PART 7

PLATFORM AND MARKETPLAC PRICING

Take Rates, Multi-Sided Economics, and Ecosystem Architecture

Platform revenue architecture across eight mechanisms, take rate determinants by marketplace type with seller economics ceiling analysis, tiered take rate design with platform revenue simulation, listing vs. transaction vs. subscription fee behavioral design, dynamic pricing revenue impact formula (4.5x static peak), ethical governance of dynamic pricing algorithms, API pricing tiers from free to enterprise with free tier economics showing 337x LTV:CAC, multi-sided ecosystem pricing optimization, platform ignition pricing as CAC, and the complete platform pricing metrics framework.

SECTION 1
THE UNIQUE ECONOMICS OF PLATFORM PRICING

Platform and Marketplace Pricing: Multi-Sided Economics

Platform and marketplace pricing is the most strategically complex pricing domain in this series because the platform simultaneously serves multiple distinct groups of participants — buyers and sellers, developers and users, content creators and audiences — whose interests are interdependent in ways that single-sided businesses do not face. A price increase on sellers reduces the supply of products available to buyers, potentially reducing buyer demand and seller volume, ultimately undermining the revenue increase the price increase was intended to generate. A price increase on buyers reduces purchase frequency, reducing revenue opportunity for sellers, potentially causing sellers to exit, further reducing buyer value, and collapsing the marketplace.

This interdependency — the two-sided network effect where the value of the platform to each side depends on the participation of the other side — is the defining financial characteristic of platform pricing. It means that pricing decisions must be modeled in the context of the entire ecosystem, not just the revenue impact on the specific side being priced. It means that the economically optimal price on one side of the platform may actually be negative — subsidizing one side to attract sufficient participation that the other side generates more than enough revenue to cover the subsidy.

This part covers the complete financial architecture of platform pricing: take rate architecture and the economic factors that determine the sustainable take rate, tiered take rates by volume and seller tier, listing fees vs. transaction fees vs. subscription fees and their behavioral economics, dynamic pricing on platforms, freemium vs. premium for marketplace sides, API pricing tiers and developer economics, data pricing as a separate revenue stream, and ecosystem pricing for multi-sided models with interdependent value propositions.

1.1 The Platform Revenue Architecture

Revenue Mechanism	Structure	Platform Type	Behavioral Effect
Transaction Take Rate	% of each transaction facilitated	B2C and B2B marketplaces	Seller bears cost as CoGS; buyer often unaware
Listing / Insertion Fee	Fixed fee per item listed	High-volume product marketplaces	Reduces low-quality listings; quality signal
Subscription (Seller)	Monthly fee for access to buyer audience	SaaS-enabled marketplace, B2B platforms	Seller committed; improves seller quality
Subscription (Buyer)	Monthly fee for access to seller inventory or features	Premium marketplaces; curated platforms	Buyer committed; reveals serious intent
Advertising (Sponsored)	Sellers pay for placement above organic results	eCommerce, gig economy, travel platforms	Creates ads revenue stream; subsidizes take rate
Payment Spread	Platform captures FX or payment processing spread	Global marketplaces, travel, remittance platforms	High-margin; embedded in transaction
Data Products	Analytics, insights sold to platform participants	Any data-rich marketplace	High margin; independent of transaction volume
SaaS Tools	CRM, inventory, analytics tools for platform sellers	Vertically integrated platforms (Shopify, Toast)	Deepens lock-in; improves seller retention

SECTION 2
TAKE RATE ARCHITECTURE AND OPTIMIZATION

Take Rate: The Core Pricing Decision of Every Marketplace

The take rate — the percentage of each transaction's value that the marketplace retains as revenue — is the most consequential pricing decision for a marketplace operator. Set too high, it makes selling on the

platform uneconomic for sellers (who will exit or route transactions off-platform), destroying the supply side that buyers depend on. Set too low, it fails to generate the revenue needed to fund the platform's operations, safety features, and growth investment, creating a business that is beloved by users but unprofitable for investors.

2.1 Determinants of the Sustainable Take Rate

The sustainable take rate is not a fixed number — it varies by category, by market maturity, by competitive intensity, and by the value the platform provides to each side beyond simple transaction matching. The platform that provides high-incremental-value services — payment processing, trust and safety infrastructure, dispute resolution, marketing reach, logistics — can charge a higher take rate than one that provides minimal services. The platform in a category with many competitive alternatives will face price pressure toward a lower take rate.

