers. This will be further discussed in the succeeding sections.

3.3 Impact of Super Hub-Airport Construction in Eastern Asia

It is expected that the next age aircraft will be introduced into the air transportation market in the beginning of the 21st century, and that the airport used by such aircraft will become the "Super Hub Airport". It is also said that one or two super hub airport will be probable in one continent. If so, it is anticipated that the location of the super hub airport will make a significant influence on the social and economic system of the region through the great change of air passenger's flow and the airline network. Therefore, it is very much interesting to predict the future equilibrium of air transportation market when a super hub airport available for the next age aircraft is on service. A super hub airport is , in this paper, defined as the airport only for which the inter-continental flight can be served, but, at other airports in the region, only feeder service flights are available.

Assumptions

In this section, the equilibrium of the air transportation market is discussed when one or two super hub airport is located in the Eastern Asian region to connect with other hub airports in America and Europe. In computation, followings are assumed about the next age aircraft and the super hub airport;

- (1) The O.D. volume of passengers is same as that of the basic case in 2010.
- (2) The capacity of next age craft is 622 sheets.
- (3) The average navigational speed is Mach 1.0 (1.2 times faster than the present jumbotype craft).
- (4) The linehaul operational cost is 1.5 times than that of the existing jumbo-type craft.
- (5) The airport cost for the next age aircraft is as the same price as that for the existing

jumbo-type craft.

(6) The capacity of all the airport in the Eastern Asia is enough large so as to accept all flights. This condition is necessary to find the equilibrium solution because it is supposed that the flight capacity of the super hub airport may not be overflowed in computation process when it invites many feeder service flights.

The Case of One Super Hub Airport

Concerning with the super hub airport, a question "where is the most probable for its location from the viewpoint of air carriers' strategy?" is very much interesting. Figure 6 shows the answer for this question. This figure shows the computed results of carriers' operational cost when the location of the super hub airports is changed. It should be noticed in this figure that the carriers' operation cost is normalized by the case that the super hub airport is located at Seoul. From Figure 6 it is observed that Seoul is most preferable for the carriers as the super hub airport because it gives minimum operation cost. This comes from the advantage of Seoul than the others in order to connect the Eastern Asian countries with Europe and America because of its location and the O.D. passengers' volume. Therefore, if the O.D. volume of the air passengers is changed from the assumed the pattern, the optimal location of the super hub airport will be changed.



Figure 6 Comparison of Carrier's Total Operation Cost

When the super hub airport is located at Seoul, what will happen to passengers utility? The answer is shown in Table 5 in which the travel time and the travel cost mean the difference from the basic case discussed in the section 3.2.

As can be understood from Table 5, the travel time of the passengers from and for Japan, Shanghai and Taipei is reduced in spite of small increase of the travel cost. On the other hand, the travel time and the cost of the passengers from and for the ASEAN countries will be largely increased. From this case study, it can be concluded that the passengers of the country who has the super hub airport and of its adjacent countries will be much more beneficial than the others.

In this context, which airport in Eastern Asia is available for the super hub airport if the airport capacity is limited as same as the basic case in 2010? The answer is shown in Figure 7 which shows the total flight number (the least necessary capacity functioned as the super hub airport) and the planned capacity of each airport in 2010.

Table 5	change of rassengers Othicy (Europe Dound)
Zone	Travel Time (min./person)	Travel Cost (US\$/person)
Sapporo	-219	7
Tokyo	-79	98
Chubu	-312	61
Osaka	-161	12
Fukuoka	-240	4
Shanghai	-105	513
Hong Kong	1	155
Taipei	-144	394
Manila	61	232
Bangkok	148	1048
Jakarta	44	868
Kuala Lumpur	169	976
Singapore	81	973



Table 5 Change of Passengers' Utility (Europe Bound)

Figure 7 Total Flight Number and Capacity of Each Airport as Used as a Super Hub Airport

From this figure it is understood that only the Singapore and the Kuala Lumpur airports are the candidates for the super hub airport. Consulting with Figure 6 and Figure 7, the Singapore airport is the only one candidate for the super hub airport if the other airports have no plan of capacity extension because it has enough capacity to become the super hub airport and .the carriers' operation cost is less than the Kuala Lumpur.

The Case of Two Super Hub Airports

Another scenario of the super hub airport is the location of two super hub airports, each of which the service flight is specialized for a special continent. That is, one is for Europe and the other is for America. In this section, this scenario is discussed. In this scenario, a question "where is chosen for the specialized super hub airport?" is now interesting.

The answer is shown in the Figure 8 in which the total operational cost of carriers for each

221

airport is shown when it becomes the specialized super hub airport. From this figure the Tokyo (Narita) International airport is most preferable for the carriers as the super hub airport specialized bound for America while the Seoul airport is most preferable for the carriers as the super hub airport specialized bound for Europe. This result again says that the ASEAN countries have the disadvantage to invite the specialized super hub airport.



