Beyond Ticket Sales: Financial Risk Management and Strategic Project Planning in Multi-City Live Entertainment Tours

Kanishka Malhotra
Pranjal Luthra, Kanak Agarwal

***Abstract*—Live entertainment tours combine uncertain ticket demand with substantial advance commitments, geographically dispersed operations and tight scheduling dependencies. These characteristics create a managerial problem that is simultaneously financial and operational: a tour may appear profitable under a base-case forecast yet remain vulnerable to changes in attendance, production costs, travel requirements and venue arrangements. This paper examines how financial risk management can be integrated with strategic project planning in a multi-city live entertainment tour. It uses a documentary case-analysis approach based on a student project summary describing an 11-show, six-city Australian tour plan and its stated financial projections of AUD 23.9 million in revenue and AUD 12.3 million in costs at 85 per cent occupancy. Because the underlying workbook, ticket-price assumptions, cost breakdown and actual performance records were not available for independent inspection, these figures are treated as planning estimates rather than realized results. An illustrative sensitivity model tests the effect of lower and higher occupancy and cost escalation, holding the baseline cost estimate constant except in the specified cost-shock scenario. The analysis indicates that the projected surplus is substantial under the stated base case, but its reliability cannot be established without a transparent cost structure, contribution-margin assumptions and risk-adjusted cash-flow forecast. The paper proposes an integrated framework linking demand scenarios, cost contingency, schedule risk, change control and management accountability. It contributes a practical decision framework for project managers and finance teams responsible for complex touring events, while identifying the data required for a stronger empirical study.**

***Index Terms*—live entertainment; project finance; financial risk; sensitivity analysis; project management; cost contingency; capacity utilization; event management**

I. INTRODUCTION

A multi-city live entertainment tour is not simply a sequence of performances. It is a temporary organization that coordinates artists, promoters, venues, production crews, transport providers, accommodation, ticketing systems, sponsors and local stakeholders across several locations. Each performance is a time-bound delivery event, while the tour as a whole depends on the coordination of multiple interrelated projects. Financial decisions are therefore inseparable from operational decisions.

The live music business exposes promoters and organizers to a distinctive risk profile. A substantial portion of expenditure may be committed before the final level of ticket demand is known. Tschmuck (2021) describes concert promotion as a high-risk activity because organizers incur costs in advance and cannot guarantee sufficient ticket sales. The risk can increase with venue capacity and the number of shows, although combining dates into a tour may allow gains at some locations to offset losses at others. This makes financial planning, demand forecasting and portfolio-level oversight particularly important.

Kanishka Malhotra's undergraduate project summary describes an end-to-end production plan for an 11-show, six-city Australian tour. The summary reports projected revenue of AUD 23.9 million and projected costs of AUD 12.3 million at 85 per cent occupancy. It also identifies venue sourcing, logistics, production scheduling and a risk register as elements of the work. These figures offer a useful starting point for examining the relationship between financial forecasts and project-management decisions. They do not, however, establish actual event performance or provide enough detail to validate the underlying financial model.

This paper asks how financial risk analysis can be embedded in the planning and governance of a multi-city live entertainment tour. Its purpose is not to claim

that the proposed tour occurred or that the forecast was achieved. Instead, it analyses the planning figures as a documentary case and uses clearly labelled scenarios to demonstrate how management decisions can be tested before commitments become irreversible.

1.1 Research aim and questions

The aim is to develop an integrated financial and project-management framework for evaluating the resilience of multi-city live entertainment tours.

- RQ1: How sensitive is the stated financial projection to changes in ticket occupancy?
- RQ2: How can cost escalation and operational uncertainty be incorporated into tour-level financial planning?
- RQ3: How should project governance connect financial monitoring, risk registers and formal change control?
- RQ4: What additional data are required to move from an illustrative planning model to an empirically validated financial assessment?

1.2 Contribution and scope

The paper's contribution is practical and conceptual. It connects event-economics literature on ticket demand and promoter exposure with project-management research on cost estimates and contingency. It proposes a decision framework in which occupancy forecasts, cost structures, schedule dependencies and change approvals are reviewed together. The analysis is limited to one documentary case and an illustrative model; it does not estimate causal effects or claim generalizability across the live entertainment industry.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Financial exposure in live entertainment

Live entertainment production involves several interdependent organizations and contractual relationships. Tschmuck (2021) identifies promoters, venue operators, agents and bookers, support-service providers and ticketing companies as central participants in the live music market. Promoters commonly organize concerts and tours at their own financial risk, committing resources to artist contracts, venue arrangements and promotion before final ticket sales are known. The gap between early expenditure and uncertain revenue creates exposure to demand shortfalls.