Marketplace Type	Typical Take Rate	Key Take Rate Drivers	Ceiling Constraint
Consumer eCommerce (Amazon 3P)	8%–15% of item price	Category depth; advertising potential; logistics value	Seller economics; competitive alternatives (Walmart, Shopify)
Gig Economy / Services (Upwork, Fiverr)	15%–30% combined	Customer acquisition value; payment trust; dispute resolution	Freelancer economics; direct client relationships
Travel (OTA — Booking, Expedia)	12%–25% of booking value	Demand generation; cancellation management; trust	Property direct booking; Google Hotels competition
B2B Procurement / SaaS Marketplaces	2%–8% of transaction	Workflow integration; compliance; ERP connection	Procurement disintermediation; long-term supplier contracts
Financial Products (insurance, lending)	1%–5% of premium or loan value	Compliance; underwriting capacity; regulatory value	Carrier/lender economics; direct channel alternatives
App Store (Apple, Google)	15%–30% of in-app revenue	Distribution reach; payment infrastructure; OS integration	Developer community relations; regulatory scrutiny
Real Estate / High-Value Assets	1%–6% of transaction value	Matching quality; trust; regulatory compliance	Agent economics; principal-direct transactions

2.2 Take Rate Economics from the Seller's Perspective

SELLER ECONOMICS AT DIFFERENT TAKE RATES

```
Seller: Handmade goods; $85 retail price; $32 COGS; $18 fulfillment
  Gross profit before platform: $85 - $32 - $18 = $35 (41.2% margin)

Platform Option A: 8% take rate
  Platform fee: $85 x 8% = $6.80
  Seller net: $35 - $6.80 = $28.20 (33.2% effective margin)
  -> Seller economics remain viable; stays on platform

Platform Option B: 15% take rate
  Platform fee: $85 x 15% = $12.75
  Seller net: $35 - $12.75 = $22.25 (26.2% effective margin)
  -> Borderline; seller may list on lower-fee platforms too

Platform Option C: 25% take rate
  Platform fee: $85 x 25% = $21.25
  Seller net: $35 - $21.25 = $13.75 (16.2% effective margin)
  -> Seller considers DTC to capture $35 gross margin instead of $13.75
  -> Take rate approaching the point of seller exit

Rule of thumb: Take rate should not consume more than 35%–40%
  of the seller's gross profit from the transaction
```

CFO INSIGHT

The take rate ceiling is determined by the seller's best alternative, not by the platform's cost structure or margin aspirations. When Amazon raised its take rate on apparel sellers in 2022 and 2023, it triggered a wave of sellers moving to Shopify (where they pay a flat 0.6%–2% transaction fee plus payment processing) because the incremental value of Amazon's distribution no longer justified the incremental cost. The CFO who models take rate decisions using only the platform's financial model — revenue impact at X% take rate — is using an incomplete model. Build the seller economics model first: at X% take rate, what is the seller's net margin? Is it sufficient for the seller to continue using the platform? What is the seller's next-best alternative? The answer to those questions determines the sustainable take rate ceiling.

SECTION 3

TIERED TAKE RATES AND VOLUME INCENTIVES

Tiered Take Rates: Rewarding Volume and Alignment

Tiered take rate structures — where the platform's percentage of each transaction decreases as the seller's volume on the platform increases — are one of the most effective tools for retaining high-volume sellers and incentivizing seller exclusivity or commitment to the platform. They also allow the platform to extract higher take rates from small, occasional sellers (who receive limited platform investment and have limited negotiating leverage) while maintaining competitive rates for large, volume sellers (who could negotiate with the platform or exit to a competitor if the rate is not competitive).

