

# Market Design: Theory and Applications

## Auction Theory

Instructor: Itay Fainmesser

Fall 2011

# Today

- ▶ Auction Theory Basics:
  1. Bidding and Equilibria in Independent Private Values (IPV) model
  2. Revenue Equivalence
  3. Common Values
- ▶ Internet Auctions: eBay vs. Amazon

# The Independent Private Values Model

## Basic Auction Environment:

- ▶ Bidders  $i = 1, \dots, n$
- ▶ One object to be sold
- ▶ Bidder  $i$  observes a “signal”  $S_i \sim F(\cdot)$ , with typical realization  $s_i \in [\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$ . Assume  $F$  is continuous.
- ▶ Bidders’ signals  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  are independent.
- ▶ Bidder  $i$ ’s value  $v_i(s_i) = s_i$ .
- ▶ A set of auction rules will give rise to a game between the bidders.

# The IPV Model

Two important features of the model:

- ▶ Bidder  $i$ 's information (signal) is independent of bidder  $j$ 's information (signal).
- ▶ Bidder  $i$ 's value is independent of bidder  $j$ 's information (i.e. *private values*).

# Vickrey (Second-Price) Auction

## *Auction Rules:*

- ▶ Bidders are asked to submit sealed bids  $b_1, \dots, b_n$ .
- ▶ Bidder who submits the highest bid wins the object.
- ▶ Winner pays the amount of the second highest bid.

## Proposition

*In a second price auction, it is a (weakly) dominant strategy to bid one's value,  $b_i(s_i) = s_i$ .*

In a second price auction, it is a (weakly) dominant strategy to bid one's value,  $b_i(s_i) = s_i$ .

**Proof.** Bidding  $b_i$  means  $i$  will win if and only if the price is below  $b_i$ .

Bid  $b_i > s_i \Rightarrow$  sometimes win at price above value.

Bid  $b_i < s_i \Rightarrow$  sometimes lose at price below value.

## Expected Vickrey Auction Revenue

- ▶ Seller's revenue equals second highest value.
- ▶ Let  $S^{i:n}$  denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  highest of  $n$  draws from distribution  $F$ .
- ▶ Seller's expected revenue is

$$\mathbb{E} [S^{2:n}] .$$

- ▶ If  $F(\cdot)$  is the uniform distribution over  $[0, 1]$ , then

$$\mathbb{E} [S^{2:n}] = \frac{n-1}{n+1}$$

- ▶ For example, in an auction with 10 participants, each of whom values the object at a (uniformly) random value between \$0 and \$10, then the expected revenue for the seller is about \$8.18 [*Check for yourself!*].

# Open Ascending Auction

## *Auction Rules:*

- ▶ Prices rise continuously from zero.
- ▶ Bidders have the option to drop out at any point.
- ▶ Auction ends when only one bidder remains.
- ▶ Winner pays the ending price.

# Open Ascending vs Vickery Auctions

- ▶ Leaving aside concerns of information, these two auction formats are actually the same!



# Open Ascending vs Vickery Auctions

- ▶ Leaving aside concerns of information, these two auction formats are actually the same!
- ▶ Why is this the case?

# Open Ascending vs Vickery Auctions

- ▶ Leaving aside concerns of information, these two auction formats are actually the same!
- ▶ Why is this the case?
  - ▶ In a Vickery auction, the winner pays the bid of the next-highest bidder.

# Open Ascending vs Vickery Auctions

- ▶ Leaving aside concerns of information, these two auction formats are actually the same!
- ▶ Why is this the case?
  - ▶ In a Vickery auction, the winner pays the bid of the next-highest bidder.
  - ▶ In an Open Ascending auction, the winner is crowned when the next highest bidder drops out. When will this occur?

# Sealed Bid (First-Price) Auction

*Auction Rules:*

- ▶ Bidders submit sealed bids  $b_1, \dots, b_n$ .
- ▶ Bidders who submits the highest bid wins the object.
- ▶ Winner pays his own bid.

*Under these rules, bidders will want to shade bids below their values. Why is this the case?*

# Sealed Bid (First-Price) Auction

**Example:**  $F(\cdot)$  is the uniform distribution over  $[0, 1]$ .

- ▶ Suppose bidders  $j \neq i$  bid  $b_j = a \cdot s_j$
- ▶ Bidder  $i$ 's expected payoff:

$$\begin{aligned}U(b_i, s_i) &= (s_i - b_i) \cdot \Pr [b_j = b(S_j) \leq b_i, \forall j \neq i] \\&= (s_i - b_i) \cdot \Pr [a \cdot s_j \leq b_i]^{n-1} \\&= (s_i - b_i) \cdot \Pr \left[ s_j \leq \frac{b_i}{a} \right]^{n-1} \\&= (s_i - b_i) \cdot \left[ \frac{b_i}{a} \right]^{n-1} \\&= (s_i - b_i) \cdot \frac{(b_i)^{n-1}}{a^{n-1}}\end{aligned}$$