Touring can provide a mechanism for spreading risk across dates and locations. A weak result at one stop may be offset by stronger results elsewhere, a process sometimes described as cross-collateralization. However, diversification across locations does not eliminate risk. A common shock—such as a change in artist demand, a major transport disruption or a broad increase in production costs—may affect multiple dates simultaneously. Tour-level financial management should therefore distinguish location-specific risks from risks shared across the entire tour.

Research on live music pricing also indicates that ticket-price architecture and capacity utilization are economically important. Magni (2023), analyzing 631 live music events, examines how event producers create and appropriate value through ticket-pricing structures. Thompson (2025) studies pricing strategies in the North American concert industry using concert data spanning 1999 to 2019 and considers relationships between price discrimination, ticket revenue and capacity utilization. These studies suggest that attendance should not be treated as the only revenue driver: the mix of ticket categories and prices may also influence revenue. For a tour planner, this means that a single occupancy percentage is insufficient unless it is linked to venue capacity, ticket inventory, average realized ticket price, discounts and complimentary allocations.

2.2 Cost estimation and contingency

Project budgets are estimates made under uncertainty. A budget that contains a contingency allowance is not necessarily robust if the allowance is poorly connected to identified risks or if the underlying estimates are systematically biased. Hoseini, Van Veen, Bosch-Rekveldt and Hertogh (2020) examined 95 projects and found differences in cost performance and contingency adequacy between client and contractor perspectives. Their results highlight the importance of understanding the assumptions and incentives behind cost estimates, rather than treating a contingency percentage as universally sufficient.

For a touring event, cost uncertainty may arise from venue hire, staging, audio-visual production, freight, local labour, accommodation, ground transport, insurance, permits, marketing, ticketing charges and schedule changes. Some costs may be fixed once a contract is signed; others may vary with the number of shows, crew size, travel distance or audience size. The

financial effect of a shock therefore depends on the composition of the cost base. A model that assumes all costs are fixed may overstate the impact of lower attendance, while a model that assumes costs vary proportionately with revenue may understate the risk of sunk commitments.

2.3 Project governance and change control

Project management provides a governance structure for translating objectives into deliverables, assigning responsibility and monitoring performance against a plan. In multi-city touring, the project plan must integrate venue availability, transport movements, production installation, rehearsals, local permissions, accommodation and performance dates. These dependencies create schedule risk: a delay in one activity can affect several subsequent activities and generate additional costs.

Formal change control is particularly important where scope, dates, venues or client requirements change after commitments have been made. A change should be assessed for its effect on scope, time, cost, quality, risk and stakeholder obligations before approval. The assignment brief supplied for the underlying course exercise explicitly requires variations to be handled through a change-management process with an impact assessment. This is a useful governance principle, although the brief itself is an instructional document and does not establish the actual operating procedures or outcomes of the 11-show tour.

2.4 Integrating finance and project management

The literature points to a need to connect financial forecasts with project controls. Financial planning identifies whether a project may be economically viable; project management determines whether the plan can be delivered within the stated constraints. These functions should not operate as separate reporting streams. For example, a venue substitution is simultaneously a scheduling decision, a stakeholder decision and a financial decision. It may alter capacity, ticket pricing, freight routes, labour requirements and cancellation exposure.

An integrated approach should therefore use a common set of assumptions across the business case, project schedule, risk register and financial model. Where assumptions change, the model and the plan should be updated together. This paper develops that proposition into a practical framework.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework treats tour resilience as the outcome of five connected management dimensions:

- Demand and revenue architecture: venue capacity, ticket inventory, ticket-price tiers, expected occupancy, discounts, sponsorship and ancillary revenue.
- Cost architecture: fixed commitments, variable costs, location-specific expenses, central tour costs and contractual cancellation exposure.
- Risk and contingency: identified threats, probability and impact assessments, cost exposure, mitigation owners and contingency release rules.
- Schedule and operational integration: venue dates, travel time, production load-in and load-out, crew availability, accommodation and critical dependencies.
- Governance and change control: decision rights, approval thresholds, reporting cadence, version control and documented impact assessments.