3.1 Tiered Take Rate Design

TIERED TAKE RATE ARCHITECTURE

```
Tier 1: New / Small Sellers (< $10,000 GMV/month)
  Take Rate: 15%  |  Rationale: High onboarding cost; low negotiating leverage

Tier 2: Growing Sellers ($10,000–$50,000 GMV/month)
  Take Rate: 12%  |  Rationale: Established; some volume; worth incentivizing

Tier 3: Mid-Market Sellers ($50,000–$200,000 GMV/month)
  Take Rate: 10%  |  Rationale: Meaningful volume; platform depends on them

Tier 4: Large Sellers ($200,000–$1M GMV/month)
  Take Rate: 8%  |  Rationale: High retention value; competitive pressure

Tier 5: Enterprise / Strategic Sellers (>$1M GMV/month)
  Take Rate: 5%–7% (negotiated)  |  Rationale: Must retain; alternatives exist

Platform Revenue Simulation (1,000 sellers; $50M total monthly GMV):
  Tier 1: 600 sellers x $3M GMV x 15% = $450,000
  Tier 2: 250 sellers x $8M GMV x 12% = $960,000
  Tier 3: 100 sellers x $15M GMV x 10% = $1,500,000
  Tier 4: 40 sellers x $16M GMV x 8% = $1,280,000
  Tier 5: 10 sellers x $8M GMV x 6% = $480,000
  Total Revenue: $4,670,000  |  Blended Take Rate: 9.34%
```

SECTION 4
LISTING FEES, SUBSCRIPTION FEES, AND BEHAVIORAL DESIGN

Fee Structure Design: Shaping Marketplace Behavior Through Pricing

The choice between listing fees, transaction fees, and subscription fees is not merely a revenue design choice — it is a behavioral design choice. Each fee structure creates different incentives for platform participants, different signals about commitment and quality, and different risk distributions between the platform and its participants. The CFO must understand both the financial mechanics and the behavioral economics of each structure before designing the platform's pricing architecture.

4.1 Listing Fees: Reducing Inventory Noise

Listing fees — charged when a seller lists an item on the platform, regardless of whether it sells — serve a specific behavioral purpose: they create a financial barrier to listing, which discourages sellers from flooding the platform with low-quality, speculative, or duplicate listings. The listing fee does not need to be large to have this effect — even a small fee (eBay's insertion fee was historically $0.30–$3.00 per listing) creates enough friction to deter bulk listing of items with little genuine sale prospect. This improves the signal-to-noise ratio in the marketplace, making it easier for buyers to find high-quality items and improving the overall marketplace experience.

Fee Type	When Charged	Financial Risk to Seller	Behavioral Effect	CFO Consideration
Listing / Insertion Fee	At item listing (before sale)	Seller bears listing cost regardless of sale outcome	Reduces speculative listings; improves quality	Predictable revenue but may reduce supply depth
Transaction Take Rate	Only when sale occurs	Seller risks nothing until sale; all risk on outcomes	Maximizes supply; no deterrent to listing	Revenue only when platform succeeds for seller
Success Fee (no-cure/no-pay)	Only when defined outcome achieved	Seller has no cost unless outcome achieved	Maximum seller participation; zero upfront friction	Revenue very lumpy; working capital risk

Fee Type	When Charged	Financial Risk to Seller	Behavioral Effect	CFO Consideration
Monthly Subscription (Seller)	Fixed monthly regardless of activity	Seller bears cost in inactive months	Selects committed, serious sellers	Predictable recurring revenue; may deter casual sellers
Freemium + Premium Features	Free tier + paid tier for advanced features	Only pay for incremental value	Broad funnel acquisition; organic upgrade pressure	Volume at low/zero ARPU; upgrade rate is key metric

4.2 Buyer-Side Pricing

Most marketplace operators price sellers and keep buyers free — following the principle that the side with fewer alternatives or less price sensitivity should bear the cost, while the side most critical to the marketplace's network effects should be subsidized. In most consumer marketplaces, buyers are the subsidized side: they pay nothing to browse and buy, because maximum buyer participation creates the demand signal that attracts sellers and justifies their listing fees and take rates.

Premium buyer subscriptions — charging buyers a monthly fee for enhanced access, better selection, exclusive deals, or reduced transaction friction — work when the platform has built sufficient supply-side depth that buyers perceive clear incremental value from the premium tier. Amazon Prime ($139 per year in the US) is the canonical example: the free shipping benefit alone justifies the fee for most frequent buyers, and the Prime content bundle makes the economics even more compelling. The CFO designing a buyer subscription must ensure that the incremental value of the paid tier — measurable in shipping cost savings, exclusive inventory access, or convenience value — exceeds the subscription fee by enough that a significant fraction of buyers find the upgrade economically rational.

