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1- Definitions

• UAV: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), sometimes referred to as drones, are aircrafts without an onboard pilot; UAVs operate with varying degrees of autonomy, such as remotely controlled by a human operator or autonomously by onboard computers
• UAS: Unmanned Aerial Systems
• UAM: Urban Air Mobility, includes goods delivery, drone taxi
• LMD: Last Mile Delivery in Logistics
• TSP: Travelling Salesman Problem
• VRP: Vehicle Routing Problem
2- Introduction: SESAR view point

High potential of development of Urban Air Mobility (UAM), specially for Aerial Logistics:

- **Controlled airspace**
  - Manned aviation in controlled airspace
    - hrs ~ 33 million
    - km ~ 20 billion
  - Unmanned aviation in controlled airspace
    - hrs ~ 7 million
    - km ~ 4 billion
  - Controlled + Uncontrolled
    - Manned aviation often in uncontrolled airspace
      - hrs ~ 2 million
      - km ~ 0.6 billion
    - Long endurance surveying & monitoring
      - hrs < 0.1 million
      - km < 0.1 billion

- **Very low level “VLL” airspace (initially at 150m or 500ft)**
  - Densely populated usage
    - hrs ~ 250 million
    - km ~ 15 billion
  - Remote infrastructure & rural usage
    - hrs ~ 20 million
    - km ~ 1 billion
  - Leisure usage
    - hrs ~ 80 million
    - km ~ 1 billion

Protected sites
2- Introduction: Market view

• E-commerce continues to outgrow offline retail revenues and is expected to reach 15% of global retail share in 2020
2- Introduction: LMD ineffiency

Last-mile delivery is one of the most complex and inefficient steps in supply chain due to:

• Fragmentation of deliveries by different players with different business models. Examples include integrated logistics players, such as DHL and UPS; same-day logistics providers, such as Deliv; retailers, such as Amazon; and pure tech players, such as UBE RRush.

• Inefficient delivery routes caused by urban congestion: 65% of all humans will live in cities by 2050. This rising urbanization coupled with unprecedented growth in e-commerce is increasing the volume of urban freight deliveries and consequently putting strain on cities grappling with congestion problems.
2- Introduction: LMD inefficiency

LMD inefficiencies make last-mile delivery as the costliest step in supply chain, accounting for up to 53% of the total shipment costs.
2- Introduction: Significance of drones in urban delivery

• **Reduce cost**: Based on research by Deutsche Bank, for typical small-box delivery, drones’ delivery cost is USD 0.05 per mile - compared to USD 2 for USPS last-mile delivery or USD 6-6.5 for premium ground like FedEx or UPS.

• **Enhance reach area**: In areas with poor infrastructure access, drones can increase reach to remote areas which cannot be served by ground transportation.

• **Reduce delivery time**: Drones significantly reduce delivery transit times compared to those of terrestrial delivery systems, such as trucking. This is because drones are capable of flying in straight lines to their destinations and bypass traffic congestion.
2- Introduction: Value Created by freight UAVs

**Improving efficiency and reducing costs:**

- Reduce operating and maintenance costs for freight and delivery by using automated or remotely controlled aerial vehicles.
- Increase freight service offering with solutions that can be operated out of usual working hours and potential to increase efficiency due to the predictability and exact timetabling of automated transportation.
- Reduction in damage to and maintenance required for road infrastructure as many heavy vehicles could be taken off the road in favour of UAVs.

**Enhancing economic, social and environmental value:**

- Increase efficiency enabling cheaper delivery services and shorter waiting times for deliveries through automated real-time optimisation of delivery routes, and less pressure and congestion on the road network.
- Reduce emissions and pollution, as road vehicles are replaced by UAVs powered by electricity.
- Improve road safety by reducing the number of freight vehicles on the road and replacing them with aerial vehicles in a dedicated aerial space.
2- Introduction: scope

• The LMD is an organizational challenge (cost, sustainability, environmental impact)
• The evolution of the technologies making LMD affordable with (UAV), allowing high Safety Levels
• UAVs have been successfully used for military applications for decades and are now increasingly being adopted by the freight and logistics industry
• The societal acceptance of LMD via UAV is a question together with regulatory issues
• Several models for LMD logistics are already developed
• Heuristic & metaheuristic methods approach are developed
3- Enabling technologies: UAVs

