Non-Monetary Mechanism Design without Distributional Information: Using Scarce Audits Wisely



¹MIT ²Columbia ³Georgia Tech

- One central planner maximize social welfare
- K strategic agents self-interested (*i.e.*, may lie)
- **3** 1 indivisible item



- One central planner maximize social welfare
- K strategic agents self-interested (*i.e.*, may lie)
- I indivisible item



- One central planner maximize social welfare
- K strategic agents self-interested (*i.e.*, may lie)
- 1 indivisible item



- One central planner maximize social welfare
- K strategic agents self-interested (*i.e.*, may lie)
- I indivisible item



- One central planner maximize social welfare
- K strategic agents self-interested (*i.e.*, may lie)
- 1 indivisible item



- One central planner maximize social welfare
- K strategic agents self-interested (*i.e.*, may lie)
- I indivisible item

Two Objectives

Efficiency. max established utility u_{i_t} (unknown!) **Incentive-Compatibility.** truthfully report $v_i \approx u_i$





Monetary mechanisms: VCG family [Vic61; Cla71; Gro73]



Monetary mechanisms: VCG family [Vic61; Cla71; Gro73]

Money isn't everything!

- Food bank allocations [Pre17; Pre22]
- Healthcare resources [PSÜY24; YBP23]
- GPU in company [ABDVVW22; PSMST22]



Monetary mechanisms: VCG family [Vic61; Cla71; Gro73]

Money isn't everything!

- Food bank allocations [Pre17; Pre22]
- Healthcare resources [PSÜY24; YBP23]
- GPU in company [ABDVVW22; PSMST22]





Distribution-Aware approaches [BGS19; GBI21; BJ24]



Distribution-Aware approaches [BGS19; GBI21; BJ24]

Distributional info a-priori is hard!

- Perfect knowledge on agents
- 2 Enormous historical data



Distribution-Aware approaches [BGS19; GBI21; BJ24]

Distributional info a-priori is hard!

- Perfect knowledge on agents
- ② Enormous historical data





Prior-Free mechanism via scarce & powerful "audits"



Prior-Free mechanism via scarce & powerful "audits"

Tradeoff between Regret & #Audits

Repeated allocation for T rounds:

• Social Welfare Regret. $\mathcal{R}_T := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=1}^T (\max_i u_{t,i} - u_{t,i_t})]$



Prior-Free mechanism via scarce & powerful "audits"

Tradeoff between Regret & #Audits

Repeated allocation for T rounds:

• Social Welfare Regret. $\mathcal{R}_T := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=1}^T (\max_i u_{t,i} - u_{t,i_t})]$ (Different from Online Learning regret!)



Prior-Free mechanism via scarce & powerful "audits"

Tradeoff between Regret & #Audits

Repeated allocation for T rounds:

• Social Welfare Regret. $\mathcal{R}_T := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=1}^T (\max_i u_{t,i} - u_{t,i_t})]$ (Different from Online Learning regret!)

② Expected Number of Audits. $\mathcal{B}_T := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{1}[\text{audit}]]$

 \exists Perfect Bayesian Equilibrium (PBE) π^* , s.t.



 \exists Perfect Bayesian Equilibrium (PBE) π^* , s.t.



 \exists Perfect Bayesian Equilibrium (PBE) π^* , s.t.



 \exists Perfect Bayesian Equilibrium (PBE) π^* , s.t.



1. Future Punishment.

Audit reveals $v_{t,i} \neq u_{t,i} \Rightarrow$ never alloc again

2. Adaptive Audits.

3. Learn via Flagging.

4. Auxiliary Games.

1. Future Punishment.

2. Adaptive Audits.

When *i* win in round *t*, audit *w.p.* $p_{t,i} := 1/V_i^{\text{alive}}$ $(V_i^{\text{alive}} := \mathbb{E}_{\text{all agents truthful}}[\sum_{\text{future round gain of agent }i])$ \implies (almost) always truthful & $\mathcal{B}_T = \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ (truthful: get $\geq 0 + V_i^{\text{alive}}$; lie: get $\leq 1 + (1 - p_{t,i})V_i^{\text{alive}}$)

Audit reveals $v_{t,i} \neq u_{t,i} \Rightarrow$ never alloc again

3. Learn via Flagging.

4. Auxiliary Games.

- 1. Future Punishment.
- 2. Adaptive Audits.