SECTION 5
DYNAMIC PRICING ON PLATFORMS

Dynamic Pricing on Platforms: Real-Time Revenue Optimization

Dynamic pricing — adjusting prices in real time based on supply and demand conditions, time of day, user characteristics, or competitive pricing — is one of the most powerful revenue optimization tools available to platform operators. Ride-sharing platforms (Uber, Lyft) use surge pricing to balance driver supply against

rider demand in real time. Airline and hotel booking platforms use yield management to adjust prices by seat/room availability and booking lead time. Online advertising platforms use real-time bidding to set prices at every individual impression. The financial impact of well-designed dynamic pricing systems is substantial — studies consistently show 5% to 25% revenue improvement relative to static pricing in applicable markets.

5.1 Dynamic Pricing Economics

DYNAMIC PRICING REVENUE IMPACT

```
Static Pricing Scenario: Ride-sharing market
  Steady-state demand: 200 rides/hour  |  Static price: $18/ride
  Driver supply at $18: 180 drivers/hour  |  Match rate: 90%
  Hourly revenue: 180 matched rides x $18 x take rate (25%) = $810

Peak Demand (event ending): 600 ride requests/hour
  Static price $18: only 180 drivers available  |  Match rate: 30%
  Unmet demand: 420 riders; no revenue from them; poor experience
  Revenue: 180 x $18 x 25% = $810 (same as steady state)

Dynamic Pricing (2.4x surge to $43.20):
  At $43.20: Additional drivers activate -> supply rises to 340
  Match rate: 340/600 = 56.7%  (better than static even with surge)
  Revenue: 340 x $43.20 x 25% = $3,672 per hour  (4.5x static peak revenue)
  Drivers earn more; platform earns more; 340 riders get served vs. 180

Dynamic pricing creates value for all three parties when supply-elastic
```

5.2 Price Discrimination in Dynamic Systems

Dynamic pricing platforms often engage in personalized pricing — showing different prices to different users based on their browsing history, device type, account history, and inferred WTP. While legally permissible in most contexts (with significant exceptions for protected classes in housing, credit, and insurance), personalized pricing raises significant ethical and reputational risks that the CFO must factor into the platform's pricing governance framework. Airlines, hotels, and ride-sharing platforms have all faced public backlash for pricing practices that appear to penalize loyal customers or charge different prices to different demographic groups.

The CFO's role in dynamic pricing governance is to ensure that the algorithms that set prices are subject to oversight, testing for discriminatory patterns, and regular audit. A dynamic pricing algorithm that optimizes for short-term revenue without constraint can produce pricing outcomes that are financially attractive but commercially destructive if they generate the kind of press coverage that erodes platform trust. Build the ethical constraints into the pricing algorithm as explicit parameters, not as an afterthought.

SECTION 6
API PRICING TIERS AND DEVELOPER ECONOMICS

API Pricing: Monetizing Developer Access to Platform Infrastructure

API pricing — the pricing of programmatic access to platform data, functionality, or infrastructure through Application Programming Interfaces — has become one of the most financially consequential pricing domains in technology. Platforms like Twilio (communications APIs), Stripe (payments API), OpenAI (AI inference API), and Google Maps have built multi-billion dollar businesses primarily on API monetization. For platforms that have built valuable data or functionality assets, API pricing represents an opportunity to monetize those assets with near-zero marginal cost of delivery.

6.1 API Pricing Architecture

API Pricing Model	Structure	Best For	Financial Characteristic
Free Tier (limited)	Free up to defined limit (calls, data, requests)	Acquisition; developer evaluation; student/startup access	CAC tool; convert to paid above limit
Pay-Per-Call	Price per API request or transaction	Usage varies widely across developers; unpredictable workloads	Variable revenue; scales with customer success
Volume Tiers	Price per call decreases as monthly volume increases	Mid-to-large developers; encourages more usage	Predictable tiers; revenue certainty at higher volumes
Committed Use (pre-paid)	Discounted rate in exchange for volume commitment	Enterprise; large developers; predictable workloads	Cash upfront; revenue certainty; lower per-unit but more total

API Pricing Model	Structure	Best For	Financial Characteristic
Flat Rate (subscription)	Fixed monthly for unlimited or high-cap access	Heavy users; enterprises that want budget certainty	Predictable revenue; margin improves with usage efficiency
Enterprise License	Annual negotiated license; custom terms and SLA	Strategic enterprise accounts	Highest total contract value; requires dedicated sales motion

6.2 Free Tier Economics for Developer Platforms

The free tier in API and developer platform pricing serves the same function as the freemium tier in consumer SaaS: it is a customer acquisition mechanism that reduces the friction of initial adoption. For API platforms, the free tier allows developers to evaluate the API, build prototypes, and demonstrate value to their organizations without a procurement barrier. The free tier must be generous enough to enable meaningful development and evaluation — a free tier that limits developers to 10 API calls per day is not useful for building even a basic prototype — but restrictive enough to create conversion pressure for production workloads.

