

## Efficiency and Risk Trade-offs in Dynamic Oligopoly Markets

#### Qingqing Huang, Mardavij Roozbehani, Munther Dahleh

Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems Massachusetts Institute of Technology

 Q. Huang, M. Roozbehani, M. Dahleh, "Efficiency and Risk Impacts of Market Architecture in Power Systems under Real-Time Pricing", To Appear in IEEE CDC, 2012
 \_\_\_\_\_, "Efficiency and Risk Trade-offs in Dynamic Oligopoly Markets", work in progress

## **Motivation**



Exogenous shocks VS endogenous risk Tail risk, aggregate demand / price spikes

- How does (endogenous risk) emerge in multi-agent dynamic system?
- What's the impact of local incentives on system-wide efficiency and risk?



## Contribution





cooperationReduce externality, more efficientMore vulnerable to some exogenous shocks

system dynamics, uncertainties, frictions (deadline constraints)

## Literature



- Previous works on **endogenous risk** 
  - Heterogeneous beliefs [1]
  - Failure of the agents to rationalize feedback links [2]
- Our work
  - Agents are fully aware of pricing mechanism, have perfect information of system state, form rational expectations about other agents in the market.
  - Market architecture  $\rightarrow$  Endogenous risk
  - Tradeoff
- Approach
  - Case study : Dynamic stochastic game, MDP
  - LTI reformulation and tradeoff analysis

Setup



Agent arrival

- L types (deadline constraint)
- Uncertainty
  - Bernoulli arrival
  - Workload distribution  $d_l(t), l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$

Decision

- State information
- Load scheduling

Cost  $\mathbf{E}[\sum_{\tau=t}^{t+l} u_i(t)p(t)]$ Pricing  $p(t) = \sum_i u_i(t)$ 



1 2 t+3

System performance

- Efficiency: expected average cost (variance of aggregate demand process)
- Risk: aggregate demand spikes (tail probability of aggregate demand process)

t+2

Setup





Setup





#### Applications:

consumer response to real-time pricing in power grids load scheduling in cloud computing market multi-portfolio execution problem consumption risk sharing Case study L=2

#### Solutions



#### market architectures $\rightarrow$ agent behaviors $\rightarrow$ aggregate demand process



# • At most 1 decision maker at each period $\left(u(t), \ d_2(t) - u(t) ight)$

• Linear quadratic

$$u^{s}(x, d_{2}) = -a^{s}x + b^{s}d_{2} + e^{s}$$

#### Non-cooperative

Dynamic stochastic game Markov perfect equilibrium

Infinite horizon average cost MDP

Cooperative

 $a^{nc} < a^c \quad b^{nc} > b^c$ 

In cooperative scheme, agents respond more aggressively to other agents' shock

Low efficiency Low risk High efficiency High risk Case study L=2 Results





## Case study L=2 Results





## General L analysis Modified system dynamics



- Jump linear system
- No closed form solution

#### Risk of spikes High backlog of load Absence of flexible load (Bernoulli)



Cooperative load scheduling less externality more rely on each other more heavily use of backlog

## **General L analysis**

۲

## Modified system dynamics

Focus on linear dynamics

Relax deadline constraints

Substitute risk measure



- LTI system
  - Multi-objective optimization
    - Efficiency aggregate demand 2<sup>nd</sup> moment
      - **Risk** aggregate backlog 2<sup>nd</sup> moment
    - Aggregate unsatisfied load 2<sup>nd</sup> moment



## General L analysis Results



#### **Efficiency frontier characterization**

(optimal F design with weighted outputs)

#### Three way tradeoff:

- - Efficiency
- Risk
- Unsatisfied load

aggregate demand 2<sup>nd</sup> moment aggregate backlog 2<sup>nd</sup> moment aggregate unsatisfied load 2<sup>nd</sup> moment



Contribution





14

Conclusion







## Thank you



**System state:** 
$$s(t) = (x(t), d_2(t))$$

- Aggregate unshiftable loads x(t)
- Consumer arrival with flexible load  $d_2(t)$



### Load scheduling decision:

- At most 1 decision maker at t : the new type 2 agent
- Split load into two periods (t, t + 1) based on state information

$$\begin{pmatrix} u(t), d_2(t) - u(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

## Efficiency and Risk Implications of Architecture





## Case study L=2 Welfare measures



market architectures  $\rightarrow$  agent behaviors  $\rightarrow$  aggregate demand process



## Case study L=2 Solution: Non-Cooperative Case



- Full state (and everything else) information
- No coordination among strategic agents
- Focus on steady state in symmetric equilibria

Symmetric Markov Perfect equilibrium in dynamic stochastic game

$$u^{s}(x(t), d_{2}(t)) = \arg\min_{u} \{p(t)u + \mathbf{E}_{t}[p(t+1)(d_{2}(t) - u)]\}$$



$$p(t) = x(t) + u$$
  

$$p(t+1) = x(t+1) + u^{s}(x(t+1), d_{2}(t+1))$$
  
Overlapping type 2 consumers

Flavor of Stackelberg competition

Case study L=2 Solution: Non-Cooperative Case



#### Symmetric Markov Perfect equilibrium in dynamic stochastic game

$$u^{s}(x(t), d_{2}(t)) = \arg\min_{u} \{p(t)u + \mathbf{E}_{t}[p(t+1)(d_{2}(t) - u)]\}$$

#### Equilibrium strategy

There exists a unique symmetric MPE with linear equilibrium strategy:

$$u^{s}(x, d_{2}) = -a^{s}x + b^{s}d_{2} + e^{s}$$

where  $a^s, b^s, e^s$  are constants determined by  $q_1, q_2, \mu_1, \mu_2$  .

Case study L=2 Solution: Cooperative Case



#### Bellman equation for infinite horizon average cost MDP

$$\lambda^{c} + V^{c}(x) = (1 - q_{2})(x^{2} + \mathbf{E}[V^{c}(d_{1})]) + q_{2}\mathbf{E}[\min_{u}\{(x + u)^{2} + V^{c}(d_{2} - u + d_{1})\}]$$

#### **Optimal stationary policy**

There exists an optimal stationary load scheduling policy:

$$u^{c}(x, d_{2}) = -a^{c}x + b^{c}d_{2} + e^{c}$$

where  $a^c, b^c, e^c$  are constants determined by  $q_1, q_2, \mu_1, \mu_2$ .

## Case study L=2 Solutions



market architectures  $\rightarrow$  agent behaviors  $\rightarrow$  aggregate demand process



## **General L analysis** Modified system dynamics





## When do spikes occur?