

Problem Set 13

1. (Mechanism Design)

Suppose that three agents need to reach the collective decision to whom an **indivisible unit** of a single good should be allocated. Agent $i = 0$ currently owns the good (“seller”), while agents $i = 1, 2$ are potential future owners (“buyers”). An outcome thus is a vector

$$x = ((k_0, k_1, k_2), (t_0, t_1, t_2)),$$

where $k_i \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether agent i owns the good, and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are net monetary transfers to agent i . Note that $k_i = 1$ for exactly one agent.

The set of feasible allocations, X , is defined by $\sum_{i=0}^2 k_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=0}^2 t_i \leq 0$.

All agents have a quilinear utility of the form

$$u_i = \theta_i k_i + t_i$$

We assume that there is no uncertainty regarding the valuation of the seller ($i = 0$), who always has $\theta_0 = 0$. That is, the seller derives her utility only from her monetary transfer. By contrast, the types of the two buyers are random and only private information, where $\Theta_1 = \Theta_2 = [0, 1]$, and each θ_i is iid uniformly distributed.

(a) What does a buyer’s type θ_i express?

(b) Let $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$. Consider the following social choice function (SCF):

$$f(\theta) = (k_1(\theta), k_2(\theta), t_1(\theta), t_2(\theta))$$

$$k_1(\theta) = 1 \equiv \theta_1 \geq \theta_2$$

$$k_2(\theta) = 1 \equiv \theta_2 > \theta_1$$

$$t_i(\theta) = -\theta_i k_i(\theta)$$

$$t_0(\theta) = t_1(\theta) + t_2(\theta)$$

Provide a verbal description of this SCF. Is it feasible? Is it ex-post efficient?

- (c) Show that this SCF cannot be implemented in dominant strategies. (*Hint: Use the revelation theorem. That is: Show that this SCF cannot be implemented in dominant strategies by the direct revelation mechanism (where the buyers simply announce their types).*) Explain intuitively why truth-telling is not incentive-compatible here.
- (d) Could you modify the transfers in the above SCF such that the modified SCF can be implemented in dominant strategies?