The framework proposes that financial resilience is improved when each material operational risk is translated into a financial exposure and assigned to an accountable owner. It also proposes that project changes should trigger a review of the revenue forecast, cost forecast and schedule baseline. These are propositions for managerial application, not hypotheses tested statistically in this single-case paper.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research design

The study adopts a qualitative documentary case-analysis design supplemented by deterministic scenario modelling. The case material consists of a resume summary describing the 11-show, six-city Australian tour plan and the stated financial projections. A separate project-management assignment brief provides context on the educational exercise's planning requirements, including venue, geographic, scheduling and change-control constraints. The two documents are not treated as interchangeable: the resume summary describes the tour plan and its headline financial estimates, while the assignment brief sets out the course exercise's requirements.

4.2 Data and evidence boundaries

The available material does not include the full financial workbook, detailed budget, venue-by-venue capacity schedule, ticket-price assumptions, supplier quotations, contracts, cash-flow timing, risk register, final project report or actual ticket-sales records. Accordingly, the study cannot verify the accuracy of the AUD 23.9 million revenue estimate or the AUD 12.3 million cost estimate. It also cannot determine whether the forecast includes taxes, ticketing fees, artist shares, sponsorship, merchandise or other revenue and cost categories.

The base-case figures are used solely as reported planning estimates. The scenario model makes one simplifying assumption: revenue changes in direct proportion to occupancy relative to the stated 85 per cent base case. In the first sensitivity exercise, total costs are held constant at AUD 12.3 million to illustrate the exposure created by committed costs. In a separate stress scenario, total costs are increased by 15 per cent. This is a deliberately transparent stress test, not a claim that costs would remain entirely fixed in practice or that a 15 per cent increase is statistically expected.

4.3 Analytical procedure

First, the base-case surplus and surplus margin are calculated from the reported revenue and cost estimates. Second, revenue is scaled to alternative occupancy assumptions using the formula: Scenario revenue = Base revenue × (Scenario occupancy ÷ Base occupancy). Third, the cost base is held constant for the occupancy-only scenarios. Fourth, a combined downside scenario applies both a lower occupancy assumption and a 15 per cent cost increase. Finally, the numerical results are interpreted alongside the literature on promoter risk, ticket pricing and cost contingency.

4.4 Ethical and methodological limitations

The project material is educational work and the assignment brief carries a commercial-in-confidence marking. It should not be reproduced or disclosed beyond what is authorized by its owner and institution. This manuscript paraphrases the relevant high-level planning context and does not reproduce proprietary schedules or detailed operational content. Before journal submission, the author must confirm permission to use the case information, verify the underlying financial workbook and ensure that the paper accurately reflects his own contribution. No interviews, surveys or human-participant data were collected for this draft; ethics approval is therefore not claimed.

V. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1 Base-case arithmetic

The resume summary reports projected revenue of AUD 23.9 million and projected costs of AUD 12.3 million at 85 per cent occupancy. On those figures, the implied projected surplus is AUD 11.6 million. The implied surplus margin is approximately 48.5 per cent of projected revenue (11.6 ÷ 23.9). This is an arithmetic result derived from the reported estimates, not a verified profit figure. The term 'surplus' is used rather than 'net profit' because the available material does not define the accounting treatment, taxes, financing costs, artist settlements or other deductions.

Measure	Calculation	Result
Projected revenue	Reported estimate	AUD 23.90m
Projected costs	Reported estimate	AUD 12.30m
Implied projected surplus	23.90 − 12.30	AUD 11.60m
Implied surplus margin	11.60 ÷ 23.90	48.5%
Occupancy assumption	Reported estimate	85%

5.2 Occupancy sensitivity

To illustrate demand sensitivity, revenue is assumed to vary proportionately with occupancy. The model holds total costs constant at AUD 12.3 million. This assumption isolates the effect of revenue variation and is most relevant where a substantial share of expenditure has already been committed. Actual costs would likely include both fixed and variable elements, so this model should be replaced with a cost-behavior model once the detailed budget is available.