3. Learn via Flagging. Audit reveals $v_{t,i} \neq u_{t,i} \Rightarrow$ never alloc again

When *i* win in round *t*, audit *w.p.* $p_{t,i} := 1/V_i^{\text{alive}}$ $(V_i^{\text{alive}} := \mathbb{E}_{\text{all agents truthful}}[\sum_{\text{future round gain of agent }i])$ \implies (almost) always truthful & $\mathcal{B}_T = \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ (truthful: get $\geq 0 + V_i^{\text{alive}}$; lie: get $\leq 1 + (1 - p_{t,i})V_i^{\text{alive}}$)

Need to estimate $\mathbb{E}_{all agents truthful}[gain of agent i]$ empirically but can't "condition on" concentration (since agents can strategize early; happy to explain offline) Idea: Let agents "flag" others for biased estimates ("victims" benefit from truthfully flagging \implies incentives aligned)

- 1. Future Punishment.
- 2. Adaptive Audits.

3. Learn via Flagging.



Audit reveals $v_{t,i} \neq u_{t,i} \Rightarrow$ never alloc again

When *i* win in round *t*, audit *w.p.* $p_{t,i} := 1/V_i^{\text{alive}}$ $(V_i^{\text{alive}} := \mathbb{E}_{\text{all agents truthful}}[\sum_{\text{future round gain of agent }i])$ \implies (almost) always truthful & $\mathcal{B}_T = \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ (truthful: get $\geq 0 + V_i^{\text{alive}}$; lie: get $\leq 1 + (1 - p_{t,i})V_i^{\text{alive}}$)

Need to estimate $\mathbb{E}_{all agents truthful}[gain of agent i]$ empirically but can't "condition on" concentration (since agents can strategize early; happy to explain offline) Idea: Let agents "flag" others for biased estimates ("victims" benefit from truthfully flagging \implies incentives aligned)

Can't use revelation principle due to unknown / non-unique distributions (happy to explain offline) How to characterize PBE? Define a "well-behaved" aux game, show aux PBE $\stackrel{induce}{\mapsto}$ actual PBE

Main Results & Takeaway

For resource allocation without money & without dist info...



Technical Ingredients

- Future Punishment
- Adaptive Audits ($\mathcal{O}(1)$ regret via $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ audits)
- Learn via Flagging ("condition on" argument is problematic when strategic)

• Auxiliary Games

(revelation principle is inapplicable w/o dist info)

Thank you!

Paper link: https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.08412

References

- [ABDVVW22] Andres Alban, Philippe Blaettchen, Harwin De Vries, and Luk N Van Wassenhove. Resource allocation with sigmoidal demands: Mobile healthcare units and service adoption. Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 24(6):2944–2961, 2022.
 - [BGS19] Santiago R Balseiro, Huseyin Gurkan, and Peng Sun. Multiagent mechanism design without money. Operations Research, 67(5):1417–1436, 2019.
 - [BJ24] Moise Blanchard and Patrick Jaillet. Near-optimal mechanisms for resource allocation without monetary transfers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10066, 2024.
 - [Cla71] Edward H Clarke. Multipart pricing of public goods. Public choice, pages 17-33, 1971.
 - [GBI21] Artur Gorokh, Siddhartha Banerjee, and Krishnamurthy lyer. From monetary to nonmonetary mechanism design via artificial currencies. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(3):835–855, 2021.
 - [Gro73] Theodore Groves. Incentives in teams. Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, pages 617–631, 1973.
 - [Pre17] Canice Prendergast. How food banks use markets to feed the poor. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 31(4):145–162, 2017.
 - [Pre22] Canice Prendergast. The allocation of food to food banks. Journal of Political Economy, 130(8):1993–2017, 2022.
 - [PSMST22] Sebastian Perez-Salazar, Ishai Menache, Mohit Singh, and Alejandro Toriello. Dynamic resource allocation in the cloud with near-optimal efficiency. *Operations Research*, 70(4):2517–2537, 2022.
 - [PSÜY24] Parag A Pathak, Tayfun Sönmez, M Utku Ünver, and M Bumin Yenmez. Fair allocation of vaccines, ventilators and antiviral treatments: Leaving no ethical value behind in healthcare rationing. Management Science, 70(6):3999–40305, 2024.
 - [Vic61] William Vickrey. Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. The Journal of finance, 16(1):8–37, 1961.
 - [YBP23] Xuecheng Yin, İ Esra Büyüktahtakın, and Bhumi P Patel. Covid-19: Data-driven optimal allocation of ventilator supply under uncertainty and risk. European journal of operational research, 304(1):255–275, 2023.