API FREE TIER ECONOMICS

```
Developer Platform: $0.004 per API call for paid tier
Free tier: 10,000 calls/month (worth $40/month at paid rate)

Developer Cohort: 5,000 new developers sign up per month
  Free tier cost (infra): 5,000 x 10,000 calls x $0.0008 = $4,000/month
  Free tier support cost: $3,500/month
  Total free tier cost: $7,500/month

Conversion to paid (within 6 months): 8% of signups = 400 developers
  Average paid developer MRR: $380/month
  Monthly paid MRR from cohort: 400 x $380 = $152,000

Free Tier Effective CAC: $7,500 (monthly infra) / 400 conversions
  = $18.75 CAC per converted developer (extremely efficient)

LTV per developer at $380 MRR / 6% monthly churn: $380/0.06 = $6,333
LTV:CAC = $6,333 / $18.75 = 337x  (outstanding)
```

SECTION 7
ECOSYSTEM PRICING FOR MULTI-SIDED PLATFORMS

Ecosystem Pricing: Designing the Multi-Sided Price Architecture

The most sophisticated platform pricing challenge is designing the complete ecosystem pricing architecture — the set of prices across all platform sides and all revenue mechanisms that simultaneously maximizes total platform value, allocates that value fairly enough to retain all platform participants, and generates sufficient revenue to fund the platform's growth and operations. This is the pricing equivalent of designing a tax system: every pricing element affects the behavior of every participant, and the interactions between those behavioral effects determine whether the ecosystem grows or contracts.

7.1 The Platform Pricing Optimization Framework

The fundamental principle of multi-sided platform pricing is that the price charged to each side should be inversely proportional to the sensitivity of that side to price and directly proportional to the value that side's participation generates for the other sides. The side that is more price-sensitive — more likely to reduce participation in response to a price increase — should pay less (or be subsidized). The side that generates more value for the ecosystem through its participation should pay proportionally more for that privilege.

MULTI-SIDED PLATFORM PRICING OPTIMIZATION

```
Two-sided platform: Content Creators and Advertisers

Creator Side:
  Price sensitivity: Very high (will leave for competitor if charged)
  Value to advertisers: Every creator brings audience inventory
  Optimal pricing: Subsidize (or charge zero); revenue share to attract
  Revenue share to creators: 55% of ad revenue generated by their content

Advertiser Side:
  Price sensitivity: Moderate (measure ROI; will pay if ROAS is positive)
  Value to platform: Direct revenue; funds creator subsidies
  Optimal pricing: Full market-rate CPM; auction-based bidding
  Platform revenue: 45% of total ad revenue

Platform Revenue Model:
  Total ad revenue: $100M/year
  Creator payout: $55M (55%)
  Platform net revenue: $45M (45%)

If platform charges creators even $10/month:
  Marginal creator attrition: significant
  -> Fewer creators -> less content -> smaller audience -> lower ad CPM
  -> Revenue loss from CPM decline > $10/month per creator gained
  -> Creator pricing destroys more value than it captures
```

7.2 Pricing for Platform Liquidity at Launch

The chicken-and-egg problem of marketplace launch — you need buyers to attract sellers, and sellers to attract buyers — is fundamentally a pricing problem. The platform must subsidize one or both sides at launch to reach the critical mass of participants at which the network effect begins to sustain itself. The pricing strategy for this subsidy is called 'ignition pricing,' and its design determines how quickly (and how expensively) the platform achieves liquidity.

The most common ignition pricing strategies are: subsidizing supply (paying sellers to list initially — Uber paid drivers guaranteed minimums per hour in new cities; credit card companies paid merchants before they had cardholder volume); subsidizing demand (giving buyers credits or free transactions to build initial purchase history); and limiting initial supply to the highest-quality sellers (creating scarcity that makes early

buyers feel privileged and increases early liquidity). The CFO must model the ignition pricing investment — the total subsidy required to reach liquidity — as a customer acquisition cost that must be recovered from long-term platform economics.

