

# Combinatorial Auctions

Tomáš Votroubek

December 13, 2021

# Today:

- Combinatorial auctions
- Vickrey-Clarke-Groves (VCG) mechanism
- Bidding Languages

Your value function is:

$$v_{you} = \begin{cases} 10, & \text{if you win A and B} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

There are two *simultaneous* English auctions. How should you bid?<sup>1</sup>

	auction for A	auction for B
$bid_{me}$	1	
$bid_{you}$	?	?

---

<sup>1</sup>You do not know my value function.

If my value function was  $v_m(A) = v_m(B) = v_m(AB) = 7$   
*("I want to win one")*  
then you lose value by participating.

Given that Your value function was

$$v_y(AB) = 10, \quad v_y(A) = v_y(B) = 0;$$

while mine was

$$v_m(A) = v_m(B) = v_m(AB) = 7;$$

what *ought to* happen?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Which allocation would be efficient?

# Combinatorial Auctions More Formally

Combinatorial auction are mechanisms for allocating multiple goods, parameterized by:

- A set of *bidders*  $N = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ ;
- A set of *goods*  $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ ;
- and *valuation functions*  $v_i : \mathcal{P}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\forall i \in N$ , s.t.  $v_i(\emptyset) = 0$ .

Their outcomes are defined by *payments*  $\mathbf{p}$  and *allocations*  $\mathbf{x}$

$$\Omega = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), \bigsqcup_{i \in N} x_i \subseteq G; \\ \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

The *utility* of each bidder is<sup>3</sup>  $u_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = v_i(x_i) - p_i$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>No externalities in auctions!

# Value functions

Given two subsets  $G_1, G_2 \subseteq G$ , s.t.  $G_1 \cap G_2 = \emptyset$  (or allocations), valuation functions can exhibit two<sup>4</sup> behaviors:

**Substitutability** When  $v(G_1 \cup G_2) < v(G_1) + v(G_2)$ .

As in “I only really need one.”

**Complementarity** When  $v(G_1 \cup G_2) > v(G_1) + v(G_2)$ .

As in “What am I going to do with just one shoe?”

Such functions are called *subadditive* and *superadditive*, respectively.

---

<sup>4</sup>Excluding the uninteresting case of additivity.

## Back to our simultaneous auctions

	<i>auction<sub>A</sub></i>	<i>auction<sub>B</sub></i>
<i>b<sub>m</sub></i>	1	
<i>b<sub>y</sub></i>	?	?

Is it really that bad?



You could do a lot worse<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>At least you could see the auction evolve.

Table 5  
First- and second-bid disparities.

Type of license	First & second bids
UHF TV channel, Christchurch area	\$ 100,004
	\$ 6
UHF TV channel, North Island	\$ 107,000
	\$ 2,000
FM Radio channel, South Island	\$ 35,070
	\$ 159
FM Radio channel, Wellington area	\$ 550,111
	\$ 159
TACS B cellular management right	\$7,000,000
	\$ 5,000

Technically, they were *not* trying to maximize revenue...  
We will not either, but let us at least see how to do it properly.

## Brief detour from auctions

Should we build a road?<sup>6</sup>

	build	not build	payment under VCG
$a_1$	200	0	
$a_2$	100	0	
$a_3$	0	250	

---

<sup>6</sup>Example from Game Theory Online.

## Brief detour from auctions

Should we build a road?<sup>6</sup>

	build	not build	payment under VCG
$a_1$	200	0	150
$a_2$	100	0	50
$a_3$	0	250	0

---

<sup>6</sup>Example from Game Theory Online.

# The connection with auctions?

Under VCG bidders pay their “*social cost*,”  
just like in the second-price (Vickrey) auction!

# Collusion

What if both increase their bids?

	build	not build	payment
$a_1$	250	0	
$a_2$	150	0	
$a_3$	0	250	

# Collusion

What if both increase their bids?

	build	not build	payment
$a_1$	250	0	100
$a_2$	150	0	0
$a_3$	0	250	0



# Monotonicity and pretending to be two bidders

Compare

	build	not build	payment
$a_1$	20	0	10
$a_2$	0	10	0

with<sup>7</sup>

	build	not build	payment
$a_1$	20	0	
$a_1$	20	0	
$a_2$	0	10	0

---

<sup>7</sup>Luckily, in an auction, you can not bid for someone *else* to win.