- Freight UAVs are currently being developed by an array of companies including start-ups like Natilus and Sabrewing, and major players like Amazon, FedEx, DHL, and UPS.
- Each prototype varies in shape and size, with Boeing’s cargo air vehicle weighing 338kg (747 lb) and carrying a 227kg (500 lb) payload, versus Wing’s 5kg (11 lb) drone that can carry 1.4kg (3 lb) payload.
- Fast technological development (electrical engines, navigation & guidance systems, and communication devices) => Increased availability of commercial UAVs at low cost and a wide range of payload (1.5 Kg to 350 Kg) and mission endurance (30 minutes to several hours).
### 3- Enabling technologies: Light UAVs

**Types** (Light Cargo, Medical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Wing Drone</th>
<th>Multi-Rotor Drone</th>
<th>Hybrid Drone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Zipline, Wings for Aid</td>
<td>e.g. Matternet, Flirtey</td>
<td>e.g. Drones for Development, Vayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeroplane-like</td>
<td>Quad-copter, helicopter or octo-copter</td>
<td>Combines advantages of Fixed Wing and Multi-Rotor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster (up to 100 km/h)</td>
<td>Shorter flight time</td>
<td>Faster (up to 100km/h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer distances (up to 150 km)</td>
<td>Shorter distance (up to 20 km)</td>
<td>Longer distances (up to 80 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload (1.5-4.5 kg)</td>
<td>Payload (up to 4.5 kg)</td>
<td>Payload (up to 5 kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require landing strip and catapult</td>
<td>Vertical take-off and landing</td>
<td>Vertical take-off and landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can only go one way; cannot return supplies</td>
<td>Battery replacement on the way optional; could return supplies</td>
<td>Battery replacement on the way optional; could return supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachute option to drop supplies</td>
<td>Generally cheaper</td>
<td>Generally more expensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3- Enabling technologies: heavy UAVs Types (Taxi, heavy Cargo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Vectored Thrust</th>
<th>Lift + Cruise</th>
<th>Wingless (Multicopter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrusters used for lift and cruise</td>
<td>Independent thrusters used for cruise as for lift</td>
<td>Thrusters only for lift, cruise via rotor pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Hyundai SA1 eVTOL</td>
<td>Wisk (Kitty Hawk) Cora</td>
<td>Volocopter 2X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Optimized for both hover and cruise</td>
<td>Redundancy benefits of multicopter without collective or cyclic actuation</td>
<td>High redundancy and simple controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lift provided by wings for cruise for highest efficiency</td>
<td>Wing configuration allows for more speed in cruise</td>
<td>Significantly quieter than helicopters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest cruising speeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower maintenance and lightweight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3- Enabling technologies: Light UAVs Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zipline</th>
<th>Matternet</th>
<th>Vayu</th>
<th>Drones for Development Dr.One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate cost</strong></td>
<td>Model on a per flight basis with a minimum number of flights agreed upon. Drones are not for sale</td>
<td>USD 5,000-USD 7,500 per drone</td>
<td>USD 30,000 per drone</td>
<td>USD 5,000 per drone. Cost are expected to decrease with scale-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further cost</strong></td>
<td>No long-term capital or maintenance costs</td>
<td>Cost for infrastructure e.g. landing stations or maintenance costs if needed for battery, motor or propeller</td>
<td>Replacement cost of battery after 1000 cycles</td>
<td>The life time of a drone is expected to be 5 years, the battery life 12 month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3- Enabling technologies: UAVs Cargo projects

- **Wing**: Part 135 certified for in the US (Helsinki in 2020)
- **Amazon**: Testing in France and Austria
- **Quantum Systems**: Ingolstadt in 2022
- **Volocopter**: N. a.
- **PiPiStrel**: Design stage
- **AutoFlight**: Design stage
- **CHANG**: N. a.
4- Societal Acceptance & Sustainability: UAM high level societal benefits in EU and Europe

- ~4.2 bn €
  market size in Europe in 2030

- ~31%
  of global UAM market to be located in Europe in 2030

- ~90 000
  jobs created in the Europe in 2030

- 15-40 min
  saved in average on travel time by UAM for a city to airport transfer

- 100%
  reduction of local emissions for electric propulsion

- ~73%
  faster delivery of organs between city hospitals possible

- 1 500 times
  less likely to be involved in a fatal accident compared to road transport on a passenger kilometre basis

---

1. Based on McKinsey VTOL market model
2. Assuming same safety level as commercial air transport in the EU
3. Based on direct, indirect and induced jobs created by CAPEX and OPEX spend of UAM industry in Europe in 2030
4. Compared to a helicopter with conventional kerosene propulsion
5. Compared to a car drive on a Thursday at 5pm

Source: VTOL team, Eurostat, Google Maps
4- Societal Acceptance & Sustainability: UAM high level societal risks in EU and Europe

Noise
"...there are certain threats that could impede the sustainable and thus successful introduction of UAM to our cities, with noise being a prominent limitation."