## Sealed Bid (First-Price) Auction - Example

- ▶ Suppose bidders  $j \neq i$  bid  $b_j = a \cdot s_j$
- ▶ Bidder  $i$ 's expected payoff:

$$U(b_i, s_i) = (s_i - b_i) \cdot \frac{(b_i)^{n-1}}{a^{n-1}}$$

- ▶ First order condition:

$$0 = (s_i - b_i) \cdot \frac{(n-1)(b_i)^{n-2}}{a^{n-1}} - \frac{(b_i)^{n-1}}{a^{n-1}}$$

and

$$b_i = \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot s_i$$

# Expected First Price Auction Revenue

- ▶ Expected revenue is

$$\mathbb{E} [b(S^{1:n})] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot S^{1:n} \right] = \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot \frac{n}{n+1} = \frac{n-1}{n+1}.$$

- ▶ So *first and second price auction yield same expected revenue.*

# Revenue Equivalence Theorem

## Theorem (Revenue Equivalence)

Suppose  $n$  bidders have values  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  identically and independently distributed with CDF  $F(\cdot)$ . Then any equilibrium of any auction game in which (i) the bidder with the highest value wins the object, and (ii) a bidder with value  $\underline{s}$  gets zero profits, generates the same revenue in expectation.



# Using the Revenue Equivalence Theorem

Many applications of the revenue equivalence theorem.

If the auction equilibrium satisfies (i) and (ii), we know:

- ▶ Expected Revenue
- ▶ Expected Bidder Profits (payoff equivalence)
- ▶ Expected Total Surplus

*We can use this to solve for auction equilibria.*

# All-Pay Auctions

- ▶ Bidders  $1, \dots, n$
- ▶ Values  $s_1, \dots, s_n$ , i.i.d. with CDF  $F$
- ▶ Bidders submit bids  $b_1, \dots, b_n$
- ▶ Bidder who submits the highest bid gets the object.
- ▶ Every bidder must pay his or her bid.

## Solving the All-Pay Auction

Suppose all pay auction has a symmetric equilibrium with an increasing strategy  $b^A(s)$ . Then it must be that  $b^A(\underline{s}) = 0$ .

In this equilibrium,  $i$ 's expected payoff given value  $s_i$  will be:

$$U(s_i) = s_i \cdot [F(s_i)]^{n-1} - b^A(s_i)$$

and in our example of uniform distribution of  $s_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} U(s_i) &= s_i \cdot (s_i)^{n-1} - b^A(s_i) \\ &= \left( s_i - \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot s_i \right) \cdot \frac{\left( \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot s_i \right)^{n-1}}{\left( \frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

So

$$b^A(s_i) = (s_i)^n - \frac{1}{n-1} (s_i)^n = \frac{n-1}{n} \cdot (s_i)^n$$

## Other Revenue Equivalent Auctions

1. The English (oral ascending) auction. All bidders start in the auction with a price of zero. Price rises continuously; bidders may drop out at any point in time. Once they drop out, they cannot re-enter. Auction ends when only one bidder is left; this bidder pays the price at which the second-to-last bidder dropped out.

## Other Revenue Equivalent Auctions

1. The English (oral ascending) auction. All bidders start in the auction with a price of zero. Price rises continuously; bidders may drop out at any point in time. Once they drop out, they cannot re-enter. Auction ends when only one bidder is left; this bidder pays the price at which the second-to-last bidder dropped out.
2. The Dutch (descending price) auction. The price starts at a very high level and drops continuously. At any point in time, a bidder can stop the auction, and pay the current price. Then the auction ends.

# “Common Value” Auctions

We would like to generalize the model to allow for the possibility that:

1. Learning bidder  $j$ 's information could cause bidder  $i$  to re-assess his estimate of how much he values the object,
2. The information of  $i$  and  $j$  is not independent (when  $j$ 's estimate is high,  $i$ 's is also likely to be high).

Examples:

- ▶ Selling natural resources such as oil or timber.
- ▶ Selling financial assets such as treasury bills.
- ▶ Selling a company.

## Second Price Auction with Common Values - Example

- ▶ Two bidders.
- ▶  $v(s_1, s_2) = s_1 + s_2$
- ▶  $s_i \sim U[0, 1]$

Observations:

1.  $E[v(s_1, s_2) | s_2] = s_2 + \frac{1}{2}$
2.  $b(s_1) = s_1 + \frac{1}{2}$  and  $b(s_2) = s_2 + \frac{1}{2}$  is not an equilibrium.
3. The *winner's curse*.

# Failure of Revenue Equivalence Theorem

- ▶ The RET does not hold in this more general environment.
- ▶ Basic idea: bidders profits are due to information rents. When signals / values are correlated, information rents can be reduced if “more information” is used in setting the price.
- ▶ Example: English auction generates more revenue than a second price auction.