

# The congested assignment problem

Anna Bogomolnaia\* and Hervé Moulin†

January 18, 2023

## Abstract

We propose a fair and efficient solution for assigning agents to  $m$  posts subject to congestion, when agents care about both their post and its congestion. Examples include assigning jobs to busy servers, students to crowded schools or crowded classes, commuters to congested routes, workers to crowded office spaces or to team projects etc...

Congestion is anonymous (it only depends on the number  $n$  of agents in a given post). A canonical interpretation of ex ante fairness allows each agent to choose  $m$  post-specific caps on the congestion they tolerate: these requests are mutually feasible if and only if the sum of the caps is  $n$ .

For ex post fairness we impose a *competitive* requirement close to envy freeness: taking the congestion profile as given each agent is assigned to one of her best posts. If a competitive assignment exists, it delivers unique congestion and welfare profiles and is also efficient and ex ante fair.

In a *fractional* (randomised or time sharing) version of our model, a unique competitive congestion profile always exists. It is approximately implemented by a mixture of ex post deterministic assignments: with an approximation factor equal to the largest utility loss from one more unit of congestion, the latter deliver identical welfare profiles and are weakly efficient.

Our approach to ex ante fairness generalises to the model where each agent's congestion is weighted. Now the caps on posts depend only upon own weight and total congestion, not on the number of other agents contributing to it. Remarkably in both models these caps are feasible if and only if they give to each agent the right to veto all but  $\frac{1}{m}$  of their feasible allocations.

*Acknowledgments:* critical comments and bibliographic references by Felix Fischer and Ioannis Caragiannis were very helpful; we also thank participants in seminars and conferences at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Singapore Management University, the Indian Statistical Institute Dehli, and the University of Auckland.

*Keywords:* *assignment, congestion, guarantee, competitive, free mobility, envy free*

---

\*Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow and Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne, CNRS, Paris

†Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow

# 1 Introduction

We take a normative viewpoint on the assignment of agents to excludable public items subject to congestion that we call "posts". Examples include: how to assign fairly and efficiently students to crowded schools, jobs to busy servers, workers to shared office spaces or team projects, messages or commuters in a congested communication or road network, etc..

The vast microeconomic literature on the bilateral assignment of agents to positions ([21], [18], [6], etc..) includes the special case of the "many agents to one position" problem, particularly rich in applications to school choice ([1]), assignment of students to classes ([7]), workers to employers etc.. These models routinely incorporate upper or lower bounds on the filling of each post: maximal capacity of a classroom or a school, minimal quotas for some subsets of agents in some posts ([12]) etc.. But when these hard constraints do not bite, congestion remains an important component of agents' preferences: some parents will accept more crowded classes if the school's academic context is better; an idle low quality server may be more appealing than a top quality but busy one, etc.. We propose what we believe to be the first mechanism design paper incorporating the potentially complicated impact of congestion on welfare into the definition of a fair and efficient assignment.

Starting with the Wardrop equilibrium of transportation models ([10]) a long and distinguished microeconomic literature discusses congestion games in the "free mobility" regime: each player chooses freely her post, and the congestion results of the players' non cooperative equilibrium behaviour. A decentralised view of congestion is surely an appropriate model for rush hour traffic, but in many other assignment problems (students to classes, workers to office spaces, etc..) the free mobility game is impractical and/or normatively repugnant. More on free mobility games and their connection to our approach in the subsection below.

Our methodology is simple: we apply the two tests of fairness standing out from more than seven decades of formal research on the fair division of private commodities. The first one captures the worst case welfare level (the *guarantee*) that a participant can secure when, *ex ante*, she is only aware of her own preferences and the physical description of the assignment problem.<sup>1</sup> Our second test, *competitiveness*, is very close to – yet different from – the familiar envy-freeness *property* ([11], [23]): taking the congestion at each post as a given (independent of my own moves), I am assigned to one of my preferred (post × congestion) pairs.

We discuss the guarantee approach in two models: when congestion is anonymous (aka unweighted), and when each agent's contribution to congestion is weighted. We identify in each case a canonical guarantee based on different *ex ante* information (different interpretations of the worst case) but implementing effectively the same veto rights.

