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## Motivations

- The organisational structure of enterprises is changing
- Increment of outsourced activity
- From monolithic to collaborative structures that tend to reduce their size


## Chinese Motorbike Industry

- Small firms meet in online places and coffee shops
- Each one is assigned the task it is best at
- A self-organísing system of design and production



## Background

- Design a selection and coordination process among multiple partners so that:
- it is easy to automate
- it meets particular production requirements
- it optimises production costs



## Procurement Stage



Make~or-Buy
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Make-or-Buy-or-Collaborate

- Mixed Multiunit Combinatorial Auctions (MMCICA)
- Automatically selects the best Make-or-Buy-or-Collaborate decisions
- Bidding Language (IJCAl07)
- Winner Determination Problem
(1) Definition (IJCAl07)
- MMUCA
(2) Solvers
- Petri-Nets based (AAMAS07)
- Direct Integer Programming (IJCAlo7)
- Connected Component/nteger Program (AAMASO8)
o Empirical Evaluation (1JA08)
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# Mixed Multi-unit Combinatorial Auctions 

- An extension of Combinatorial Auctions that provides:
- A formal language to express preferences over operations across the supply chain
- A formalisation of the optimisation problem that selects:
(1) The best business partners
(2) A feasible sequence of operations


## Automatically selects the best Make-or-Buy-or-Collaborate decisions

Mixed Multi-unit Combinatorial Auctions


## Atomic Bid and Supply Chain Operation

## $S C O=($ Inputs, Outputs)

$\underline{\mathrm{SCO}_{4}}=\left(2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 1 \mathrm{O}_{2}+2 \mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$

- $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}=\left(1^{\prime} \mathrm{O}_{2}+2 \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, nothing $)$

$$
\mathrm{BID}_{1}=\left(1, \underline{\mathrm{SCO}_{1}}+2, \underline{\mathrm{SCO}_{2}},-\epsilon_{2}\right)
$$

$\mathrm{BID}_{1} X O R \mathrm{BID}_{2} X O R \mathrm{BID}_{3} X O R \mathrm{BID}_{4}$ $B I D_{1}$ ORBID2 OR $_{1} \mathrm{BID}_{3}$ ORBID 4

## Bidding Language

- Abidder can express preferences over bundles of SCOs (Atomic Bid)
- A bidder can submit combinations of Atomic Bids (e.g. XOR, OR)
- Theorem: $X \bigcirc R$ is expressive enough to represent any valuation


## MMUCAWDP



## Winner Determination Problem

Compute a sequence of SCOs selected among the ones submitted by bidders such that:

- it fulfils the constraints expressed by the bids
- it is feasible
- it maximises the auctioneer's revenue
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## Comparing solvers for MMCLCA

| SOLVER | TOPOLOGY | $\frac{\text { DDecision }}{\text { Variables }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petri-Nets Based <br> IntegerProgram | ACYCLIC | $O(N)$ |
| Direct IntegerProgram | ANY | $O\left(N^{2}\right)$ |
| Connected <br> Components IP | ANY | $O(N) \leq ? ? \ll O\left(N^{2}\right)$ |

$N$ : overall number of Supply Chain Operations

## Cyclic topologies


WDP SOLVERS LIMITATIONS Petri-Nets Based

Cyclic topologies


## Direct Integer Program



## Direct Integer Programming approach



## DIP explained

| Positions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCOs | SCO, | SCO | $\mathrm{SCO}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{1}$ | , |  |
|  | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | SCO |
|  | $\mathrm{SCO}_{+}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{+}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{5}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{SCO}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{6}$ |

## Problem

- The search space associated to DIP is big
- This affects the computational performance of DIP
- Can we reduce the associated search space?


## Outline

- Motivation
- Background (MMUCA)
- Limitations of WD solvers for MMUCA
- The Improved Solver
- Empirical evaluation
- Future work


## Equivalent Solutions

## 



Equivalent Solutions


# Reducing the search space 

- Can we avoid considering re-orderings of the solution sequence?
- Indeed: Assume that the auctioneer doesn't care about the ordering of a solution sequence as long as enough goods are available for every SCO in the sequence

Equivalent Sequences


# How to remove some sequences 

- Each solution to the MMCICA WDP can be reordered into a solution that complies with a given TEMPLATE
- This template is built considering the dependency relationships among SCOs

SCO Dependency Graph


SCO Dependency Graph

$5 \mathrm{SO}_{2}$
SCO


SCO Dependency Graph


## SCODependency Graph

## 



SCO Dependency Graph


SCO Dependency Graph
$\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ depends on $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$
$\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ depends on $\mathrm{SCO}_{+}$
$\mathrm{SCO}_{2}, \mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ belong to a loop


Strongly Connected Components
$\mathrm{SCO}_{2}, \mathrm{SCO}_{3}, \mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ cannot be ordered among them

We group them: GCC


Strongly Connected Components


Strongly Connected Components


The Solution Template


## Proof of correctness

- THE OREM: "each solution to the MMUCAWDP can be reordered into an equivalent solution that fulfils the solution template"
- If we reduce the search space to the sequences fulfilling the solution template we do not to lose any solutions


## Comparing DIP and CCIP

- The hypothesis behind DIP is that a SCO can hold any position within the solution sequence

$$
5 \times 6=30
$$



Comparing DIP and CCIP

- The hypothesis behind CCIP is that a SCO can hold only the positions allowed by the template

| Positions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Template }}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{2}$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{SCO}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{SCO}_{3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Empirical Evaluation


(a) Components of a car engine. (b) Supply chain for a car's engine.

## MMCICA WDP Generator




## Conclusions

- The scalability of an IP implementation of MMCICA is affected by the size of the largest connected components
- When there is a "natural" flow in the supply chain, CCIP scales reasonably well wrt number of transformations and goods


## Outline

- Motivation
- Background (MMUCA)
- Limitations of WD solvers for MMUCA
- The Improved Solver
- Empirical evaluation
- Future work


## Future Work

- Incorporate tíme
- time to perform operations
- time to finish before a deadline
- Incorporate uncertainty
- bidders may fail
- maximise the expected value
- Study connections to Planning

