

# Minimising Numbers of Losses and Abandonments in Small Call Centres Under a Transient Regime

Hritika Gupta<sup>1,2</sup> and Peter G. Taylor<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne

<sup>2</sup>ARC Training Centre in Optimisation Technologies, Integrated Methodologies, and Applications (OPTIMA)

December 8, 2023

## Abstract

In this paper, we show how to calculate transient performance measures in models for small call centres that employ skills-based routing. In particular, we calculate the expected number of customer losses and call abandonments in a fixed time. We use the results to compare how call allocation policies can minimise the expected numbers of losses and abandonments, and make recommendations about which policies should be employed.

## 1 Introduction

The term *call centre* is commonly used to describe a telephone-based human-service operation. A call centre provides teleservices, namely services in which customers and service agents are remote from each other (Mandelbaum, Sakov, and Zeltyn [15]). They have become increasingly popular as service quality is now a very important factor in attracting and retaining customers.

Human resources typically account for more than 60% of the total operating cost of a call centre (Gans, Koole, and Mandelbaum [9], Brown et al. [7]). Hence, it is not profitable to overstaff a call centre. On the other hand, understaffing a call centre leads to poor customer service which can have a negative impact on the business's reputation. Therefore, it is important to strike a balance and appropriately staff a call centre. However, it can be hard to estimate the workload of a call centre because of the uncertainty involved in the time and number of call arrivals, type of query, service time and customers' patience level.

Call centre service providers frequently have contracts with their clients under which they have to manage the client's customer care department and meet certain quality standards, for example, serving at least 90% of the calls within 20 seconds and having less than 3% of call abandonments per month. A reasonable objective for a call centre service provider is to minimise the staffing requirements while meeting all the targets. This can be achieved by improving the prediction accuracy of call arrivals, using an efficient scheduling method and making the best use of resources by appropriately allocating an incoming call to an agent.

When a customer calls a call centre, they are first connected to an *Interactive Voice Response (IVR)* system, where they are required to provide some information regarding their query. In some instances the query is resolved by the IVR system itself and the call is completed. In all other cases, the customer requires human assistance. In such cases, if a suitable agent is available, the caller is transferred to that agent. Otherwise, the customer joins a queue where they wait either until they are served or abandon the queue depending on their patience level and the value of that service for them.

In many call centres, customer queries are divided among different categories depending on the level of complexity of the query. Similarly, agents are also assigned a skill level depending on their ability to solve these queries. When a call arrives, based on the caller's initial input to the IVR, they are assigned to an agent with the appropriate skill level. Some agents are multi-skilled and can deal with more than one type of query. When a call centre has multi-skilled agents, it can lead to a number of possibilities for allocating an incoming call to an agent. We call these rules of assigning an incoming call to an agent a *policy*.

Skills-based routing has been studied many times before through different techniques. One of the most common and effective ways is to study them through simulations, see Takakuwa and Okada [21], Adetunji et al. [2], Akhtar and Latif [3], Mehrotra et al. [17], Ilk, Shang, and Goes [12] and Mughele and Susan [18]. In Section 6, we have also used simulations for comparison and verification purposes.

Wallace and Whitt [22] developed routing algorithm for skills-based routing. Stolletz and Helber [20], Gans and Zhou [10] and Wang and Srinivasan [23] compared the routing policies under a steady state assumption while Gurvich, Armony, and Mandelbaum [11] considered other asymptotic regimes such as the quality-and-efficiency-driven regime as the system load goes to infinity. Bhulai [5] obtained nearly optimal routing policies under the specific case where there is either no buffer for waiting customers or there is a buffer and all agents have either a single skill only or they are fully cross-trained. Legros, Jouini, and Koole [14] performed this analysis for call centres with a call back option but which does not have skills-based routing. Rusilko [19] investigated the routing process under the asymptotic assumption of a large number of customers. Ali [4], Mehrbod, Grilo, and Zutshi [16], Ilk, Shang, and Goes [12] and Jorge, Pereira, and Novais [13] used machine learning techniques such as support vector machines, random forests and neural networks for their analysis.

In this paper, we develop a method to calculate various performance mea-

asures related to call centres such as the expected number of call abandonments and the expected total waiting time of customers. We show how to calculate these measures over short time intervals using Markov chains under a transient setting without using any asymptotic regimes. Hence, the method is appropriate for small call centres which is important because routing policies make a bigger difference in such cases. Since, the number of agents and the arrival rate can change over a short timescale, implying that the initial distribution has a significant impact on the performance of a call centre, it is crucial to calculate these quantities in a transient regime. We can then utilise these performance measures to compare different routing policies. We have verified all the results presented using simulations.

Different policies can lead to a difference in the performance level of a call centre. Consider an example in which customers are calling with either a sales query or a technical query. Some agents, which we call level 1 agents, are only trained to answer sales queries, and other agents, which we call level 2 agents, are trained to answer both sales and technical queries. Say, a sales query is coming in and both level 1 and level 2 agents are available. The best course of action, in this case, would be to assign that query to one of the available level 1 agents. Similarly, when a technical query is coming in and a level 2 agent is available, we would assign the query to the available level 2 agent. However, what if a sales query is coming in and all level 1 agents are busy handling other calls whereas a level 2 agent is available? Should we assign this call to the available level 2 agent and block them from taking a technical query for a while, or wait for a level 1 agent to become free by making the caller wait in the queue? This decision can depend on a number of factors, for example, the number of level 2 agents available, the service rate of a sales query caller by a level 2 agent, the abandonment rate of a sales query caller and the priority of a sales query caller as compared to a technical query caller for the call centre.

In this paper, we will consider a general model with  $\nu$  classes of query and  $\nu$  levels of agents. Level  $i$  agents have the skill to deal with level  $i$  and level  $i - 1$  queries. However, the method introduced here can be applied to other policies and settings as well, provided that the state space is manageable. A diagram of this model for two levels is shown in Figure 1.

The type of policy we look at is a reservation policy. Under this policy, if there is an arrival of a level  $i - 1$  caller, we first try to assign that call to a level  $i - 1$  agent and if they all are busy, we check the number of level  $i$  agents available, if there are at least  $n_i$  agents available at level  $i$ , we assign the call to one of the available level  $i$  agents, otherwise the caller has to wait in the queue.

When there is a service by a level  $i$  agent, the level  $i$  agent who becomes available will first look for level  $i$  calls and answer them in first-come-first-served (FCFS) order, and if no level level  $i$  calls are in waiting but level  $i - 1$  calls are in waiting, then they will take the first level  $i - 1$  call in the queue if the number of level  $i$  agents available is at least  $n_i$ . This implies that FCFS is followed across the same level of calls but not across all levels.

