An Agent-Based Simulation of Payment Behavior in E-Commerce

<u>Axel Hummel¹</u>, Heiko Kern¹ and Arndt Döhler²

¹ Business Information Systems, University of Leipzig ² Intershop Communications AG

Ninth German Conference on Multi-Agent System Technologies October 7, 2011, Berlin

Outline

- 1) Introduction and problem motivation
- 2) Simulation model
- 3) Evaluation of the simulation results
- 4) Validation of the simulation
- 5) Conclusion

Introduction

Current situation

- E-commerce is an important channel of distribution in order to sell products or provide services
- Business and consumers (B2C): online store
- Success depends on an optimal configuration of different aspects (shop layout, marketing activities, available payment methods, ...)

- Problem

- Optimal configuration requires knowledge about
 - Interdependency between configuration parameters
 - Impact of the parameters within the e-commerce ecosystem
- Store managers decide on basis of their expert knowledge

Unsolved question

- How many payment methods should be offered in an online store?
- Which are the best payment methods?
- Aspects of payment methods



General workflow in online stores



Overview of the shopping simulation



Simulation of the payment behavoir

Simulation objective

Reproduce the payment behavior of customers

Two possible scenarios

- 1) Disable an existing payment method
- 2) Add a new payment method
- We will focus on the first case!
- Practical relevance of scenario one
 - Complete deactivation of the payment method (high costs, fraud cases, ...)
 - Customer dependent availability of payment methods (scoring, value of the shopping cart)

Underlying assumptions of the payment behavior

The simulation model is based on the following assumptions:

- 1. Every customer has a favored payment method.
- 2. If the favored payment method of a customer is available in the online store, then the customer will choose this payment method.
- 3. The favored payment method of a customer depends only on the customer's gender.
- 4. In a first step, we consider four payment methods, namely invoice, prepayment, credit card and cash on delivery.

The customer agent and its environment



Simulation of the payment decision



If favorite payment method is available?

– Yes:

 Payment method = favorite payment method

No:

- Calculate probability $\overline{P}(P_i)$ for each alternative P_i (payment method or cancel):

$$\overline{\mathbf{P}}(P_i) = \frac{utility(P_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n utility(P_i)}$$

utility (P_i) = utility of alternative P_i

- Decide on basis of the probabilities

Calibration of the simulation model

- Gender ratio: 23% female and 77% male based on [Krabichler08]
- Ratio $r(P_i)$ of the several payment methods ($r(P_i) = fav_f(P_i)/fav_m(P_i)$)

Invoice	Prepayment	Credit Card	Cash on Delivery	Cancel
1.20	0.66	0.52	0.53	1

Probability distribution of the favorite payment method [Krabichler08]

Gender	Invoice	Prepayment	Credit Card	Cash on Delivery	Cancel
neuter	0.65	0.04	0.23	0.03	0.05
male	0.62	0.04	0.26	0.03	0.05
female	0.77	0.03	0.13	0.02	0.05

Utility of payment methods based on [Rodenkirchen11]

Invoice	Prepayment	Credit Card	Cash on Delivery	Cancel
0.96	0.09	0.29	0.12	0.3

Simulation results

Config.	P1	P2	Р3	P4	P1	P2	P 3	P4	Cancel	_ Number of
1	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	1.00	customers:
2	1	0	0	0	0.88	-	-	-	0.12	- 100 000
3	0	1	0	0	-	0.24	-	-	0.76	
4	0	0	1	0	-	-	0.59	-	0.41	– Execution:
5	0	0	0	1	-	-	-	0.28	0.72	– 10 times
6	1	1	0	0	0.84	0.06	-	-	0.10	
7	1	0	1	0	0.69	-	0.24	-	0.07	
8	1	0	0	1	0.84	-	-	0.05	0.11	
9	0	1	1	0	-	0.13	0.52	-	0.35	
10	0	1	0	1	-	0.19	-	0.23	0.58	
11	0	0	1	1	-	-	0.52	0.14	0.34	P1= invoice
12	1	1	1	0	0.67	0.04	0.23	-	0.06	P2= prepayment
13	1	1	0	1	0.81	0.05	-	0.04	0.10	
14	1	0	1	1	0.67	-	0.24	0.03	0.06	P3 = credit card
15	0	1	1	1	-	0.11	0.47	0.13	0.29	P4= cash on
16	1	1	1	1	0.65	0.04	0.23	0.03	0.05	delivery

Axel Hummel, University of Leipzig, MATES 2011

Evaluation of the simulation results

- If |payment methods| \uparrow , then cancel \downarrow
 - |payment methods| = 1, cancel = 50 %; |payment methods| = 2, cancel = 26 %

|payment methods| = 3, cancel = 13 %; |payment methods| = 4, cancel = 5 %

- Purchase on invoice has the highest rate of acceptance
- Cancel (invoice): 12 % <</p>