Safety
"The key areas of discussion to move forward will be to meet, or exceed, the current safety parameters with these new vehicles."

Privacy
"Civil liberties groups have privacy concerns with widespread UAM adoption..."

Visual pollution
"The sensitive topic of visual and noise pollution must also be addressed."

Affordability
"Public acceptance of these new systems and services is imperative, driven by... ...and affordability."

Obsolete jobs
"There is concern that autonomous technology will render jobs obsolete across multiple industries"

Environmental impact
"Air pollution caused by pollutants such as particulate matter, nitrogen oxides and ozone, as well as odour nuisance should be avoided."
4- Societal Acceptance & Sustainability: EU Survey for implementation of delivery drones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Rather unlikely</th>
<th>Rather likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öresund</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Societal Acceptance & Sustainability: EU Survey, perceived usefulness of UAVs services

#### Perceived usefulness of UAM use cases, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Case</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drone delivery of medical supplies to hospitals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport of injured person to hospital</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport of emergency medical personnel</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster management using drones</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drone delivery of medical supplies to home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drone delivery of groceries and Goods in remote areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drone delivery of goods from online shopping in urban area</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance forwarding of heavy cargo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drone delivery of meals in urban areas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle service to airport</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional air mobility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute from a suburb to the city centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point to point travel within a city</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing by air taxi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Emergency use cases

1. Drone delivery of medical supplies to hospitals
2. Transport of injured person to hospital
3. Transport of emergency medical personnel
4. Disaster management using drones
5. Drone delivery of medical supplies to home
6. Drone delivery of groceries and Goods in remote areas
7. Drone delivery of goods from online shopping in urban area
8. Long-distance forwarding of heavy cargo
9. Drone delivery of meals in urban areas
10. Shuttle service to airport
11. Regional air mobility
12. Commute from a suburb to the city centre
13. Point to point travel within a city
14. Sightseeing by air taxi
15. None
5- LMD modes & Decision Making: LMD modes

• Reception Box (RB): Shared RB, Own RB, Delivery Box own by LMD provider
• Collection-and-delivery points (CDPs): Locker point or unattended point is a shared reception box that installed at public area
• Post office (PO): traditional local service mode
• Attended home delivery (AHD): widely used and still be a popular mode
• Unattended home delivery (UAHD): could offer a choice of solutions to the ‘not at home’ and ‘time windows’ problems
### 5- LMD modes & Decision Making: LMD modes comparison wrt operational topic & stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>In perspectives of</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>CDPs</th>
<th>Post office</th>
<th>AHD</th>
<th>UAHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared reception box</td>
<td>Own reception box</td>
<td>Delivery box</td>
<td>Service point</td>
<td>Locker point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening hours</td>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed first-time delivery</td>
<td>Service providers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery cost</td>
<td>Service providers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5- LMD modes & Decision Making: Indicator System for the Last-Mile Travel-Mode Selection
The Travelling Salesman Problem: The TSP is a non-deterministic problem within combinatorial optimisation, used in operation research to find the shortest path that connects a set of nodes, for which the order of visit is not important. It takes its name from the analogy of a salesman who, given a set of destinations, must visit each one of them starting from a certain node and ending at his starting location. The goal of the problem is to minimise the total length of the tour.

The Vehicle Routing Problem: The Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP) is a combinatorial optimisation and integer programming problem, which generalises the TSP. The goal of the VRP is to define the optimal tour given a set of nodes and a fleet of vehicles, such that each node is visited at least once and only once, and the costs of operations are minimised.
6- Mathematical Models: the TSP

• The objective function is to minimise the cost of visiting each node. The decision variable $x_{ij}$ refers to the binary integer value that returns 1 if the path goes from node $i$ to node $j$ and zero otherwise. The combinatorial model involves $n$ cities and it only allows path solutions that visit each node once and only once and that define a tour.

• Some adaptation of the TSP with combined drones and van fleets

\[
\text{OF } \quad \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ij} * x_{ij}
\]

\[
\text{ST } \quad \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \quad 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (1)
\]

\[
\min \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (2)
\]

\[
x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (3)
\]
The objective function is to minimise the cost of the tour, by providing the cheapest possible sequence of nodes to be visited. The decision variable $x_{ijk}$ can assume the value of 1 if customer $j$ is visited immediately after customer $i$ by vehicle $k$, and 0 otherwise. The variable $y_{ik}$ defines whether customer $i$ is visited with vehicle $k$. The capacity of the vehicles is limited by constraint 3, in which $q_i$ indicates the demand at each node visited by vehicle $k$ and $Q_k$ the capacity of vehicle $k$. Constraint 6 guarantees that not sub tours are generated.
6- Mathematical Models: Adaptations of the VRP