The objective is to find the optimal value of the number of agents to be reserved at each level for a given set of parameters and the initial state of the




Figure 1: Call allocation for two levels.

system so that the expected number of call abandonments is minimised during some future time interval.

We model the system as a continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC), assuming that the calls are arriving according to a Poisson process, and the service and abandonment times are exponentially distributed. The method we will use here was introduced in Chiera and Taylor [8].

For illustrative purposes, in Section 2, we start by describing the method in detail for the case with only one type of query and one class of agent. In Section 3, we extend the method to four types of queries and agents. In Section 4, we provide some numerical examples on how to employ the method to find the optimal allocation policy. In Section 5, we discuss the limitations of the method and in Section 6, we compare our optimal policy with some other policies using simulations. We conclude the paper in Section 7.

## 2 A single level

### 2.1 Expected cost of abandonments and losses

Let the total number of agents be  $k$  and the total number of telephone lines be  $\ell$ , that is, we cannot have more than  $\ell$  callers in the system, and  $\ell \geq k$ . A customer is lost/blocked if they call when all the lines are busy. Let  $\beta$  be the cost of blocking a customer and  $\gamma$  be the cost that the call centre believes it incurs when they lose a customer through a call abandonment. Since there is only one type of query and one class of agents, any agent can serve any customer and the customers are served in an FCFS order.

For the CTMC in this case, the state space is given by  $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$  denoting the number of callers in the system. Let  $\lambda$  be the Poisson arrival rate of calls requiring agents' assistance,  $\mu$  be the exponential service rate and  $\theta$  be the exponential abandonment rate (see Figure 2).




Figure 2: Flowchart of calls in a call centre.

For  $a \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$  and  $t > 0$ , let  $A_a(t)$  be the expected cost of abandonments and losses during  $(0, t)$  given that the system is in state  $a$  at time 0. Let  $A_a(t|x)$  be the same quantity as  $A_a(t)$  given that  $x$  is the first time that the system leaves state  $a$ .

There is a transition from  $a$  to  $a + 1$  in the case of an arrival and a transition from  $a$  to  $a - 1$  in the case of a service or an abandonment. The arrival rate is equal to  $\lambda$  if  $a < \ell$ , otherwise the customer is blocked. The service rate is equal to  $a\mu$  if  $a \leq k$  and is equal to  $k\mu$  otherwise. Similarly, the abandonment rate is equal to 0 if there is no one in the queue, that is when  $a \leq k$ , and is equal to  $(a - k)\theta$  if there are  $a - k$  customers waiting, that is when  $a > k$ . Hence, the transition rates are

$$q_{a,a+1} = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} \quad (1)$$

$$q_{a,a-1} = \min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta. \quad (2)$$

Now, we can write an expression for  $A_a(t|x)$ ,

$$A_a(t|x) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < x, a < \ell \\ \lambda t \beta & t < x, a = \ell \\ A_1(t - x) & t \geq x, a = 0 \\ \frac{a\mu A_{a-1}(t - x) + \lambda A_{a+1}(t - x)}{a\mu + \lambda} & t \geq x, 0 < a \leq k \\ \frac{k\mu A_{a-1}(t - x) + (a - k)\theta(\gamma + A_{a-1}(t - x)) + \lambda A_{a+1}(t - x)}{k\mu + (a - k)\theta + \lambda} & t \geq x, k < a < \ell \\ \lambda x \beta + \frac{k\mu A_{\ell-1}(t - x) + (\ell - k)\theta(\gamma + A_{\ell-1}(t - x))}{k\mu + (\ell - k)\theta} & t \geq x, a = \ell. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

As the model is a Markov chain and  $x$  is exponentially distributed with rate given by  $\lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + \min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta$ , we can remove the conditioning with respect to  $x$  by integrating  $A_a(t|x)$  to derive an expression for  $A_a(t)$ . Using

$A_a(t) = \int_0^\infty A_a(t|x)dF_a(x)$ , we have for  $a = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} A_0(t) &= \int_0^t A_1(t-x)dF_0(x) \\ &= \int_0^t A_1(t-x)\lambda e^{-\lambda x}dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for  $0 < a \leq k$

$$\begin{aligned} A_a(t) &= \int_0^t \frac{a\mu A_{a-1}(t-x) + \lambda A_{a+1}(t-x)}{a\mu + \lambda} dF_a(x) \\ &= \int_0^t (a\mu A_{a-1}(t-x) + \lambda A_{a+1}(t-x))e^{-(a\mu+\lambda)x} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for  $k < a < \ell$

$$\begin{aligned} A_a(t) &= \int_0^t \frac{k\mu A_{a-1}(t-x) + (a-k)\theta(\gamma + A_{a-1}(t-x)) + \lambda A_{a+1}(t-x)}{k\mu + (a-k)\theta + \lambda} dF_a(x) \\ &= \int_0^t ((k\mu + (a-k)\theta)A_{a-1}(t-x) + \lambda A_{a+1}(t-x))e^{-(k\mu+(a-k)\theta+\lambda)x} dx \\ &\quad + \frac{(a-k)\theta\gamma}{k\mu + (a-k)\theta + \lambda} (1 - e^{-(k\mu+(a-k)\theta+\lambda)t}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and for  $a = \ell$

$$\begin{aligned} A_\ell(t) &= \int_0^t \lambda x\beta + \frac{k\mu A_{\ell-1}(t-x) + (\ell-k)\theta(\gamma + A_{\ell-1}(t-x))}{k\mu + (\ell-k)\theta} dF_\ell(x) + \int_t^\infty \lambda t\beta dF_\ell(x) \\ &= \int_0^t (k\mu + (\ell-k)\theta)A_{\ell-1}(t-x)e^{-(k\mu+(\ell-k)\theta)x} dx \\ &\quad + \frac{(\ell-k)\theta\gamma + \lambda\beta}{k\mu + (\ell-k)\theta + \lambda} (1 - e^{-(k\mu+(\ell-k)\theta+\lambda)t}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