Cancel (prepayment, credit card, cash on delivery): 29 %

- Adding of a new payment method does not always reduce the dropout rate (Config. 6, Config. 13)
- One payment method can substitute another (Config. 12, Config. 14)

Validation (reference values based on [Krabichler08])

Conti	g. P1	P2	P3	P4	Δ(Ρ1)	Δ(Ρ2)	Δ(Ρ3)	Δ(Ρ4)	Δ(Cancel)	absolute error Δ
1	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	
3	0	1	0	0	-	0.03	-	-	0.03	
6	1	1	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	
9	0	1	1	0	-	0.02	0.01	-	0.01	
10	0	1	0	1	-	0	-	0	0	
13	1	1	0	1	0.01	0.01	-	0	0	
16	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Confi	g. P1	P2	P3	P4	δ(Ρ1)	δ(Ρ2)	δ(Ρ3)	δ(P4)	δ(Cancel)	relative error $\boldsymbol{\delta}$
Confi 1	g. P1	P2	P3	P4	δ(P1) -	δ(P2) -	δ(P3) -	δ(P4) -	δ(Cancel) 0%	relative error δ
Confi 1 3	g. P100	P2 0 1	P3 0	P4 0	δ(P1) - -	δ(P2) - 14 %	δ(P3) - -	δ(P4) - -	δ(Cancel) 0% 4%	relative error δ P1= invoice
Confi 1 3 6	g. P1001	P2 0 1 1	P3 0 0	P4 0 0 0 0	δ(P1) - - 0 %	δ(P2) - 14 % 0 %	δ(P3) - - -	δ(P4) - - -	δ(Cancel) 0% 4% 0%	relative error δ P1= invoice P2= prepayment
Confi 1 3 6 9	 g. P1 0 0 1 0 	P2 0 1 1 1 1	P3 0 0 0 1	P400000	δ(P1) 0% -	δ(P2) - 14 % 0 % 18 %	δ(P3) - - - 2 %	δ(P4) - - - -	δ(Cancel) 0% 4% 0% 3%	relative error δ P1= invoice P2= prepayment P3= credit card
Confi 1 3 6 9 10	 g. P1 0 0 1 0 0 0 	P2 0 1 1 1 1 	P3 0 0 0 1 0	 P4 0 0 0 0 1 	δ(P1) 0%	δ(P2) - 14 % 0 % 18 %	δ(P3) 2 % -	δ(P4) 0 %	δ(Cancel) 0% 4% 0% 3% 0%	relative error δ P1= invoice P2= prepayment P3= credit card
Confi 1 3 6 9 10 13	 g. P1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 	P2 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	P3 0 0 0 1 0 0	P4 0 0 0 1 1 	δ(P1) 0% 1%	δ(P2) - 14 % 0 % 18 % 0 % 17 %	δ(P3) 2 %	δ(P4) 0% 0%	δ(Cancel) 0% 4% 0% 3% 0% 0% 0%	relative error δ P1= invoice P2= prepayment P3= credit card P4= cash on

Axel Hummel, University of Leipzig, MATES 2011

Conclusion

- Agent-based simulation technique is applied to model the payment behavior of customers
- Benefits of the agent-based paradigm
 - Natural way to model the behavior of customers (bottom-up)
 - Supports the iterative approach

Limitations

- Mapping from aggregated data to the agent properties is required
- Problems with scalability
- Simple simulation model with some weaknesses
 - Limited number of payment methods and influencing factors
 - Adding of a new payment method can not be simulated

References

[Krabichler08]	Krabichler, Thomas; Wittmann, Georg; Stahl, Ernst; Breitschaft, Markus: Erfolgsfaktor Payment—Der Einfluss der Zahlungsverfahren auf Ihren Umsatz (German): ibi research an der Universität Regensburg GmbH. (2008).
[Rodenkirchen11]	Rodenkirchen, Sonja; Krüger, Malte: Ausgewählte Studien des ECC Handel—Der Internet- Zahlungsverkehr aus Sicht der Verbraucher: Ergebnisse der Umfrage IZV10 (German). (2011).

Thank you for your attention!

Contact information:

Axel Hummel

Business Information Systems

University of Leipzig

Johannisgasse 26

04103 Leipzig, Germany

phone: +49 341 9732360

hummel@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

http://bis.informatik.uni-leipzig.de/AxelHummel



The SimProgno Project

http://www.simprogno.de

Funded by the German Federal

Ministry of Education and Research

SPONSORED BY THE



Federal Ministry of Education and Research