Figure 8 Comparison of Carriers' Operation Cost

Next question is again "what will happen to the passengers' utility if these two super hub airports are located? " The computed results of the travel cost and the generalized cost of a passenger from and to each airport are shown in Figure 9 in the case, in which these costs mean the difference from the basic case discussed in the section 3.2.

This figure says that, if the super hub airport specialized bound for America is located at Tokyo, the travel cost and the generalized cost of the passengers to and from America through each airport are unchanged or slightly changed except those using the Shanghai airport. On the other hand, if the super hub airport specialized bound for Europe is located at Seoul, the travel cost and the generalized cost of the passengers through most of airports will be increased. Thus, the passengers may not use the specialized super hub because this case does not give any convenience to the travelers.

4. CONCLUSION

The present paper develops a model to obtain the Nash type equilibrium solution of the air transportation market when it is assumed as the completely competitive, and it is applied to the analysis of the Asian air transportation market in 2010 (basic case). Further, it is also applied to analyze the impact of the location of the super hub airport in the Eastern Asian region in the future considering the next age super-jumbo type aircraft.

The analytical results of the basic case say that, if the O.D volume in 2010 is increased by the present pattern, the Taipei, the Seoul, the Singapore and the Hong Kong airports will invite the inter-Asian passengers as the transit passengers. The travelers for and from Oceanian countries will use the Hong Kong and Singapore airports as the transit airport, and the transit passengers for and from America will use the New Chubu, the Singapore and the Tokyo (Narita) airports. The travelers for and from Europe will use the Seoul, the Singapore and Taipei airports as the transit airport. In any case, the capacity of each airport except the Japanese airports and the Jakarta airport will be enough for the demand in 2010.



Figure 9 Impact on the Passengers' Utility

The analytical results of the scenario of appearance of the super hub airport in Eastern Asia region suggest that the location of super hub airport at Korea or Japan will be probable from the view point of carriers' strategic behavior if those airport have enough capacity to accept all the necessary flights, and it will result in the increase of the convenience of the passengers for and from Japan, Korea and Taiwan, but vice versa for and from the passengers of the ASEAN countries. However, the analytical results show that ,if those airports can not have enough capacity, the most probable location of the super hub airport will be at Singapore. If so, the passengers' convenience will be changed from the case of above mentioned.

The present paper can give many interesting suggestions for the future air transportation market. However, the present paper includes some uncertainties associated with the estimation of O.D. volume, and the model structure itself has a problem. That is, in the real world, the air transportation demand will be elastic to the travel cost, then its increase will result in the decrease of demand, which will influence on the behavior of the carriers, but the change of carriers' behavior will further influence on the passengers' behavior, and so forth. The improvement of the proposed model concerning with this problem is remained in the future.

REFERENCES

b) Journal Papers

Furuichi, M. and Koppelman, F. (1993) Integrated Forecasting Model for International Air Travel Demand. Infrastructure Planning Review, 239-246.

Kanafani , A., and Ghobrial, A. (1985) Airline Hubbing - Some Implications for Airport

Behavior Analysis of Air Carrier under the Passengers' Equilibrium Flow in the Asian-Pacific Aviation Network

Economics. Transportation Research Record, A-19, A-No.1, 15-27.

Kuroda, K. and Takebayashi, M. (1997) Analysis of the Impact on Domestic Air Passengers' Flow by Aviation Policy Scenario, Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol.2, No.1, 205-217.

Morich, S., Yai, T. and Hyodo, T. (1993) A Study on Demand Structure of International Air Passengers in Japan. Journal of Infrastructure Planning and Management, 27-36.

Yai, T., TAKADA, K., and Okamoto, N. (1998) Analysis of the Structural Network Expansion and Economic Effects on the Eastern Asian International Air Transport Network. Jounals of Infrastructure and Management, No.597, IV-40, JSCE, 71-85.

c) Papers presented to conferences

Kobayashi, K., Kurino, M. (1998) Impact Study of the Airport Fee on the Structure of the Aviation Network. Proc. of Annual Meeting of JSCE, 284-285.

Kuroda, K. and Takebayashi, M. (1996) Stackelberg Equilibria Analysis of Air Transportation Market. Proc. of International Conference on Urban Engineering in Asian Cities in the 21st Century, AIT, Thailand, E.25-E.30, November 1996.

d) Other documents

ICAO (1997), Airport Statistics.

ICAO (1992), Airport and Route Facilities.

ICAO (1995), Financial Data.

IATA (1993), International Traffic Forecast 1993-1997.

IATA (1995), Asia-Pacific Air Transport Forecast 1980-2010.