It follows that the Laplace transforms  $\tilde{A}_a(s)$  satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_0(s) &= \frac{\lambda\tilde{A}_1(s)}{s + \lambda} \\ \tilde{A}_a(s) &= \frac{\lambda\tilde{A}_{a+1}(s) + a\mu\tilde{A}_{a-1}(s)}{s + \lambda + a\mu}, \quad 0 < a \leq k \\ \tilde{A}_a(s) &= \frac{\lambda\tilde{A}_{a+1}(s) + (k\mu + (a-k)\theta)\tilde{A}_{a-1}(s) + \frac{(a-k)\theta\gamma}{s}}{s + \lambda + k\mu + (a-k)\theta}, \quad k < a < \ell \\ \tilde{A}_\ell(s) &= \frac{(k\mu + (\ell-k)\theta)\tilde{A}_{\ell-1}(s) + \frac{(\ell-k)\theta\gamma + \lambda\beta}{s}}{s + k\mu + (\ell-k)\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For all  $a \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$ , we can write 8 in the form

$$\tilde{A}_a(s) = \frac{\lambda \tilde{A}_{a+1}(s) \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + (\min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta) \tilde{A}_{a-1}(s) + \frac{(\max(0, a - k)\theta\gamma + \lambda\beta \mathbb{1}_{a=\ell})}{s}}{\lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + \min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta + s} \quad (9)$$

with  $\tilde{A}_a(s) = 0$  for  $a \notin \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$ .

For a given set of parameters, we can solve these equations and then invert them using the Euler method discussed in Abate and Whitt [1].

Putting  $\gamma = 1$  and  $\beta = 0$  gives us the expected number of call abandonments and putting  $\gamma = 0$  and  $\beta = 1$  gives us the expected number of customers blocked.

## 2.2 Time-dependent transition probabilities

We have discussed how to calculate the expected number of call abandonments over a single time interval, but what if we want to calculate this measure over multiple time intervals with varying parameters? For example, say the day is divided into two shifts with varying numbers of agents and call arrival rates. In such a case, we want to be able to project over both time intervals with the initial state of the second interval being the final state of the first interval. In this subsection, we will calculate the distribution of the state of the system after  $t$  time units (transition probabilities at time  $t$ ). If  $P^{(t)}$  is the probability matrix for our Markov chain and  $Q$  is the generator matrix, then this implies that we need to find an expression for  $P^{(t)} = \exp(tQ)$  (Borovkov [6]). We will again use the Laplace transform in order to solve this equation. If  $\tilde{P}(s) = [\tilde{p}_{ij}(s)]$  is the Laplace transform of  $P^{(t)}$ , then  $\tilde{P}(s) = (sI - Q)^{-1}$ .

Let  $p_{i,j}(t)$  be the probability of finding the system in state  $j$  at time  $t$  given that we start in state  $i$  at time 0. Let

$$\lambda_j = \lambda \mathbb{1}_{0 \leq j < \ell},$$

$$\mu_j = \min(j, k)\mu \mathbb{1}_{0 < j \leq \ell}$$

and

$$\theta_j = \max(0, j - k)\theta \mathbb{1}_{0 < j \leq \ell}.$$

Let  $p_{i,j}(t) = 0$  for  $i$  or  $j \notin \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$ . For  $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$ , the forward Kolmogorov equations are

$$\frac{dp_{i,j}(t)}{dt} = \lambda_{j-1}p_{i,j-1}(t) + (\theta_{j+1} + \mu_{j+1})p_{i,j+1}(t) - (\lambda_j + \theta_j + \mu_j)p_{i,j}(t).$$

Taking Laplace transform on both sides, we have

$$s\tilde{p}_{i,j}(s) - p_{i,j}(0) = \lambda_{j-1}\tilde{p}_{i,j-1}(s) + (\theta_{j+1} + \mu_{j+1})\tilde{p}_{i,j+1}(s) - (\lambda_j + \theta_j + \mu_j)\tilde{p}_{i,j}(s) \quad (10)$$

and  $p_{i,j}(0) = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}$ . Rearranging we have

$$\tilde{p}_{i,j}(s) = \frac{\lambda_{j-1}\tilde{p}_{i,j-1}(s) + (\theta_{j+1} + \mu_{j+1})\tilde{p}_{i,j+1}(s) + \mathbb{1}_{i=j}}{\lambda_j + \theta_j + \mu_j + s}. \quad (11)$$

We can use these probabilities to calculate the expected number of call abandonments (or any relevant quantity) over two intervals with different parameters (or any new information). We calculate the expected number of call abandonments in the first interval and we start the second interval with initial state vector given by  $p_{i,j}(t)$ . We can extend this further to more than two intervals.

### 2.3 Expected total waiting time of the customers

Now we will calculate the expected total waiting time of the customers over an interval  $(0, t)$  regardless of whether they abandon or are served. It is the expected time that all customers spend in the system not getting served during a time interval. After time  $t$ , we can use Subsection 2.2 to project over the next interval.

Let  $W_a(t)$  be the expected total waiting time of the customers who are in the system during  $(0, t)$  given that the system is in state  $a$  at time 0. Let  $W_a(t|x)$  be the same quantity as  $W_a(t)$  given that  $x$  is the first time when the system leaves state  $a$ .

Using the same notation as Subsection 2.1, we can write an expression for  $W_a(t|x)$

$$W_a(t|x) = \begin{cases} \max(0, a - k)t & t < x \\ \max(0, a - k)x + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} W_{a+1}(t - x) + (\min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta)W_{a-1}(t - x)}{\lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + \min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta} & t \geq x. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

This is because at any point in time when the system is in state  $a$ , there are  $\max(0, a - k)$  callers waiting in the queue, hence for an interval of  $t$  time units, the total waiting time is equal to  $\max(0, a - k)t$ . The transitions are exactly the same as in Subsection 2.1. Proceeding in the same manner as above, we see that the Laplace transforms  $\tilde{W}_a(s)$  satisfy the set of equations

$$\tilde{W}_a(s) = \frac{\lambda \tilde{W}_{a+1}(s) \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + (\min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta)\tilde{W}_{a-1}(s) + \frac{\max(0, a - k)}{s}}{\lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + \min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta + s}. \quad (13)$$

If the blocking cost  $\beta = 0$ , we observe that  $\tilde{W}_a(s)$  satisfies the same equations as  $\tilde{A}_a(s)$  except for the last term in the numerator, from which we can conclude that the expected number of call abandonments and expected total waiting time are proportional to each other. This is not surprising. While customers are waiting, they each have their own ‘Poisson abandonment process’ going, which has rate  $\theta$  and is independent of what other customers are doing. Hence the expected total waiting time should indeed be proportional to the expected number of abandonments.