- **VRP with pick-up and delivery (VRPPD):** goods are first moved from the retail shop to pick-up points and then to the delivery locations;

- **VRP with last in first out (VRPLIFO):** the VRPPD is extended with another restriction that the first item to be delivered must be the last one that was picked up. This is usually used when the loading and unloading time at the delivery location is limited;

- **VRP with multiple trips (VRPMT):** vehicles are allowed to do more than one route in their tour;

- **Open VRP (OVRP):** vehicles do not have to return to the initial node (depot or retail store);

- **VRP with time windows (VRPTW):** used when deliveries have pre-arranged times for the delivery visit;

- **Dynamic VRPTW (DVRPTW):** extension of the VRPTW in which two types of customers are defined, the known customers and the new customers. Known customers refers to the ones that are already planned in the delivery schedule, while new customers refer to the one that call in and must be inserted in the existing route;

- **Capacitated VRP (CVRP):** used in the case that the vehicles have a limited capacity.
7- Models Implementation: example of the VRP

• The VRP belongs to the category of **NP-complete** problems, a class of computational problems for which no efficient solution algorithm has been found. For this reason, exact algorithms can be used to obtain true optimal routes only up to 30 nodes. In case of more than 30 nodes, **heuristic algorithms** must be used.

• An example of exact algorithm for the VRP is the Branch-and-Bound algorithm, the BnB algorithm is used to solve discrete and combinatorial optimization problems, using a systematic enumeration of candidate solutions by means of state space search. The iterations are seen as forming a tree, which branches represent subsets of the solution set. At each iteration, feasible sets are broken up into successively smaller subsets, for which the upper and lower bounds of the objective function are calculated and used for discard certain subsets from further consideration, in case they cannot produce a better solution than the best one already found.
Two types of heuristic algorithms to solve the Vehicle Routing Problem:

- **Constructive heuristics**: Constructive heuristics gradually build a feasible solution, while minimizing the solution cost. The construction method is based either on the nearest, the farthest or the cheapest neighbour, depending on the criteria used for the selection method. In all cases, constructive heuristics can fail to provide the best optimal solution, given the greedy nature of their algorithms.

- **Improvement heuristics**: Improvement heuristics aim to obtain a feasible solution upgrading the previous one obtained, by changing the sequence of edges within or between vehicle routes. Improvements come from a neighbourhood search process, for which each route is associated with a neighbourhood, and better solutions are sought within that specific neighbourhood.
Metaheuristic algorithms are a category of modern heuristics that are used for generate or select the best heuristic method to solve an optimisation problem, providing a sufficiently good solution in case of imperfect information or limited computation capabilities.

Global optimal solution is not guaranteed, given the fact that this type of solution approach relies on assumptions about the optimisation problem to be solved.

To find a sufficiently good solution in case of imperfect information, metaheuristics implement a stochastic optimisation, generating a random set of variables and solving the problem for that specific set; in this way, the solution is highly dependent on the chosen variables, which contributes to the reasons why global optimal solution is not guaranteed.
Six types of metaheuristics can be used to solve the VRP: Simulated Annealing (SA), Deterministic Annealing (DA), Tabu Search (TS), Genetic Algorithm (GA), Ant System (AS) and Neural Networks (NN)

• SA, DA and TS, start from the initial solution $x_1$, each iteration $t$ is characterised by a starting solution $x_t$ and provides a new solution $x_{t+1}$, which belongs to the neighbour $N(x_t)$ of the starting solution $x_t$. Cost improvements are not guaranteed

• GA takes its name from the geneticevolution of species; it considers at each iteration a population of solutions derived from previous iterations by combining their best elements and getting rid of the worst

• AS is a probabilistic constructive approach that finds the optimal path to be followed through graph theory, inspired by the behaviour of real ants. In each iteration, several new solutions are created as a result of information gathered at previous iterations

• NN are a learning mechanism that base their solution on previous results, gradually adjusting the outcome values or implementation mechanism until an acceptable solution is reached
8- Conclusion

Last Mile Delivery by Drone is a fast growing domain with several issues / opportunities to be addressed:

- UAS Regulation and UAS Traffic Management (UTM)
- LMD Drone Public Acceptance evaluation via Surveys
- LMD modes selection wrt cost, environmental performance & efficiency (travel time)
- LMD combined vehicles routing optimisation (Drone, Van, Tricycle, Bicycle…) through TSP and VRP, and evolutions
- LMD Traffic evaluation and optimisation in Urban Areas
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