---

<sup>1</sup>The seminal example is Steinhaus' cake-cutting mechanism, in which each agent can guarantee that her share will be worth at least  $\frac{1}{n}$ -th of her valuation for the entire cake, irrespective of the actions of the other  $n - 1$  participants ([22]).

We develop the competitive approach when congestion is anonymous. Competitiveness may not be feasible in the deterministic model, but if it is it selects an essentially unique efficient assignment. Competitiveness is always feasible in the randomised (or time sharing) version of the model, where it still delivers an approximately unique recommendation.

**overview of our results** In section 2 congestion is anonymous. We have  $m$  posts and  $n$  agents, each one bringing one unit of congestion where they are assigned. An agent cares about her allocation  $(a, s_a)$  (to post  $a$  shared with  $s_a - 1$  other agents). The canonical guarantee allows her to report for each post  $a$  the maximal congestion  $\lambda_{ia}$  she accepts if assigned to  $a$  (e. g.,  $\lambda_{ia} = 0$  if she refuses  $a$  altogether). Provided the sum  $\sum_a \lambda_{ia}$  is  $n$ , any profile  $\lambda = (\lambda_i)$  of one such request per agent  $i$  is simultaneously satisfied by at least one assignment :Proposition 1. We call such assignment  $\lambda$ -Fair. To identify the  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments requires much less than a full report of individual preferences: the vector  $\lambda_i$  is cognitively simple and reveals little of agent  $i$ 's full preferences.

But the set of  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments can still be large and may include assignments with sharply different welfare consequences, and/or seriously inefficient ones. Both issues are solved by the ex post test of competitiveness.

An assignment is competitive if I weakly prefer my allocation  $(a, s_a)$  to any other agent's allocation  $(b, s_b)$  as well as to  $(c, 1)$  if post  $c$  is empty.

Proposition 2 explains why a competitive assignment is a compelling normative solution: if preferences over allocations are strict there is only one such assignment and it is efficient; with general preferences the corresponding congestion and welfare profiles are still unique and the latter is efficient (at least weakly and often strongly Pareto optimal);  $\lambda$ -Fairness is preserved as well.

To remedy the possible absence of any competitive assignment in the deterministic model, we allow randomised assignments and assume vNM expected utilities (subsection 2.2). Our concept of competitiveness is "ex post": it selects first the unique *competitive expected congestion profile*  $\sigma^*$  (Definition 3 and Lemma 2), then implements it by a distribution over finitely many deterministic assignments in which an agent is assigned to a post in her competitive demand at  $\sigma^*$ . These assignments are approximately (up to twice the worst utility loss of one unit of congestion) identical congestion-wise and welfare-wise: Theorem 1. In an example where the two concepts make disjoint recommendations we contrast our ex post definition of competitiveness with the familiar ex ante notion of envy freeness in the random assignment literature: we believe that our concept is easier to explain and accept in particular because its recommendation is essentially unique.

In the weighted congestion model (section 3) each agent  $i$  brings  $w_i$  units of congestion: this could measure the impact of trucks versus cars on traffic, of jobs with different processing times, of students with different claims on the resources of the school, etc.. As usual severely complicates the congestion problem: for instance the existence of a free mobility equilibrium is guaranteed under anonymous but not under weighted congestion ([15]), and the computationally

challenging knapsack problems arise ([8]).

The canonical guarantee still allows each agent to cap the maximal congestion that she tolerates on each post, but this time it only depends upon this agent’s own weight  $w_i$  and the total weight of the other agents, *not* on the number of agents in the problem. The system of conditions detailed in Theorem 2 ensuring that the individual reports (profiles of caps) are mutually feasible is similar to – though less transparent than – the previous one in Proposition 1. The key fact is that in both models, the canonical guarantee allows each agent to veto exactly all but the top  $\frac{1}{m}$ -th share of her feasible allocations.

The concluding section 4 briefly discusses several possible extensions or variants of our problem that can inspire further research.

**Some relevant literature** The vast literature on non cooperative/ free mobility congestion games includes the seminal instance of potential games ([19], [16]) and offers powerful existence results of Nash and strong equilibria ([15], [13]).