## 2.4 Expected number of services

The difference between the expected cost of abandonments and losses and the expected number of services is that instead of counting abandonments and losses, we count services. Let  $S_a(t)$  be the expected number of services during the time interval  $(0, t)$  given that the system is in state  $a$  at time 0. The state space and the generator matrix remain the same as Subsection 2.1. Hence, one can find the expected number of services by just changing the last term in the numerator in Eq. (9). When the system is in state  $a$ , the number of customers being served is  $\min(a, k)$ . Hence, the expression for the Laplace transform of the expected number of services,  $\tilde{S}_a(s)$  is given by

$$\tilde{S}_a(s) = \frac{\lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} \tilde{S}_{a+1}(s) + (\min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta) \tilde{S}_{a-1}(s) + \frac{\min(a, k)\mu}{s}}{s + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{a < \ell} + \min(a, k)\mu + \max(0, a - k)\theta}. \quad (14)$$

## 2.5 Expected waiting time of the $i^{\text{th}}$ customer

Let  $R_a$  be the expected waiting time of a tagged customer with  $a$  other customers in front of them and  $R_{a|z}$  be the same quantity given that  $z$  is the first time that the system leaves state  $a$ . Here, state refers to the number of customers in front of our tagged customer, hence, we are only concerned with services and abandonments of customers in front. Then,

$$R_{a|z} = \begin{cases} 0 & a < k \\ z + \frac{(k\mu + (a - k)\theta)R_{a-1}}{k\mu + (a + 1 - k)\theta} & a \geq k. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

We can integrate Eq. (15) with respect to  $z$ . This gives us  $R_a = 0$  for  $a < k$  and for  $a \geq k$ ,

$$R_a = \frac{1 + (k\mu + (a - k)\theta)R_{a-1}}{k\mu + (a + 1 - k)\theta}. \quad (16)$$

We can solve the recursion in Eq. (16) to obtain the expression

$$R_a = \frac{a + 1 - k}{k\mu + (a + 1 - k)\theta} \mathbb{1}_{a \geq k}. \quad (17)$$

# 3 Four levels

In this section we will formulate and analyse a modification of the above model for four levels of calls.

## 3.1 Policy and parameters

We will characterise the reservation policy through a reservation vector  $\mathbf{n} = (n_2, n_3, n_4)$  where  $n_i$  denotes the number of level  $i$  agents reserved to answer level  $i$  calls only.

The objective is to find the value of  $\mathbf{n}$  that minimises the expected number of call abandonments.

For  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , let  $\lambda_i$ ,  $\theta_i$ , and  $\gamma_i$  be the arrival rate, abandonment rate, and abandonment cost of level  $i$  callers, respectively. Let  $k_i$  be the total number of level  $i$  agents,  $\mu_i$  be the service rate when level  $i$  callers are served by level  $i$  agents, and for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , let  $\mu'_i$  be the service rate when level  $i$  callers are served by level  $i + 1$  agents. Let  $\ell$  be the total capacity of the system shared by all callers regardless of their level and  $\beta$  be the blocking cost.

Because the number of reserved agents has to be less than the total number of agents at that level, we have for  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ ,  $n_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k_i\}$ .

### 3.2 State space

We denote the state of the system by  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ , where  $a, b, c$  and  $d$  are the number of level 1, 2, 3 and 4 callers in the system, and  $a_1, b_1$  and  $c_1$  are the number of level 1, 2 and 3 callers in the system being served by level 2, 3 and 4 agents, respectively.

When the system is in state  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$  there are  $a$  level 1 callers,  $a_1$  of which are being served by level 2 agents. Hence,  $\min(a - a_1, k_1)$  level 1 callers are being served by level 1 agents, and  $\max(0, a - (a_1 + k_1))$  level 1 callers are waiting in the queue. It is possible that some of the level 1 agents are free while level 2 agents are serving level 1 callers if level 1 agents became free after the calls were already assigned to level 2 agents. Now, if  $a_1$  level 2 agents are serving level 1 callers and  $b_1$  level 2 callers are being served by level 3 agents, then that  $\min(b - b_1, k_2 - a_1)$  level 2 callers are being served by level 2 agents, and  $\max(0, b - (b_1 + k_2 - a_1))$  are waiting in the queue. Similarly, we can calculate how many level 3 and level 4 callers are waiting and how many are being served by each level of agent.

Here,  $a, b, c, d \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$  and  $a + b + c + d \leq \ell$ . The maximum value  $a_1$  can take is  $\min(k_2 - n_2, a)$  because by the definition of  $a_1$ , it cannot be more than the total number of level 1 callers and has to be less than or equal to the total number of level 2 agents. The minimum value of  $a_1$  is zero in all cases except for when  $a > k_1$  and  $b < k_2 - n_2$  (that is, the number of level 1 callers are more than the number of level 1 agents and there are more than  $n_2$  level 2 agents available). Hence,

$$\min(a - k_1, k_2 - b - n_2) \leq a_1 \leq \min(k_2 - n_2, a). \quad (18)$$

Similarly,

$$\min(b - k_2, k_3 - c - n_3) \mathbb{1}_{b > k_2, c < k_3 - n_3} \leq b_1 \leq \min(k_3 - n_3, b) \quad (19)$$

and

$$\min(c - k_3, k_4 - d - n_4) \mathbb{1}_{c > k_3, d < k_4 - n_4} \leq c_1 \leq \min(k_4 - n_4, c). \quad (20)$$

Hence, the state space is given by  $\Omega = \{(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)\}$  such that

- $a, b, c, d \in \{0, 1, \dots, l\}$ ,

- $a + b + c + d \leq \ell$ ,
- $\min(a - k_1, k_2 - b - n_2) \mathbb{1}_{a > k_1, b < k_2 - n_2} \leq a_1 \leq \min(k_2 - n_2, a)$ ,
- $\min(b - k_2, k_3 - c - n_3) \mathbb{1}_{b > k_2, c < k_3 - n_3} \leq b_1 \leq \min(k_3 - n_3, b)$  and
- $\min(c - k_3, k_4 - d - n_4) \mathbb{1}_{c > k_3, d < k_4 - n_4} \leq c_1 \leq \min(k_4 - n_4, c)$ .

Now, for a given state  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d) \in \Omega$  at time 0 and reservation vector  $\mathbf{n}$ , we define  $A_{a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d}(\mathbf{n}, t), t \geq 0$  as the expected cost of abandonments and losses during the time interval  $(0, t)$ .

### 3.3 Transition rates

For transitions between the states, we can either have an arrival or a service or an abandonment at each level. We will now discuss all the possible transitions from the state  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .

- If a level 1 caller arrives, it leads to three possibilities.
  - The first possibility is that they are allocated to a level 1 agent if at least one of them is available leading to the state  $(a+1, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .
  - The second possibility is that they are allocated to a level 2 agent (if no level 1 agent is available, no level 2 call is in waiting and there are more than  $n_2$  level 2 agents available) leading to the state  $(a+1, a_1+1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .
  - The third possibility is that they join the queue if neither of the first two conditions are satisfied leading to the state  $(a+1, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .

Hence, there is a transition to the state  $(a+1, a_1 + \mathbb{1}(a - a_1 \geq k_1, b - b_1 < k_2 - n_2 - a_1), b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$  with rate  $\lambda_1$  if  $a + b + c + d < \ell$ , otherwise the caller is blocked, costing  $\beta$ .

- Similarly, a transition to the state  $(a, a_1, b+1, b_1 + \mathbb{1}(b - b_1 \geq k_2, c - c_1 < k_3 - n_3 - b_1), c, c_1, d)$  happens with rate  $\lambda_2$  and a transition to the state  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c+1, c_1 + \mathbb{1}(c - c_1 \geq k_3, d < k_4 - n_4 - c_1), d)$  happens with the rate  $\lambda_3$  if  $a + b + c + d < \ell$ .
- When a level 4 caller arrives, there is only one possibility, that is a transition to the state  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d+1)$  with rate  $\lambda_4$  if  $a + b + c + d < \ell$ .
- A service of level 1 caller by a level 1 agent happens with rate  $\min(k_1, a - a_1)\mu_1$  leading to the state  $(a - 1, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .
- If there is a service of level 1 caller by a level 2 agent, it leads to two possibilities.
  - The first is that after they are served, that agent becomes free or starts serving a level 2 caller if there are any in waiting leading to the state  $(a - 1, a_1 - 1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .

- The second is that after they are served, the agent starts serving another level 1 caller leading to the state  $(a-1, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$ .

Hence, there is transition to the state  $(a-1, a_1 - (1 - \mathbb{1}(a - a_1 > k_1), b - b_1 = k_2 - n_2 - a_1), b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$  with rate  $a_1\mu'_1$ .

- Similarly, when there is a service of a level 2 caller by a level 2 agent, that agent can either serve another level 2 caller or depending on the conditions, serve a level 1 caller or stay available. Hence, we transition to the state  $(a, a_1 + \mathbb{1}(a - a_1 > k_1), b - b_1 = k_2 - n_2 - a_1), b - 1, b_1, c, c_1, d)$  with rate  $\min(b - b_1, k_2 - a_1)\mu_2$ .
- Similarly, we transition to
  - $(a, a_1, b - 1, b_1 - (1 - \mathbb{1}(b - b_1 > k_2 - a_1), c = k_3 - n_3 - b_1), c, c_1, d)$  with rate  $b_1\mu'_2$  when there is a service of level 2 caller by a level 3 agent,
  - $(a, a_1, b, b_1 + \mathbb{1}(b - b_1 > k_2), c - c_1 = k_3 - n_3 - b_1), c - 1, c_1, d)$  with rate  $\min(c - c_1, k_3 - b_1)\mu_3$  when there is a service of a level 3 caller by a level 3 agent,
  - $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c - 1, c_1 - (1 - \mathbb{1}(c - c_1 > k_3 - b_1), d = k_4 - n_4 - c_1), d)$  with rate  $c_1\mu'_3$  when a level 3 caller is served by a level 4 agent and
  - $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1 + \mathbb{1}(c - c_1 > k_3 - b_1), d = k_4 - n_4 - c_1), d - 1)$  with rate  $\min(d, k_4 - c_1)\mu_4$  when there is a service of level 4 caller.
- The transitions in case of abandonments are straightforward. There is a transition to
  - $(a-1, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d)$  when a level 1 caller abandons with rate  $\max(0, a - (k_1 + a_1))\theta_1$  costing  $\gamma_1$ ,
  - $(a, a_1, b-1, b_1, c, c_1, d)$  when a level 2 caller abandons with rate  $\max(0, b - (k_2 - a_1 + b_1))\theta_2$  costing  $\gamma_2$ ,
  - $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c-1, c_1, d)$  when a level 3 caller abandons with rate  $\max(0, c - (k_3 - b_1 + c_1))\theta_3$  costing  $\gamma_3$  and
  - $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d-1)$  when a level 4 caller abandons with rate  $\max(0, d - (k_4 - c_1))\theta_4$  costing  $\gamma_4$ .

### 3.4 Laplace Transform

As we did in Subsection 2.1 for the single caller case, we can write a set of equations for  $A_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, t)$  and then take Laplace transforms to express them as linear equations. The expression is given in Appendix A.

Again, we can solve these equations numerically and then invert them using the Euler method.

Similarly, we can extend Subsections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 to four levels of calls.

Now, we will discuss how the method can be used to find the optimal value of the reservation parameter.

## 4 Numerical results

In this section, we will look at some examples on how to decide the best allocation policy.

### 4.1 Example 1

For the first example, the parameter values are given in Table 1 along with  $\beta = 0$ ,  $\ell = 10$  and the initial state is  $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ .

Table 1: Parameter values for Example 1.

$i$	1	2	3	4
$\lambda_i$	1	1/2	1/5	1/8
$\mu_i$	2/3	1/2	1/4	1/6
$\mu'_i$	2/3	1/2	1/4	-
$\theta_i$	2	1	1	1
$k_i$	3	2	2	2
$\gamma_i$	1	1	1	1

Table 2: Expected proportion of abandonments in the first 60 minutes for the parameter values given in Table 1.

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
0	0	0	3.22
0	0	1	3.68
0	0	2	4.39
0	1	0	4.77
0	1	1	5.13
0	1	2	5.67
0	2	0	6.6
0	2	1	6.91
0	2	2	7.4
1	0	0	4.9
1	0	1	5.35
1	0	2	6.02
1	1	0	6.22
1	1	1	6.57

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
1	1	2	7.1
1	2	0	7.77
1	2	1	8.09
1	2	2	8.58
2	0	0	6.51
2	0	1	6.95
2	0	2	7.61
2	1	0	7.72
2	1	1	8.07
2	1	2	8.6
2	2	0	9.17
2	2	1	9.48
2	2	2	9.97

Assuming that the unit of time is one minute, the values in Table 1 imply that calls are arriving one per minute, one per two minutes, one per five minutes and one per eight minutes for level 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively, capturing the fact that more complex calls are rarer. The service rate for the four levels of calls is such that the expected service time increases with the increase in the level and is indifferent to whether the call is being served by the same level agent or by one higher level agent. Similarly, the abandonment rate for level 1 calls is two per minute and for all other levels is one per minute. The number of agents available at each level is 3, 2, 2 and 2, respectively. The cost of abandonment is equal

for all four levels of calls and we are not counting the blocked customers (the expected number of callers blocked in this example is less than 0.3% showing that  $\ell = 10$  is reasonable). We will calculate the expected number of call abandonments between  $t = 0$  and  $t = 60$  minutes. Table 2 gives the expected proportion of abandonments for all possible values of  $\mathbf{n}$ . As can be seen from the table, the optimal value of  $\mathbf{n}$  is  $(0, 0, 0)$ , that is, not to use reservation of agents at all and allocate lower level calls to higher level agents as they are available. In this example, for the best value of the reservation vector, the expected proportion of abandonments is 3.22% and in the worst case scenario of complete reservation, the expected proportion of abandonments is 9.97%.