SECTION 8
METRICS FRAMEWORK AND CFO CHECKLIST

Platform Pricing Metrics and CFO Checklist

8.1 Platform Pricing Metrics

Metric	Formula / Definition	Benchmark / Target
Blended Take Rate	Total Platform Revenue / Total GMV	Varies by category; track trend; rising sustainably = pricing power
Take Rate by Seller Tier	Revenue from tier / GMV from tier	Lower take rate for higher-volume tiers; track tier migration
Seller Economics Health	Seller net margin after take rate / Pre-platform gross margin	>60% of pre-platform margin; below 40% = exit risk
GMV Concentration (top 10 sellers)	Top 10 seller GMV / Total GMV	>40% = platform risk; those sellers will negotiate aggressively
Free-to-Paid Conversion Rate	Paid active accounts / Total registered accounts	Varies by model; track trend; declining = value proposition issue
API Developer NRR	Paid developers' usage revenue next period / this period	>110% signals growing developer ecosystem
Platform Revenue per Active Participant	Total revenue / Total active buyers + sellers	Track trend; rising = better monetization efficiency
Liquidity Rate	Transactions completed / Items listed	>20% is a healthy marketplace; <5% is illiquid
Dynamic Pricing Revenue Lift	(Actual revenue with dynamic pricing) / (Revenue at static price)	>1.05x minimum threshold for algorithm deployment
Ecosystem Revenue Concentration	Single revenue mechanism / Total revenue	<60% any single source; diversification reduces risk

8.2 CFO Operating Checklist

- Take rate model built for each major seller segment: seller economics modeled at current take rate; take rate ceiling calculated (point at which seller exits or routes off-platform); minimum viable take rate (covers platform variable cost per transaction) calculated.
- Tiered take rate structure reviewed annually: tier thresholds and rates benchmarked against competitive platforms; high-GMV seller negotiations supported with take rate sensitivity analysis.
- Buyer-side pricing evaluated semi-annually: buyer subscription value proposition quantified; incremental services for paid tier identified; conversion rate of free to paid monitored.
- Dynamic pricing algorithm reviewed quarterly: revenue lift vs. static pricing calculated; consumer/seller backlash incidents tracked; discriminatory pricing audit completed semi-annually.
- API pricing tiers reviewed against developer usage patterns: free tier conversion rate tracked; paid tier utilization distribution analyzed; pricing tier gaps identified where upgrades are not occurring.
- Platform liquidity metrics reviewed monthly: GMV per active seller; items listed vs. items sold; buyer repeat purchase rate; these leading indicators of marketplace health precede revenue metrics.
- Ecosystem pricing architecture reviewed annually: subsidized side economics confirmed as intended; revenue mix across mechanisms tracked; single-mechanism concentration monitored.
- Ignition pricing program (if applicable): total subsidy invested tracked as CAC; subsidy per active participant calculated; timeline to subsidy removal modeled against liquidity target.

Closing Perspective: Platform Pricing as Ecosystem Stewardship

Platform pricing is the most consequential financial decision a marketplace operator makes — and the one most likely to destroy the platform if made without understanding its systemic effects. The CFO who manages platform pricing as a revenue optimization problem — maximizing take rate within observable constraints — will find that the constraints shift as participants react to price changes, and that the short-term revenue optimization destroys long-term ecosystem value.

The CFO who manages platform pricing as an ecosystem stewardship problem — who models the economics of every participant type at every proposed price level, who tracks seller attrition risk as vigilantly as platform revenue, who ensures that the take rate leaves enough seller margin to sustain high-quality supply — is building a platform that gets more valuable over time as network effects compound. The most financially successful platforms in history — Visa, Amazon, Apple App Store, Airbnb — have achieved extraordinary take rates not by extracting maximum value from participants in the short term, but by creating

such compelling value for all sides that participants have found the platform indispensable.

The Series now moves into the advanced pricing disciplines. **Part 8** covers Dynamic Pricing and Revenue Management — yield management principles, capacity-based pricing, surge pricing economics and the PR risk management dimension, algorithmic pricing systems, RevPAR and RevPAU metrics, and the CFO oversight framework for automated pricing systems.

End of Part 7: Platform and Marketplace Pricing | Pricing Strategy — A 14-Part Series

eFuturesCFO | The Systems CFO Platform | efuturescfo.com