Free mobility games also play a key role in the hedonic model of coalition formation ([2], [3]) in particular local public goods ([4], [5]). They (the congestion games) host the seminal discussion of the price of anarchy ([14], [20]) and of algorithmic mechanism design ([17]).

The two fairness properties organising our discussion are closely related to the Nash equilibria of the corresponding free mobility game.

If congestion is anonymous this game always has at least one Nash equilibrium and each equilibrium implements a  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment, provided each  $\lambda_i$  vetoes all but agent  $i$ ’s top  $n$  allocations (Lemma 1). Conversely a free mobility equilibrium is competitive ”up to one unit of congestion” but not necessarily efficient. The connection is more tenuous if congestion is weighted because the free mobility game may not have any Nash equilibrium ([15]) but the properties just mentioned in Lemma 1 still hold.

The classic combinatorial optimisation knapsack (aka bin packing) problems ([8], see also makespan minimisation as in [17]) discuss like us how to fill bins (posts) with indivisible balls (agents); but the balls are just objects in those problems and the concern is about the ”welfare” of the bins (e.g., to respect a capacity constraint) while we focus on the welfare of the balls and treat the bins as objects.

One exception is [9] where each ball has its own maximal acceptable congestion in each bin: this is exactly like the reported profiles of caps  $\lambda_i$  above, with the difference that the caps are exogenous in [9] so that we may not be able to assign all balls to some bin. The paper shows the complexity of computing the maximal number of balls we can assign and evaluates the price of anarchy of the free mobility equilibrium for this metric.

## 2 anonymous congestion

We have  $m$  posts denoted  $a, b, \dots$ , and their set is  $A$ .

Each agent  $i$  in the finite set  $N$  of cardinality  $n$  must be assigned to some post  $a$  in  $A$ , which creates one unit of congestion at  $a$ .

An *assignment* of agents to posts is a partition  $P = (S_a)_{a \in A}$  of  $N$  where  $S_a$  is the set of agents assigned to post  $a$ ; the sets  $S_a, S_b$  are mutually disjoint and at most  $m - 1$  of them can be empty. The corresponding congestion at post  $a$  is  $s_a = |S_a|$  (the cardinality of  $S_a$ ); we call  $s = (s_a)_{a \in A}$  the *congestion profile* of  $P$ .

We use the notation  $[q]$  for the interval  $\{1, q\}$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ . An agent's ordinal preferences depends upon his assigned post  $a$  and the congestion  $s_a$  at that post. Agent  $i$ 's (transitive and complete) preferences  $\succeq_i$  bear on the set  $A \times [n]$  of feasible allocations  $(a, s_a)$  and are strictly decreasing in  $s_a$  (indifferences between allocations at different posts are allowed).

When the assignment is randomised in subsection 2.2 we assume that the agents' preferences are represented by vNM expected utility functions  $u_i(a, s)$  over  $A \times [n]$ .

## 2.1 the canonical guarantee

In the ex ante state agent  $i$  only knows the set  $A$  and  $n$ , the number of agents. He selects for each post  $a$  the largest congestion  $\lambda_{ia}$  he accepts if assigned to  $a$ :  $\lambda_{ia} \in [n] \cup \{0\}$ . So  $\lambda_{ia} = 0$  means that  $i$  refuses to be assigned to  $a$ ,  $\lambda_{ia} = 1$  that he wants to be alone if assigned there, etc..

**Definition 1** *Given  $A, N$ , and a profile of caps  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_{ia})_{a \in A}$ , the assignment  $P$  is  $\lambda$ -Fair iff*

$$s_a \leq \lambda_{ia} \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ and } i \in S_a \quad (1)$$

In what set can we allow each agent to choose his profile of caps so that, when the  $n$  agents choose independently in that set, the constraints (1) are jointly compatible?