## 4.2 Example 2

In this example, we look at the scenario in which type 4 calls are much more important than other calls, so if a type 4 caller abandons the queue it is four times more expensive than any other type of caller abandoning it.

The parameter values are given in Table 3 along with  $\beta = 0$  and  $\ell = 10$ . Table 4 gives the expected proportion of abandonments between  $t = 0$  and  $t = 60$  minutes for all possible values of  $\mathbf{n}$ .

Table 3: Parameter values for Example 2.

$i$	1	2	3	4
$\lambda_i$	1	1/2	1/4	1/4
$\mu_i$	2/3	1/2	1/4	1/2
$\mu'_i$	2/3	1/2	1/4	-
$\theta_i$	2	1	1	1
$k_i$	3	2	2	2
$\gamma_i$	1	1	1	4

Table 4: Expected proportion of abandonments in the first 60 minutes for the parameter values given in Table 3.

$n_2$	$n_3$	$n_4$	% abandoned
0	0	0	6.48
0	0	1	5.94
0	0	2	6.49
0	1	0	7.61
0	1	1	7.19
0	1	2	7.64
0	2	0	8.98
0	2	1	8.57
0	2	2	8.98
1	0	0	7.94
1	0	1	7.42
1	0	2	7.94
1	1	0	8.89
1	1	1	8.46

$n_2$	$n_3$	$n_4$	% abandoned
1	1	2	8.91
1	2	0	10.06
1	2	1	9.65
1	2	2	10.05
2	0	0	9.38
2	0	1	8.86
2	0	2	9.38
2	1	0	10.25
2	1	1	9.83
2	1	2	10.27
2	2	0	11.33
2	2	1	10.92
2	2	2	11.33

The expected proportion of abandonments, in this case, ranges from 5.94% to 11.33% and the best reservation policy is  $\mathbf{n} = (0, 0, 1)$ , that is, out of two level 4 agents, we should reserve one for just level 4 callers and all other agents should be flexible.

### 4.3 Example 3

Now we look at an outlier example. The parameter values are given in Table 5 along with  $\beta = 0$ , and  $\ell = 10$ . Table 6 gives the expected proportion of abandonments between  $t = 0$  and  $t = 60$  minutes for all possible values of  $\mathbf{n}$ .

Table 5: Parameter values for Example 3.

$i$	1	2	3	4
$\lambda_i$	1/4	1/4	1/3	1/8
$\mu_i$	1	1/4	1/2	1/6
$\mu'_i$	1	1/8	1/2	-
$\theta_i$	1	1	2	1
$k_i$	2	2	2	2
$\gamma_i$	1	1	10	1

Table 6: Expected proportion of abandonments in the first 60 minutes for the parameter values given in Table 5.

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
0	0	0	14.34
0	0	1	34.48
0	0	2	57.57
0	1	0	11.59
0	1	1	25.93
0	1	2	43.14
0	2	0	10.9
0	2	1	21.42
0	2	2	34.45
1	0	0	14.38
1	0	1	34.46
1	0	2	57.49
1	1	0	11.66
1	1	1	25.97

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
1	1	2	43.15
1	2	0	10.97
1	2	1	21.49
1	2	2	34.52
2	0	0	14.47
2	0	1	34.54
2	0	2	57.55
2	1	0	11.75
2	1	1	26.05
2	1	2	43.23
2	2	0	11.07
2	2	1	21.58
2	2	2	34.61

The expected proportion of abandonments, in this case, is a lot more sensitive to the value of  $\mathbf{n}$ . The minimum expected proportion of abandonments is 10.9% for  $\mathbf{n} = (0, 2, 0)$  and the maximum expected proportion of abandonments is 57.57% for  $\mathbf{n} = (0, 0, 2)$ .

## 5 Limitations

This method works well for policies that do not require tracking of the arrival times of individual customers. For example, if we want to analyse a policy in which we first try to assign a caller to an agent at its own level, and if they are not available, then we transfer it to an agent at a higher level after waiting for say 15 seconds, this kind of policy would require a separate state variable for the arrival time of every customer. This will lead to the problem of state explosion. For such policies, we can use simulations and compare their performance with the reservation policy.

For the type of reservation policy we considered, the case with four levels of call required seven variables. This was computationally tractable only for relatively small values of the total system capacity  $\ell$ . With efficient state space ordering and the use of a supercomputer, we have demonstrated that it works for  $\ell = 15$  and we expect that with some additional time, if needed, the value of  $\ell$  can be taken up to 20. However, higher values might lead to memory issues.

For a small call centre with a low arrival rate, the proportion of callers blocked with  $\ell = 10$  is very low (less than 0.3% for the parameter values listed in Table 1), hence the method is usable. For cases with less than four levels of calls (or policies with less than seven state space variables), this method can be used for larger call centres.

We believe that the method can be extended to five levels of calls, but since with each level of call, we need to add two variables and state space grows exponentially with each variable, it would be hard to extend the method any more than that.

In the next section, we use simulation to check the results in Section 4. We also compare the performance of our suggested reservation policy with some other policies that are not so analytically tractable.

## 6 Simulations

Now, we verify our results above using simulations. We perform 2000 simulations for the three sets of parameter values in Section 4. The results are shown in Tables 7, 8 and 9.

As can be observed, the simulated values are very close to the values calculated using our analytical method, hence verifying the results.

Now, we analyse some policies using simulations that we were unable to analyse using the Laplace transform method.

The first policy, policy A follows an FCFS order across all levels of calls without any reservation. So, if a level  $i$  agent becomes free, it will look at the queue and take the earliest arriving eligible customer, which could be either a level  $i$  or a level  $i - 1$  customer. A level  $i - 1$  call is assigned to a level  $i$  agent only if there is no level  $i - 1$  agent available.