Occupancy	Scenario revenue	Assumed costs	Implied surplus	Surplus margin
70%	AUD 19.69m	AUD 12.30m	AUD 7.39m	37.5%
75%	AUD 21.09m	AUD 12.30m	AUD 8.79m	41.7%
85%	AUD 23.90m	AUD 12.30m	AUD 11.60m	48.5%
90%	AUD 25.31m	AUD 12.30m	AUD 13.01m	51.4%
95%	AUD 26.72m	AUD 12.30m	AUD 14.42m	54.0%

Under the simplified assumptions, a decline from 85 to 70 per cent occupancy reduces projected revenue by approximately AUD 4.21 million and the implied surplus by the same amount. The model still shows a positive surplus at 70 per cent occupancy, but that result should not be interpreted as proof of financial safety. It depends on the original revenue estimate being reliable, costs remaining at the stated level, and no additional losses arising from cancellations, refunds, contractual penalties or other unmodelled items.

5.3 Combined downside stress test

A second scenario combines 70 per cent occupancy with a 15 per cent increase in the reported cost estimate. The revised cost estimate becomes AUD 14.145 million. Under the same proportional revenue assumption, revenue is approximately AUD 19.682 million. The implied surplus is therefore approximately AUD 5.537 million, equivalent to a margin of about 28.1 per cent. This scenario demonstrates that the combined effect of demand weakness and cost escalation is more informative than either variable viewed alone.

Scenario	Occupancy	Revenue	Costs	Implied surplus	Margin
Base case	85%	AUD 23.900m	AUD 12.300m	AUD 11.600m	48.5%
Lower demand	70%	AUD 19.682m	AUD 12.300m	AUD 7.382m	37.5%
Lower demand + cost shock	70%	AUD 19.682m	AUD 14.145m	AUD 5.537m	28.1%

5.4 Interpretation

The scenario analysis illustrates three points. First, a headline surplus does not reveal the distribution of risk across the tour. A tour may have a positive aggregate forecast while individual dates or cities are loss-making. Second, occupancy is a useful but incomplete performance indicator. The relationship between attendance and revenue depends on ticket categories, realized prices, discounts, capacity restrictions and ancillary income. Third, cost escalation compounds the impact of lower demand when a large proportion of the cost base is committed in advance.

A more decision-useful model would separate fixed, variable and semi-variable costs; forecast cash flows by date and location; and calculate contribution margin for each show. It would also identify the point at which cancellation, relocation or rescheduling becomes financially preferable to proceeding. Without those inputs, a precise break-even occupancy cannot be calculated from the available information.

VI. DISCUSSION

6.1 From tour-level profitability to show-level viability

The base case is presented at tour level. However, tour-level aggregation can conceal local financial exposure. A high-performing city may compensate for a weaker city in aggregate reporting, but that does not mean the weaker event was well managed or that the tour's cash-flow profile was safe. Managers should therefore monitor both show-level contribution and total tour performance. Each event should have a revenue forecast, direct cost budget, allocated share of central costs and a documented risk position.

6.2 Revenue management and capacity utilization

The scenario model scales revenue with occupancy, but a more realistic model should recognize that not all

tickets generate the same revenue. Premium, standard, concession, group and promotional categories may have different prices and sales patterns. Magni (2023) and Thompson (2025) show why ticket-price structures and capacity utilization should be analyzed together. A practical tour model should track tickets available, tickets sold by category, average realized price, refund rates and remaining inventory at regular intervals. Management can then evaluate whether targeted price adjustments or marketing interventions are likely to improve total contribution without damaging demand or customer trust.

6.3 Contingency as a governance mechanism

Contingency should be tied to specific risk events rather than inserted as an arbitrary percentage. Examples include freight delays, additional accommodation nights, equipment replacement, venue overtime, local labour availability and schedule disruption. Each risk should have an estimated probability, financial impact, mitigation action and accountable owner. The contingency budget should be released through a defined approval process. This approach is consistent with the importance of realistic cost estimates and contingency adequacy highlighted by Hoseini et al. (2020).

6.4 Change control and managerial accountability

A change in venue, route or performance date may affect several budget lines simultaneously. For example, a venue change can alter capacity and ticket revenue, but also freight distance, labour requirements, accommodation, marketing materials, permits and cancellation exposure. The change-control process should therefore require a consolidated impact assessment rather than a narrow estimate of the immediate additional cost. A change log should record the request, rationale, options considered, financial and schedule impacts, decision authority and updated baseline.