**Proposition 1** *Given  $A, N$  let each agent  $i \in N$  choose a profile of caps  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_{ia})_{a \in A}$  in the following simplex  $\Delta^{\mathbb{N}}(A; n)$  with integer coordinates:*

$$\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{ia} = n \text{ and } \lambda_{ia} \geq 0 \text{ for all } a \in A \quad (2)$$

*Then there exists at least one  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment  $P$ .*

*The constraints (2) cannot be relaxed: if agents are allowed to report at least one profile  $\lambda_i$  such that  $\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{ia} \leq n - 1$ , there may exist no  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment.*

**Proof** *Step 1 existence*

Notation: if  $\succeq$  is a preference over the set  $Z$ , a *top- $q$  set of  $\succeq$  in  $Z$*  is a subset  $X$  of size  $q$  in  $Z$  such that  $y \succeq z$  for all  $y \in X$  and  $z \in Z \setminus X$ .

We use a simple greedy algorithm and an induction argument on  $n$ .

If  $\lambda_{ia} = 0$  for each  $i$  we set  $S_a = \emptyset$  and it remains to prove the claim on the residual problem  $(A \setminus \{a\}, N, \lambda)$ . We clean up in this way all posts that nobody accepts so we can assume from now on that  $\max_i \lambda_{ia} \geq 1$  for all  $a$ .

Pick any post  $a$  and order the caps  $\lambda_{ia}, i \in N$  as  $\lambda^{*1} \geq \lambda^{*2} \geq \dots$ . Write  $\tilde{k}$  for the largest  $k$  s.t.  $\lambda^{*k} \geq k$  (well defined because  $\lambda^{*1} \geq 1$ ) and pick a top- $\tilde{k}$  subset  $S_a$  of the ordering  $\{i \succeq^a j \Leftrightarrow \lambda_{ia} \geq \lambda_{ja}\}$  in  $N$ . Then  $\{\lambda_{ia}\}_{i \in S_a} = \{\lambda^{*k}\}_{1 \leq k \leq \tilde{k}}$  and  $\lambda_{ja} \leq \tilde{k}$  for each  $j \in N \setminus S_a$  by definition of  $\tilde{k}$ .

Assigning  $S_a$  to  $a$  meets inequalities (1) for  $a$ , and in the residual problem  $(A \setminus \{a\}, N \setminus S_a, \lambda)$  we have  $\sum_{b \in A \setminus \{a\}} \lambda_{ib} \geq n - \tilde{k} = |N \setminus S_a|$  so the induction argument applies: Proposition 1 implies at once that any set of caps s. t.  $\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{ia} \geq n$  for each  $i$  ensures the existence of a  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment.

*Step 2 maximality* If agent  $i$  reports caps s. t.  $\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{ia} \leq n - 1$  and everyone else reports  $\lambda_i$  as well, a  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment cannot have more than  $\lambda_{ia}$  agents posted at  $a$ , for each  $a$ , so that not everyone can be assigned to a post. ■

Agent  $i$  will be assigned to a given post  $a$  by reporting  $\lambda_{ia} = n, \lambda_{ib} = 0$  for  $b \neq a$ . At the other extreme reporting<sup>2</sup>  $\lambda_{ia} = \lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor$  or  $\lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$  for all  $a$  guarantees a congestion level uniform (up to one unit) across all posts.

If agent  $i$  with preferences  $\succeq_i$ , clueless about other agents' preferences, maximises his welfare in the worst case he will select the caps  $\lambda_{ia}$  so that the union of the intervals  $\{a\} \times [\lambda_{ia}]$  is a top- $n$  set of  $\succeq_i$  in  $A \times [n]$ .<sup>3</sup> Indeed  $i$  cannot rule out the case where everyone else has identical preferences  $\succeq_i$  and reports identical caps. Then an assignment rule treating equals equally can give agent  $i$  anyone of the allocations  $(a, \lambda_{ia})$ , in particular a worst one in this set. Thus  $i$ 's *cautious* report can also be viewed as a *truthful* message about his preferences.

We now relate Proposition 1 to a classic result in the congestion games literature. Given a problem  $(A, N, \succeq_i, i \in N)$  we define the non cooperative *free mobility game*: each agent chooses a post  $a$  in  $A$ , then consumes the allocation  $(a, q_a)$  where  $q_a - 1$  is the number of other agents who chose  $a$ .