The second policy, policy B is similar to the first one, but instead of assigning a call to the higher level agent immediately (in the case when no same level agent



Table 7: Average proportion of abandonments in the first 60 minutes calculated using simulations for the parameter values given in Table 1.

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
0	0	0	3.21
0	0	1	3.67
0	0	2	4.35
0	1	0	4.74
0	1	1	5.22
0	1	2	5.67
0	2	0	6.58
0	2	1	6.87
0	2	2	7.53
1	0	0	4.9
1	0	1	5.37
1	0	2	6.02
1	1	0	6.23
1	1	1	6.57

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
1	1	2	7.17
1	2	0	7.82
1	2	1	8.01
1	2	2	8.59
2	0	0	6.43
2	0	1	6.93
2	0	2	7.69
2	1	0	7.74
2	1	1	8.23
2	1	2	8.61
2	2	0	9.12
2	2	1	9.52
2	2	2	10.0

Table 8: Average proportion of abandonments in the first 60 minutes calculated using simulations for the parameter values given in Table 3.

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
0	0	0	6.47
0	0	1	6.01
0	0	2	6.47
0	1	0	7.68
0	1	1	7.23
0	1	2	7.7
0	2	0	8.99
0	2	1	8.51
0	2	2	8.93
1	0	0	7.95
1	0	1	7.43
1	0	2	8.0
1	1	0	8.89
1	1	1	8.55

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
1	1	2	8.79
1	2	0	9.96
1	2	1	9.7
1	2	2	10.07
2	0	0	9.27
2	0	1	8.82
2	0	2	9.27
2	1	0	10.29
2	1	1	9.78
2	1	2	10.21
2	2	0	11.3
2	2	1	10.92
2	2	2	11.29

is available), we wait for  $y$  time units and if no same level agent becomes free in that time period, we assign it to a higher level agent.

We ran simulations with 50,000 repetitions for both policies and calculated the average number of call abandonments for the same initial state and time period as Section 4.

## 6.1 Comparison

For policy A, with the parameter values listed in Table 1, the average number of abandonments was 3.37% which is only slightly more than the minimum we have from the reservation policy. For the parameter values listed in Table 3, the average number of abandonments was 6.7% which is 0.8% more than the

Table 9: Average proportion of abandonments in the first 60 minutes calculated using simulations for the parameter values given in Table 5.

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
0	0	0	14.13
0	0	1	34.65
0	0	2	57.72
0	1	0	11.64
0	1	1	25.72
0	1	2	43.95
0	2	0	10.64
0	2	1	21.2
0	2	2	33.83
1	0	0	14.28
1	0	1	34.4
1	0	2	57.07
1	1	0	11.64
1	1	1	26.67

n_2	n_3	n_4	% abandoned
1	1	2	42.95
1	2	0	10.76
1	2	1	21.14
1	2	2	34.58
2	0	0	14.98
2	0	1	34.57
2	0	2	57.08
2	1	0	11.63
2	1	1	25.82
2	1	2	42.66
2	2	0	10.94
2	2	1	21.53
2	2	2	34.96

minimum from the reservation policy. Depending on the monthly abandonment target of a call centre, a difference of 0.8% may be considered significant. For parameter values listed in Table 5, the average number of abandonments was 14.45%, a difference of 3.5% compared to the optimal reservation policy. In all three cases, this policy performs slightly worse than the reservation policy with  $\mathbf{n} = (0, 0, 0)$ .

For policy B, there is an extra parameter,  $y$ . When  $y = 0$ , there is no difference between these two policies. For the three examples, we calculated the average number of abandonments with  $y$  ranging from  $1/60$  to  $10/60$  minutes. For all three examples, the average number of abandonments increases with the increase in the value of  $y$ . For Example 4.1, when we wait for 1 second ( $y = 1/60$ ), there is 3.61% call abandonments on average and when we wait for 10 seconds, there is 5.43% call abandonments on average. For Examples 4.2 and 4.3 as well, the minimum is achieved for  $y = 1/60$  with 6.94% and 15.96% average call abandonments, respectively; and the maximum is for  $y = 10/60$  with 8.23% and 26.59% average call abandonments, respectively. Our results show that waiting for some time before assigning the call to the next agent is not optimal.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have calculated some important transient performance measures for small call centres. We developed a general method that can be used to calculate many desirable quantities for various queueing models such as the expected number of call abandonments and expected total waiting time of the customers. In a forthcoming paper, we will describe how a modification of this method can be used to find the waiting time distribution.

From the analysis above, we discovered that out of all three policies, the

reservation policy with the optimal reservation vector minimises the expected number of call abandonments.

We also observed that having an FCFS policy within a level of calls can be more beneficial than having an FCFS policy across all levels and that waiting for some time before assigning calls to the next level agent may not be a good policy in most cases.

There are many examples where the policy of zero reservation is not optimal and for those cases, the method above can be employed to find the optimal reservation vector.

**Acknowledgements.** This research was partially funded by the Australian Government through the Australian Research Council Industrial Transformation Training Centre in Optimisation Technologies, Integrated Methodologies, and Applications (OPTIMA), Project ID IC200100009.

This research was partially funded by Probe CX.

We are very thankful to Dr Mark Fackrell for his continued support.

This research was supported by The University of Melbourne's Research Computing Services and the Petascale Campus Initiative.

**Competing interests declaration.** The authors declare none.

## References

1. Abate, J. and Whitt, W. (1995). Numerical inversion of Laplace transforms of probability distributions. In: *ORSA Journal on Computing* 7.1, pp. 36–43.
2. Adetunji, A. et al. (2007). Performance comparison of call routing algorithms over virtual call centres. In: *2007 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications*. IEEE, pp. 1–5.
3. Akhtar, S. and Latif, M. (2010). Exploiting simulation for call centre optimization. In: *Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering*. Vol. 3, pp. 2963–2970.
4. Ali, A. R. (2011). Intelligent call routing: Optimizing contact center throughput. In: *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Workshop on Multimedia Data Mining*, pp. 1–9.
5. Bhulai, S. (2009). Dynamic routing policies for multiskill call centers. In: *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* 23.1, pp. 101–119.
6. Borovkov, K. (2014). *Elements of stochastic modelling*. World Scientific Publishing Company.
7. Brown, L. et al. (2005). Statistical analysis of a telephone call center: A queueing-science perspective. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100.469, pp. 36–50.
8. Chiera, B. and Taylor, P. (2002). What is a unit of capacity worth? In: *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* 16.4, pp. 513–522.
9. Gans, N., Koole, G., and Mandelbaum, A. (2003). Telephone call centers: Tutorial, review, and research prospects. In: *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 5.2, pp. 79–141.
10. Gans, N. and Zhou, Y.-P. (2007). Call-routing schemes for call-center outsourcing. In: *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 9.1, pp. 33–50.
11. Gurvich, I., Armony, M., and Mandelbaum, A. (2008). Service-level differentiation in call centers with fully flexible servers. In: *Management Science* 54.2, pp. 279–294.
12. Ilk, N., Shang, G., and Goes, P. (2020). Improving customer routing in contact centers: An automated triage design based on text analytics. In: *Journal of Operations Management* 66.5, pp. 553–577.

