CS395T Agent-Based Electronic Commerce Fall 2003

Peter Stone

Department or Computer Sciences The University of Texas at Austin

Week 4b, 9/18/03

Logistics

• In Tuesday's reading look for typos!



Logistics

- In Tuesday's reading look for typos!
- Any questions?





- Time between bids is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Amount of competition is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Quantity is "endogenous" (Milgrom)



- Time between bids is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Amount of competition is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Quantity is "endogenous" (Milgrom)
- "Part of the strategy, or bidder decision"



- Time between bids is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Amount of competition is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Quantity is "endogenous" (Milgrom)
- "Part of the strategy, or bidder decision"
- Distortionary taxes



- Time between bids is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Amount of competition is "endogenous" (Crampton)
- Quantity is "endogenous" (Milgrom)
- "Part of the strategy, or bidder decision"
- Distortionary taxes
 - Tax on labor vs. tax on capital



Weber

• Any comments about particular moves by the bidders?



Weber

- Any comments about particular moves by the bidders?
- Why did WirelessCo bid-withdraw-rebid in round 99? (page 10?)



Weber

- Any comments about particular moves by the bidders?
- Why did WirelessCo bid-withdraw-rebid in round 99? (page 10?)
- Any other moves you want to discuss?



PRSDR

• Simulator built previously to exactly match auction rules



PRSDR

- Simulator built previously to exactly match auction rules
- We had to define:
 - How many agents
 - Their values
 - Their knowledge of each other's values
 - Their strategies



PRSDR

- Simulator built previously to exactly match auction rules
- We had to define:
 - How many agents
 - Their values
 - Their knowledge of each other's values
 - Their strategies
- Started out as an exploration of strategy space in the simulator



• Long, iterative process



- Long, iterative process
- Not a stationary target



- Long, iterative process
- Not a stationary target
- Unclear how reliable the info is



- Long, iterative process
- Not a stationary target
- Unclear how reliable the info is
- The auctions are a poker game!



• Secondary bidders



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want
 - Assumed no more than 2



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want
 - Assumed no more than 2
 - p.292: \$5M * 30M pop * 10 mhz * 1.05 (priority) = \$1.575B



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want
 - Assumed no more than 2
 - p.292: \$5M * 30M pop * 10 mhz * 1.05 (priority) = \$1.575B
- No inter-market dependencies



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want
 - Assumed no more than 2
 - p.292: \$5M * 30M pop * 10 mhz * 1.05 (priority) = \$1.575B
- No inter-market dependencies
- Uncertainties assume reasonably good knowledge



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want
 - Assumed no more than 2
 - p.292: \$5M * 30M pop * 10 mhz * 1.05 (priority) = \$1.575B
- No inter-market dependencies
- Uncertainties assume reasonably good knowledge
 - Agent is told a perturbed value from actual value



- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report
- Random goals based on a realistic model
- Priorities = how many you want
 - Assumed no more than 2
 - p.292: \$5M * 30M pop * 10 mhz * 1.05 (priority) = \$1.575B
- No inter-market dependencies
- Uncertainties assume reasonably good knowledge
 - Agent is told a perturbed value from actual value



- Used to compute satisfaction



- You value A at \$30 and B at \$35
- I value A at \$1 and B at \$30



- You value A at \$30 and B at \$35
- I value A at \$1 and B at \$30
- You have \$40 at most to spend



- You value A at \$30 and B at \$35
- I value A at \$1 and B at \$30
- You have \$40 at most to spend
- What is the obvious outcome?
 - How much utility?



- You value A at \$30 and B at \$35
- I value A at \$1 and B at \$30
- You have \$40 at most to spend
- What is the obvious outcome?
 - How much utility?
- How can you do better?



Fairing and cheater detection

 Does fairing guarantee that all bidders are satisfied eventually?



Fairing and cheater detection

- Does fairing guarantee that all bidders are satisfied eventually?
- Is it possible for cheaters to be misidentified?



PRSDR and efficiency and optimality

• Does PRSDR lead to an efficient outcome?



PRSDR and efficiency and optimality

- Does PRSDR lead to an efficient outcome?
- Is it a dominant strategy in this domain?