**Lemma 1** Fix a problem  $(A, N, \succeq_i, i \in N)$ .

- i*) The free mobility game has at least one Nash equilibrium (thereafter FMEq).
- ii*) At a free mobility equilibrium each agent  $i$ 's allocation is in a top- $n$  set of  $\succeq_i$  in  $A \times [n]$ . Therefore a FMEq assignment is a  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment for each agent  $i$  for at least one cautious/truthful report of this agent.

Statement *i*) is the main result in Milchtaich (1996).

*Proof of statement ii)* Fix a FMEq  $x = (x_i)_{i \in N} \in A^N$  and use the notation  $s(a|x)$  for the resulting congestion of post  $a$ . The equilibrium property is  $(x_i, s(x_i|x)) \succeq_i (a, s(a|x) + 1)$  for all  $a$ ; combining this with  $(x_i, s(x_i|x)) \succ_i (x_i, s(x_i|x) + 1)$  we see that the only allocations that  $i$  could strictly prefer to  $(x_i, s(x_i|x))$  are in  $\{x_i\} \times [s(x_i|x) - 1]$  and  $\{a\} \times [s(a|x)]$  for each  $a \neq x_i$ : their number is  $n - 1$ . ■

We can use statement *i*) to prove Proposition 1: attach to each profile  $\lambda_i$  in its premises a strict preference  $\succ_i$  on  $A \times [n]$  of which the top  $n$  allocations cover the union of the intervals  $\{a\} \times [\lambda_{ia}]$ . Then a free mobility equilibrium at

<sup>2</sup>Notation:  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  and  $\lceil x \rceil$  are the largest (resp. smallest) integer bounded above (resp. below) by  $x$ .

<sup>3</sup>This set may not be unique if  $\succeq_i$  has some indifferences.

those preferences implements a  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment. This is of course an overkill as the proof of Milchtaich’s result is much more difficult than the easy induction argument for Proposition 1. Note that the existence of a FMEq is not guaranteed in the weighted congestion model (section 3).

We illustrate the power of the  $\lambda$ -Fairness constraint (1) and its connection to the FMEq assignments in some examples.

If all agents report the same profile of caps  $\lambda_0$  this is clearly the unique  $\lambda$ -Fair congestion profile; we start with two more examples where this uniqueness still holds.

**Example 1: two posts** If  $m = 2$  and there are several  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments they have the same congestion and welfare profiles and are easy to describe. Fix  $A = \{a, b\}$ , the vectors of caps  $\lambda_i, i \in N$ , and arrange the caps on  $a$  and on  $b$  decreasingly as  $\lambda_a^{*k}, \lambda_b^{*k}, 1 \leq k \leq n$ . Because  $\lambda_{ia} + \lambda_{ib} = n$  for all  $i$ , there is for any  $k \in [n]$  (at least) one agent s. t.  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_a^{*k}, \lambda_b^{*n-k+1})$ . There is clearly a single  $\ell$  s. t.

$$\lambda_a^{*\ell} \geq \ell \geq \lambda_a^{*\ell+1} \iff \lambda_b^{*n-\ell} \geq n - \ell \geq \lambda_b^{*n-\ell+1}$$

The assignment  $P$  is  $\lambda$ -Fair if  $S_a$  is a top- $\ell$  set of the ordering  $\geq^a$  (by weakly decreasing  $\lambda_{ia}$ ) in  $N$  – equivalently  $S_b$  is a top- $(n - \ell)$  set of the ordering  $\geq^b$  in  $N$ . If  $\lambda_a^{*\ell} > \lambda_a^{*\ell+1}$  ( $\iff \lambda_b^{*n-\ell+1} < \lambda_b^{*n-\ell}$ ) this defines a unique partition which is the unique  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment. If  $\lambda_a^{*\ell} = \lambda_a^{*\ell+1} = \ell$  we have  $q$  "borderline" agents,  $q \geq 2$ , reporting  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_a^{*\ell}, \lambda_b^{*n-\ell})$ , while  $p_a$  agents accept a congestion on  $a$  higher than  $\ell$  and  $p_b$  agents accept more than  $n - \ell$  on  $b$ . The  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments place any subset of borderline agents in  $S_a$  together with the  $p_a$  "fans" of post  $a$  and the rest in  $S_b$  with the fans of  $b$ .

Note that if the reports are truthful, the sets of FMEq and of  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments coincide.