13. Jorge, S., Pereira, C., and Novais, P. (2020). Intelligent call routing for telecommunications call-centers. In: *Intelligent Data Engineering and Automated Learning–IDEAL 2020: 21st International Conference, Guimaraes, Portugal, November 4–6, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 21*. Springer, pp. 316–328.
14. Legros, B., Jouini, O., and Koole, G. (2016). Optimal scheduling in call centers with a callback option. In: *Performance Evaluation* 95, pp. 1–40.
15. Mandelbaum, A., Sakov, A., and Zeltyn, S. (2000). Empirical analysis of a call center. In: URL <http://iew3.technion.ac.il/serveng/References/ccdata.pdf>. *Technical Report* 60.
16. Mehrbod, N., Grilo, A., and Zutshi, A. (2018). Caller-agent pairing in call centers using machine learning techniques with imbalanced data. In: *2018 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC)*. IEEE, pp. 1–6.
17. Mehrotra, V. et al. (2012). Routing to manage resolution and waiting time in call centers with heterogeneous servers. In: *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 14.1, pp. 66–81.
18. Mughele, E. S. and Susan, K. (2020). Exploring mathematical models to improve routing protocol for call centre. In: *International Journal of Computer Applications* 975, p. 8887.
19. Rusilko, T. V. (2021). Network stochastic call centre model. In: *CEUR Workshop Proceedings: Selected Papers of the 6th International Scientific and Practical Conference Distance learning technologies*. Vol. 3057, pp. 91–101.
20. Stollez, R. and Helber, S. (2004). Performance analysis of an inbound call center with skills-based routing: A priority queueing system with two classes of impatient customers and heterogeneous agents. In: *OR Spectrum* 26, pp. 331–352.
21. Takakuwa, S. and Okada, T. (2005). Simulation analysis of inbound call center of a city-gas company. In: *Proceedings of the Winter Simulation Conference, 2005*. IEEE.
22. Wallace, R. B. and Whitt, W. (2005). A staffing algorithm for call centers with skill-based routing. In: *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 7.4, pp. 276–294.
23. Wang, J. and Srinivasan, R. (2008). Staffing a call center with interactive voice response units and impatient calls. In: *2008 IEEE International Conference on Service Operations and Logistics, and Informatics*. Vol. 1. IEEE, pp. 514–519.

## Appendix A Laplace transform of the expected number of call abandonments

The Laplace transform of the expected number of call abandonments in the case four levels of calls,  $\tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s)$  satisfies

$$\tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) = \frac{\xi_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s)}{\psi_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(s)} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) = & (\lambda_1 \tilde{A}_{a+1,a_1+\mathbb{1}(a-a_1 \geq k_1, b-b_1 < k_2-n_2-a_1),b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \lambda_2 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b+1,b_1+\mathbb{1}(b-b_1 \geq k_2, c < k_3-n_3-b_1),c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \lambda_3 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c+1,c_1+\mathbb{1}(c-c_1 \geq k_3, d < k_4-n_4-c_1),d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \lambda_4 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d+1}(\mathbf{n}, s)) \mathbb{1}_{a+b+c+d < \ell} + \min(k_1, a - a_1) \mu_1 \tilde{A}_{a-1,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + a_1 \mu'_1 \tilde{A}_{a-1,a_1-(1-\mathbb{1}(a-a_1 > k_1, b-b_1 = k_2-n_2-a_1)),b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \min(b - b_1, k_2 - a_1) \mu_2 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1+\mathbb{1}(a-a_1 > k_1, b-b_1 = k_2-n_2-a_1),b-1,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + b_1 \mu'_2 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b-1,b_1-(1-\mathbb{1}(b-b_1 > k_2-a_1, c = k_3-n_3-b_1)),c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \min(c - c_1, k_3 - b_1) \mu_3 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1+\mathbb{1}(b-b_1 > k_2, c-c_1 = k_3-n_3-b_1),c-1,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + c_1 \mu'_3 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c-1,c_1-(1-\mathbb{1}(c-c_1 > k_3-b_1, d = k_4-n_4-c_1)),d}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \min(d, k_4 - c_1) \mu_4 \tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1+\mathbb{1}(c-c_1 > k_3-b_1, d = k_4-n_4-c_1),d-1}(\mathbf{n}, s) \\ & + \max(0, a - (k_1 + a_1)) \theta_1(\tilde{A}_{a-1,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) + \gamma_1/s) \\ & + \max(0, b - (k_2 - a_1 + b_1)) \theta_2(\tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b-1,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) + \gamma_2/s) \\ & + \max(0, c - (k_3 - b_1 + c_1)) \theta_3(\tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c-1,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) + \gamma_3/s) \\ & + \max(0, d - (k_4 - c_1)) \theta_4(\tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d-1}(\mathbf{n}, s) + \gamma_4/s) \\ & + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \beta \mathbb{1}_{a+b+c+d=\ell}/s, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(s) = & (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \mathbb{1}_{a+b+c+d < \ell} + \min(k_1, a - a_1) \mu_1 + a_1 \mu'_1 + \min(b - b_1, k_2 - a_1) \mu_2 \\ & + b_1 \mu'_2 + \min(c - c_1, k_3 - b_1) \mu_3 + c_1 \mu'_3 + \min(d, k_4 - c_1) \mu_4 + \max(0, a - (k_1 + a_1)) \theta_1 \\ & + \max(0, b - (k_2 - a_1 + b_1)) \theta_2 + \max(0, c - (k_3 - b_1 + c_1)) \theta_3 \\ & + \max(0, d - (k_4 - c_1)) \theta_4 + s. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and  $\tilde{A}_{a,a_1,b,b_1,c,c_1,d}(\mathbf{n}, s) = 0$  for  $(a, a_1, b, b_1, c, c_1, d) \notin \Omega$ .