6.5 A practical integrated control cycle

The proposed framework can be implemented through a recurring control cycle:

- At planning approval: establish demand assumptions, ticket-price architecture, cost categories, cash-flow requirements and risk-adjusted scenarios.
- Before each ticket-sales milestone: compare actual sales pace with the forecast and update expected occupancy and revenue.
- Before major supplier or venue commitments: test downside scenarios and confirm cancellation, postponement and substitution terms.
- During tour execution: review show-level budgets, schedule dependencies, cash position, risk triggers and contingency use.
- After each event: record actual attendance, realized revenue, direct costs, deviations and lessons for later dates.

This cycle turns the financial model into an active management instrument rather than a one-time spreadsheet prepared for approval.

VII. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

For promoters and tour managers, the analysis suggests that a single headline profit forecast should never be the sole basis for approving a multi-city tour. Decision-makers should request a transparent model that explains the assumptions behind occupancy, ticket prices, cost behaviour and cash-flow timing. The model should show downside scenarios and distinguish between costs that can still be avoided and costs that have already become sunk or contractually committed.

For finance teams, the most important improvement is to move from aggregate budget monitoring to location-level contribution analysis. A rolling forecast should incorporate ticket sales, refunds, supplier commitments and changes in expected costs. Scenario analysis should be refreshed when material information changes, not only at formal reporting dates.

For project managers, the implication is that risk registers and schedules should be financially connected. Each high-priority operational risk should have a financial consequence and a mitigation owner. Change requests should be evaluated against the full tour baseline. This reduces the risk that local operational decisions create unrecognized financial consequences elsewhere.

For students and early-career managers, the case demonstrates the value of interdisciplinary competence. Finance provides tools to evaluate viability and uncertainty; project management

provides mechanisms to coordinate resources, stakeholders and delivery. The ability to translate between these perspectives is relevant beyond entertainment, including conferences, sports events, product launches and other temporary multi-location projects.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has several limitations. It relies on a short project summary rather than the full financial model and supporting documentation. The revenue and cost figures are reported estimates, and no actual ticket-sales or cost outcomes were available. The scenario analysis assumes a linear relationship between occupancy and revenue and holds costs constant in the occupancy-only cases. These assumptions are intentionally simple and should not be mistaken for a forecast of actual tour performance.

The study also examines one planning case and cannot establish whether the proposed framework improves profitability or reduces cost overruns in a wider population of tours. The literature reviewed spans live music economics and project cost management, but further research could examine the specific contractual and operational characteristics of touring entertainment.

Future work should obtain the detailed financial workbook and reconcile it with the project report. A stronger study could compare planned and actual results across multiple tours, using show-level data on capacity, ticket categories, sales timing, production costs, travel costs, cancellations and schedule deviations. Interviews with promoters, tour managers, venue operators and finance professionals could explain how risk information is used in decision-making. With sufficient observations, researchers could test whether the use of rolling forecasts, risk-linked contingency and formal change control is associated with improved cost performance or reduced forecast error.

IX. CONCLUSION

Multi-city live entertainment tours require financial and operational decisions to be managed as one integrated system. The documentary case examined in this paper reports a projected revenue of AUD 23.9 million and costs of AUD 12.3 million at 85 per cent occupancy, implying a projected surplus of AUD 11.6 million. An illustrative sensitivity analysis shows that lower occupancy reduces the implied surplus, and a combined demand and cost shock can materially reduce the margin. These results are conditional on simplified assumptions and do not verify actual profitability.

The central managerial conclusion is that tour resilience depends not only on the size of the projected surplus but on the quality of the assumptions, the visibility of show-level economics and the governance of operational change. A robust planning system should connect ticket demand, cost behavior, contingency, schedule dependencies and change control through a common financial and project baseline. The framework proposed here offers a practical starting point, while a full empirical evaluation requires access to detailed and verified project data.

REFERENCES

[1]. Hoseini, E., VAN VEEN, P., BOSCH-REKVELDT, M., & HERTOGH, M. (2020). Cost performance and cost contingency during project execution: Comparing client and contractor perspectives. Journal of Management in Engineering, 36(4), 05020006. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000772

[2]. Magni, F. (2023). Value creation and appropriation in the live music industry: A population ecology analysis of live music ticket pricing. Journal of Media Business Studies, 20(2), 137–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/16522354.2022.2036440

[3]. Thompson, D. (2025). The evolution of ticket pricing strategies in the North American concert industry: Evidence from two decades of data. Applied Economics. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2025.2464817

[4]. Tschmuck, P. (2021). Live music. In The Economics of Music (pp. 127–150). Agenda Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781788214292.008