**Example 2: three posts and a "single"  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment** The  $n = 12$  agents are split in four types labeled  $\alpha$  to  $\delta$  with three agents in each type. Agents of a given type are not necessarily identical but they report the same caps as follows, implying that there is just one  $\lambda$ -Fair congestion and six  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments by permuting the type  $\alpha$  agents:

$n = 12$	$a$	$b$	$c$			
	$\alpha\alpha\alpha$	4	4	4		
	$\beta\beta\beta$	8	2	2	$\implies$ $\lambda$ -Fair assignment:	
	$\gamma\gamma\gamma$	2	8	2		$a$
	$\delta\delta\delta$	2	2	8		$b$
						$c$
						$\alpha\beta\beta\beta$ $\alpha\gamma\gamma\gamma$ $\alpha\delta\delta\delta$

The claim follows by noticing that we can fit  $\lambda$ -Fairly at most 4 agents on each post, therefore the only possible congestion profile is 4 agents per post. Here again free mobility equilibrium and  $\lambda$ -Fairness pick the same assignments.

More generally write  $c^{mx}(a; \lambda)$  for the maximal number of agents we can fit  $\lambda$ -Fairly at post  $a$ : if  $\sum_{a \in A} c^{mx}(a; \lambda) = n$  then all  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments generate the congestion profile  $s(a) = c^{mx}(a; \lambda)$  for all  $a$ . The converse property holds as well: *all  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments have the same congestion profile only if  $\sum_{a \in A} c^{mx}(a; \lambda) = n$ .* We omit the easy proofs.

**Example 3: three posts and multiple  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments**

$$\begin{array}{rcccc}
 n = 15 & a & b & c \\
 \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha & 7 & 7 & 1 \\
 \beta\beta\beta\beta\beta & 7 & 1 & 7 \\
 \gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma & 1 & 7 & 7
 \end{array} \implies$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
 a & b & c & \\
 \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha & \gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma & \beta\beta\beta\beta\beta & \text{and} \\
 a & b & c & \\
 \alpha\alpha\alpha & \alpha\alpha\gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma & \beta\beta\beta\beta\beta & \text{are } \lambda\text{-Fair}
 \end{array}$$

These  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments have very different congestion and welfare implications. Both types of  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments may or may not describe a FMEq, depending on individual preferences. For instance an  $\alpha$ -agent in the symmetric assignment on the left may prefer  $(b, 6)$  to  $(a, 5)$ . So the converse of statement ii) in Lemma 1 does not hold.

**2.2 competitiveness**

Note that  $\lambda$ -Fairness, in addition to the multiplicity just illustrated, can easily allow inefficient assignments. For instance in Example 2 the six assignments of the  $\alpha$ -agents respect  $\lambda$ -Fairness but if each  $\alpha$ -agent prefers a different allocation  $(x, 4)$  only one of these is efficient. Competitive assignments do not have this problem and their recommendation is unambiguous as well.

**2.2.1 deterministic competitiveness**

We use the notation  $z \vee y = \max\{z, y\}$ .

**Definition 2** *Fix a problem  $(A, N, \succeq_i, i \in N)$ . The assignment  $P$  is competitive (Comp) iff*

$$\text{for all } a \in A \text{ and } i \in S_a : (a, s_a) \succeq_i (x, s_x \vee 1) \text{ for all } x \in A$$

The difference with the familiar envy freeness property is in the treatment of empty posts: an agent preferring an empty post  $x$  to her own post demands to move there; in this case our agent cannot assume that the post remains empty when she gets there ( $(a, 0)$  is not an allocation) so Comp requires  $(a, s_a) \succeq_i (x, 1)$ . But any assignment where all agents share a single post are automatically envy free, so the concept must be adapted to our model.

A FMEq assignment is competitive "up to one unit of congestion on an occupied post"; conversely at a competitive assignment  $P$  the corresponding strategies  $x_i = a \iff i \in S_a$  form a FMEq. Both claims follow at once from the definitions.



