Online Mechanism Design Part II: Online Auction

Lin Gao



Network Communications and Economics Lab (NCEL)

Department of Information Engineering The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Lin Gao (NCEL, IE@CUHK)

Online Auction Design

Feb. 2013

Outline

Review of Online Mechanism Design

- Online Scheduling Problem
- Online Mechanism Design
- Research Roadmap
- Online Auction Design
 - System Model
 - Online Auction Mechanism

Conclusion

Lin Gao (NCEL, IE@CUHK)

Online Scheduling Problem

- Allocating items to sequentially arrived demanders
- Key features
 - No future information
 - Opportunity is fleeting (Real-time decision)
 - No withdrawing (No preemption)
- Example: Persian Princess's Marriage





- Online Scheduling Problem
 - Performance evaluation Competitive Ratio
 - The worst case of the ratio between the performance under an online algorithm and the optimal offline performance.
 - Constant competitive ratio (e.g., 2-competitive) is expected.
 - Example: Learning-before-scheduling algorithm
 - The largest probability (of allocating the item to the highest valuation demander) is: 1/e = 1/2.718 = 36.79%
 - The competitive ratio is zero (i.e., not constant CR).
 - For example, when the highest valuation is within the learning stage, and all other valuations are much smaller than the highest one.



Online Mechanism Design

- Objective
 - Elicit the private information of demanders (truthfulness)
 - Achieve desirable (efficient or optimal) allocations based on demanders' truthful information disclosure.
- Examples (offline mechanism design)
 - Social welfare maximization (efficiency): Second-price Auction
 - Revenue maximization (optimality): Second-price Auction with Optimal Reserve Price



- Online Mechanism Design
 - Objective of Online Mechanism Design
 - Truthfulness
 - Every demander reports truthfully his private information.
 - Constant competitive efficiency
 - The achieved social welfare is constant competitive to the maximum offline welfare.
 - Constant competitive optimality
 - The achieved operator revenue is constant competitive to the maximum offline revenue.



Online Matching Problem

- A typical online scheduling problem
- NP-hard (even for offline matching)



Online Matching under Information Asymmetry

- Private information: Vi, Di, [Ai, Bi]
- Online Auction Mechanism
 - [Mohammad T. Hajiaghayi, 2005 EC]



Outline

Review of Online Mechanism Design

- Online Scheduling Problem
- Online Mechanism Design
- Research Roadmap

Online Auction Design

- System Model
- Online Auction Mechanism

Conclusion

System Model

Mobile Users

- Arrive randomly and sequentially;
- For each mobile user i,
 - Vi: valuation, Di: demand for slots,
 - [Ai, Bi]: the range of interested slots
- Network Operator
 - Problem: How to allocate/schedule all slots among mobile users under information asymmetry?



System Model

- Assumptions
 - Successive and constant demand: Di = D (public information)
 - ► No early arrival: $ai \ge Ai$
 - ► No later departure: bi \leq Bi

• User Type: $W_i \triangleq [A_i, B_i, V_i]$ (private information)

• User Bid:
$$w_i \triangleq [a_i, b_i, v_i]$$

Subject to: $[a_i, b_i] \in [A_i, B_i]$

Key feature – Multi-dimensional private information

- Online Auction Mechanism Design
 - Design scheduling rule (Q) and payment rule (P)

$$Q: [w_1, ..., w_n] \to [q_1, ..., q_n]$$

- $P: [w_1, ..., w_n] \to [p_1, ..., p_n]$
- Truthfulness
 - Every user i reports his truthful type, i.e., wi == Wi.
- Constant competitive efficiency
 - The achieved social welfare is constant competitive to the maximum offline welfare.
- Constant competitive optimality
 - The achieved operator revenue is constant competitive to the maximum offline revenue.

Truthfulness

- ► Monotonicity: Q is monotone, if $qi \ge qi'$ for any $wi \ge wi'$
 - ► Here wi ≥ wi' means (i) ai ≤ ai', (ii) bi ≥ bi', and (iii) vi ≥ vi'
 - Generalization of the one-dimensional monotonicity.



Monotonicity Criterion: There exists a payment rule P (below) such that the mechanism (Q, P) is truthful, if and only if Q is monotone.

$$p_i(w_i, \boldsymbol{w}_{-i}) = q_i(w_i, \boldsymbol{w}_{-i}) \cdot v_i - \int_0^{v_i} q_i([a_i, b_i, x], \boldsymbol{w}_{-i}) dx \quad (1)$$

The payment rule is value-independent, but not bid-independent !

Lin Gao (NCEL, IE@CUHK)

Truthfulness

$$p_i(w_i, \boldsymbol{w}_{-i}) = q_i(w_i, \boldsymbol{w}_{-i}) \cdot v_i - \int_0^{v_i} q_i([a_i, b_i, x], \boldsymbol{w}_{-i}) dx \quad (1)$$

User i's payoff

- (i) Suppose ai and bi are fixed: User i will report the truthful vi.
- (ii) Mis-representing a larger ai will decrease user i's payoff; Mis-representing a smaller ai is not allowed;
- (iii) Mis-representing a smaller bi will decrease user i's payoff;
 Mis-representing a larger bi is not allowed.



Truthful Payment Rule defined in (1)

==>

- Truthfulness
 - Monotonicity Criterion
- 2-Competitive Efficiency
 - Detailed proof can be referred to online scheduling references.



Lin Gao (NCEL, IE@CUHK)

Optimality

- There is no truthful auction mechanism whose revenue is constantcompetitive.
- Relaxation of Information Asymmetry
 - For example, suppose $w_i \in [\underline{w}_i, \overline{w}_i]$, and the operator know the upper bound. There is an online auction mechanism which achieves a competitive ratio of

$$O(\log(h))$$
 where $h = \frac{\overline{w}_i}{\underline{w}_i}$

Conclusion

- We review the basic concepts of online scheduling and online mechanism design problem.
- We present an online auction mechanism design (by Mohammad) for online matching problems:
 - Truthfulness
 - Efficiency
 - Optimality
- Future extensions
 - Different and non-unit user demands
 - Non-successive user demand
 - Multiple channels
 - ...

Most of these extensions are open problem.