# Monotonicity and pretending to be two bidders

Compare

	build	not build	payment
$a_1$	20	0	10
$a_2$	0	10	0

with<sup>7</sup>

	build	not build	payment
$a_1$	20	0	0
$a_1$	20	0	0
$a_2$	0	10	0

---

<sup>7</sup>Luckily, in an auction, you can not bid for someone *else* to win.

Back to auctions.

# VCG auction example 1

Find the social welfare maximizing allocation and the corresponding payments under VCG.

	$v_i$			payment
	A	B	AB	
$bidder_1$	10	5	15	
$bidder_2$	1	6	12	

# VCG auction example 1

Find the social welfare maximizing allocation and the corresponding payments under VCG.

	$v_i$			payment
	A	B	AB	
$bidder_1$	10	5	15	6
$bidder_2$	1	6	12	5

## VCG auction example 2

Find the social welfare maximizing allocation and the corresponding payments under VCG.

	$v_i$			payment
	A	B	AB	
$bidder_1$	10	5	15	
$bidder_2$	1	10	12	

## VCG auction example 2

Find the social welfare maximizing allocation and the corresponding payments under VCG.

	$v_i$			payment
	A	B	AB	
$bidder_1$	10	5	15	2
$bidder_2$	1	10	12	5

# Bidding languages.

Asking bidders for exponentially many bids is impractical.



# Atomic bids

Let the bidders decide on the bundles. Represents an *AND* operator.

(“Left glove”  $\wedge$  “Right glove”, 20)

“I want a left glove *AND* a right glove,  
but have no use for them individually.”

## OR bids

A disjunction of atomic bids. Can not directly represent substitutability! Represents the logical OR in the sense of “at least one”, not the english intuitive interpretation.

$$(F, 30) \vee (D, 20)$$

“I would pay 30 for food *OR* 20 for drink,  
both are worth 50 to me.”<sup>8</sup>

---

$$(v_1 \vee v_2)(S) = \max_{R \sqcup T \subseteq S} v_1(R) + v_2(T)$$

---

<sup>8</sup>I know, I know...*You* try coming up with an example, then!

## *XOR* bids

Represents an exclusive OR of atomic bids, i.e. “at most one.”

$$(R, 300) \oplus (C, 200)$$

“I would pay 300 for a train ticket R *XOR* 200 for ticket C,  
I can not ride two trains at once.”

---

$$(v_1 \oplus v_2)(S) = \max(v_1(S), v_2(S))$$

## $OR^*$ bids

You can simulate XOR with OR, by including *dummy* variables.

$$(R, 300) \oplus (C, 200)$$

is equivalent to

$$(R \wedge \mathcal{D}, 300) \vee (C \wedge \mathcal{D}, 200)$$

as you can not satisfy both atomic bids at the same time.

# Bidding Language Example: OR

Consider the following OR bid:

$$(A \wedge B, 7) \vee (D \wedge E, 8) \vee (A \wedge C, 4)$$

What valuations does the bid express?<sup>9</sup>

Allocation	Value
A	
AB	
AC	
ABC	
ABDE	

---

<sup>9</sup>Assume *free disposal* and *nothing-for-nothing*.

# Bidding Language Example: OR

Consider the following OR bid:

$$(A \wedge B, 7) \vee (D \wedge E, 8) \vee (A \wedge C, 4)$$

What valuations does the bid express?<sup>9</sup>

Allocation	Value
A	0
AB	7
AC	4
ABC	7
ABDE	15

---

<sup>9</sup>Assume *free disposal* and *nothing-for-nothing*.

# Bidding Language Example: XOR

Consider the following XOR bid:

$$(A \wedge B, 7) \oplus (D \wedge E, 8) \oplus (A \wedge C, 4)$$

What valuations does the bid express?

Allocation	Value
A	
AB	
AC	
ABC	
ABDE	

# Bidding Language Example: XOR

Consider the following XOR bid:

$$(A \wedge B, 7) \oplus (D \wedge E, 8) \oplus (A \wedge C, 4)$$

What valuations does the bid express?

Allocation	Value
A	0
AB	7
AC	4
ABC	7
ABDE	8



Have a nice day!