**NeurIPS 2024**

# **Mitigating Externalities while Learning**

A. Scheid, A. Capitaine, E. Boursier, E. Moulines, M. Jordan, A. Durmus



2



#### **Example of externalities: factories on a river**

### **Example: factories on a river**

**Upstream utility:**  $\pi_1(q_1)$  increases with  $q_1$ **Downstream utility:**  $\pi_2(q_1, q_2)$  increases with  $q_2$  and decreases with  $q_1$ 

Upstream optimal strategy:  $q_1^{\star}$ Downstream optimal strategy:  $q_2^{\star}$  $\gamma_1^{\star}$  = arg max *q*

 $\tau_2^{\star}$  = arg max  $\pi_2(q_1^{\star}, q)$ *q*

 $\pi_1(q_1^{\star}) + \pi_2(q_1^{\star}, q_2^{\star}) < max_{q_1, q_2} {\pi(q_1) + \pi(q_1, q_2)}$ 



externality

 $\pi_1(q)$ 

**Social inefficiency:**



# **Recovering social optimum**

**Idea:** allowing proprietary rights to restore social efficiency

4

*q*1,*q*<sup>2</sup>  $max \pi_1(q_1) + \pi_2(q_1, q_2)$ 



 $\rightarrow$  recover social optimum

# **What if we learn utility functions over time?**



#### Issue: the players do not know their utilities!



#### We can recover social optimum through transfers





#### *Ressource sharing*

# **Model with transfers**

At each time t:

- 1. Downstream player proposes payment  $(\tau, \tilde{a}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [K]$
- 2. Upstream player:
- $(\tau(t),\tilde{a})$ *t* )
- $-$  plays  $A_t \in [K]$ 
	-
- 3. Downstream player:  $-$  plays  $B_t \in [K]$ 
	- $-$  gets reward  $X_{\!A_t,B_t}\!(t) \mathbf{1}_{A_t}$ 
		- observes separately

$$
(-1) - 1_{A_t = \tilde{a}} \tau
$$
  
y 
$$
X_{A_t, B_t}(t)
$$
 and 
$$
1_{A_t = \tilde{a}}
$$

7





Downstream Player

- receives and observes:  $Z_{A_t}(t) + \mathbf{1}_{A_t = \tilde{a}} \tau$ 

8



Downstream Player

# Designing no regret strategies

**Upstream player is a no-regret learner**

# **Downstream policy**

**Idea:** run batched binary searches to find  $\tau_a^{\star}$ : the *minimal incentive* to have *i* 

- Propose payment  $(a, \tau)$  for  $T^{\alpha}$  successive time steps
- Observe  $T^{\neq}$  the number of times upstream did not pull  $a$

10

Using the **no-regret assumption**, w.h.p.

\n- If 
$$
T^{\neq} > CT^{\alpha \kappa + \beta}
$$
, then  $\tau_a^{\star} > \tau - \frac{1}{T^{\beta}}$
\n- If  $T^{\neq} < T^{\alpha} - CT^{\alpha \kappa + \beta}$ , then  $\tau_a^{\star} < \tau + \frac{1}{T^{\beta}}$
\n

#### $\alpha^{\star}$  *the minimal incentive to have*  $A_t = a$

For any  $\beta$  s.t.  $\alpha \kappa + \beta < \alpha$ 



### **Downstream policy**



→ most of the regret is due to *waiting for the upstream player learning* 

- 
- $\rightarrow$  upstream and downstream players can typically use UCB as a subroutine

 $\rightarrow$  the faster does the upstream player learns, the better for the downstream one

11

#### **Theorem**

# **Conclusion**

#### **Summary:**

- Study a repeated two player games with an upstream/downstream relation
- We propose a downstream algorithm that works for general upstream policies

#### **Direct extensions:**

- Instance dependent bounds
- Anytime policy
- Extension to linear contextual case

12

### **Perspectives**

#### **Higher level questions:**

- More general interactions between multiple learning agents
- Propose *black box independent* strategies
- Potential long term strategic manipulations



**Thank you!**