# CS395T Agent-Based Electronic Commerce Fall 2006

**Peter Stone** 

Department or Computer Sciences The University of Texas at Austin

Week 8b

#### **Good Afternoon, Colleagues**

Are there any questions?



# **Stopping Rules, Activity Rules**

Goal: Fast auction; simultaneous closings; simple

- Close licenses separately, but slow down bidding on each one as final prices are approached.
- Close the core "big" licenses first and simultaneously, then the smaller ones separately.
  - efficiency on big licenses, speed after that.
- Simultaneous close, but require activity
  - Activity on a license: bid placed or previous high bid
  - Low activity lowers *eligibility*
  - Eligibility bounds what you can bid on
  - Activity requirements increase as time goes on



- Identify variables, but not relative magnitudes
  - Conflicting effects  $\Rightarrow$  can't tell which will dominate



• Identify variables, but not relative magnitudes

- Conflicting effects  $\Rightarrow$  can't tell which will dominate

• Ignores transaction costs of implementing policies



- Identify variables, but not relative magnitudes
  - Conflicting effects  $\Rightarrow$  can't tell which will dominate
- Ignores transaction costs of implementing policies
- May depend on unknown information
  - e.g. bidder valuations



- Identify variables, but not relative magnitudes
  - Conflicting effects  $\Rightarrow$  can't tell which will dominate
- Ignores transaction costs of implementing policies
- May depend on unknown information
  - e.g. bidder valuations
- Doesn't scale to complexity of spectrum auctions



- Identify variables, but not relative magnitudes
  - Conflicting effects  $\Rightarrow$  can't tell which will dominate
- Ignores transaction costs of implementing policies
- May depend on unknown information
  - e.g. bidder valuations
- Doesn't scale to complexity of spectrum auctions

Bidders can be counted on to seek ways to outfox the mechanism — Milgrom p. 150 (top)

Used laboratory experiments too



- Dutch auction (top of p.27)
- Low competition, declining opening bids
- What went wrong?



- Dutch auction (top of p.27)
- Low competition, declining opening bids
- What went wrong?

• Designated entities also didn't work



- Dutch auction (top of p.27)
- Low competition, declining opening bids
- What went wrong?

• Designated entities also didn't work

• How do you evaluate whether an auction succeeded?



- Dutch auction (top of p.27)
- Low competition, declining opening bids
- What went wrong?

• Designated entities also didn't work

- How do you evaluate whether an auction succeeded?
  - Or even better, whether it **will** succeed?



• High complexity estimates



- High complexity estimates
- What's so hard?



- High complexity estimates
- What's so hard?
  - 492 licenses  $\Rightarrow > 10^{148}$  combinations.



- High complexity estimates
- What's so hard?
  - 492 licenses  $\Rightarrow > 10^{148}$  combinations.
- 700 MHz never happened



### Human factors

• CEO allows fears to control strategy



### Human factors

- CEO allows fears to control strategy
- Throwing good money after bad
  - German auction
  - Auction 35 (p.27,28)



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price
- Continue until all units clinched



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price
- Continue until all units clinched
- 3 bidders, 100 items
- \$5  $\Longrightarrow$  all demand 100



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price
- Continue until all units clinched
- 3 bidders, 100 items
- \$5  $\Longrightarrow$  all demand 100
- \$20  $\Longrightarrow$  demand of 45, 50, 55



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price
- Continue until all units clinched
- 3 bidders, 100 items
- \$5  $\Longrightarrow$  all demand 100
- \$20  $\Longrightarrow$  demand of 45, 50, 55
- 3rd bidder gets 5 units for \$20



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price
- Continue until all units clinched
- 3 bidders, 100 items
- \$5  $\Longrightarrow$  all demand 100
- \$20  $\Longrightarrow$  demand of 45, 50, 55
- 3rd bidder gets 5 units for \$20
- Continue
- Like VCG, price independent of bid  $\implies$  incentive compatible



- Auctioneer raises prices and each announces demand
- If aggregate demand of rivals less than supply, some units clinched at that price
- Continue until all units clinched
- 3 bidders, 100 items
- \$5  $\Longrightarrow$  all demand 100
- \$20  $\Longrightarrow$  demand of 45, 50, 55
- 3rd bidder gets 5 units for \$20
- Continue
- Like VCG, price independent of bid  $\implies$  incentive compatible
- Dynamic, so more transparent than VCG (good for dependent values)



• Honain Khan on auctions vs. beauty contests





• Simulator built previously to exactly match auction rules



- 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



- 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!



### **Market Values**

• Secondary bidders



### **Market Values**

- Secondary bidders
- Merill Lynch report



### **Market Values**

- 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*



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



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



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



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



## Fairing and cheater detection

• How is ownership "transfered?"



# Fairing and cheater detection

- How is ownership "transfered?"
- How were the magic numbers determined?



• Does/can PRSDR lead to an efficient outcome?



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



- Does/can PRSDR lead to an efficient outcome?
- Is it a dominant strategy in this domain?
- Why are the game matrices representative?



- Does/can PRSDR lead to an efficient outcome?
- Is it a dominant strategy in this domain?
- Why are the game matrices representative?
- Is SDR illegal?



- Does/can PRSDR lead to an efficient outcome?
- Is it a dominant strategy in this domain?
- Why are the game matrices representative?
- Is SDR illegal? What about publishing PRSDR?



- You have 30 old textbooks
  - Sell as a group, or one volume at a time?
  - What if they're volumes of a dictionary?
- How would you build/test a theory of allocations?



#### • Any comments about particular moves by the bidders?



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



- 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?