**Proposition 2:** Fix a problem  $(A, N, (u_i)_{i \in N})$ .

i) All competitive assignments have the same congestion profile (except possibly at some posts occupied by at most one agent), and the same welfare profile across agents.

ii) A competitive assignment is weakly efficient, and efficient if preferences are strict and/or if all posts are occupied.

iii) A competitive assignment is  $\lambda_i$ -Fair if  $\lambda_i$  describes a truthful top- $n$  set of  $\succeq_i$  for all  $i$ .

**Proof**

i) *Uniqueness* At every congestion profile  $s \in \Delta^{\mathbb{N}}(A; n)$  (see(2)) we define agent  $i$ 's demand  $D(i; s) = \{a | (a, s_a \vee 1) \succeq_i (x, s_x \vee 1) \text{ for all } x\}$ : the assignment  $P$  is competitive if and only if  $a \in D(i; s)$  whenever  $i \in S_a$ .

Fix  $P = (S_x)_{x \in A}$ ,  $P^* = (S_x^*)_{x \in A}$  both competitive and s. t.  $s \neq s^*$ . Assume first that  $A^* = \{a \in A | s_a^* \vee 1 > s_a \vee 1\}$  is non empty and note that in  $A^*$  we have  $s_a^* > s_a, 1$ . Fixing an agent  $i$  we claim that if  $D(i; s^*)$  intersects  $A^*$  at  $a$  then  $D(i; s)$  must be a subset of  $A^*$ .

If the claim fails there is some  $b \in D(i; s)$  outside  $A^*$  such that, for all  $a$  in  $A^*$ :  $(b, s_b \vee 1) \succeq_i (a, s_a \vee 1) \succ_i (a, s_a^*)$  (the strict preference because  $s_a^* > s_a, 1$ ). By the choice of  $b$  we also have  $s_b \vee 1 \geq s_b^* \vee 1$ ; these two facts together give  $(b, s_b^* \vee 1) \succ_i (a, s_a^*)$ , and as  $a$  was arbitrary in  $A^*$  it follows that  $D(i; s^*)$  cannot intersect  $A^*$ , contradiction.

Now for each  $i \in \cup_{a \in A^*} S_a^*$  the claim says  $D(i; s) \subseteq A^*$  therefore  $\sum_{a \in A^*} s_a \geq \sum_{a \in A^*} s_a^*$ , contradicting  $s_a^* > s_a$  in  $A^*$ . We conclude that  $A^*$  must be empty.

So  $P, P^*$  must be such that  $s_a^* \vee 1 = s_a \vee 1$  for all  $a$ : this means that  $s_a^* \neq s_a$  can only happen when one of  $s_a^*, s_a$  is 0 and the other is 1, as claimed in statement i).

We check now that all agents are indifferent between the two assignments. Say agent  $i$  is in  $S_a$  and  $S_b^*$ : from  $s_a, s_b^* \geq 1$  and Comp we have

$$(a, s_a) \succeq_i (b, s_b \vee 1) \text{ and } (b, s_b^*) \succeq_i (a, s_a^* \vee 1) \quad (3)$$

If  $s_a = s_a^*$  and  $s_b = s_b^*$  we are done. If  $s_a \neq s_a^*$  and  $s_b = s_b^*$  then  $s_a = 1 > 0 = s_a^*$  and  $s_b^* \geq 1$  so that (3) gives  $(a, 1) \succeq_i (b, s_b) = (b, s_b^*) \succeq_i (a, 1)$  as desired; the last subcase  $s_a \neq s_a^*$  and  $s_b \neq s_b^*$  is just as easy.

A simple example with multiple competitive congestion profiles has all agents except 1 and 2 refusing the three posts  $a, b, c$ , while 1 and 2 refuse all but  $a, b, c$  and they are indifferent between  $(a, 1)$ ,  $(b, 1)$  and  $(c, 1)$ .

ii) *Efficiency* Assume, to the contrary, that  $P = (S_x)$  is competitive and Pareto inferior to  $Q = (T_x)$ . Say  $i$  assigned to  $a$  at  $P$  is assigned to  $b$  at  $Q$  ( $a, b$  not necessarily distinct), and suppose that post  $b$  is occupied at  $P$ :  $s_b \geq 1$ . Then by Comp and the weak Pareto improvement we have

$$(b, S_b) \preceq_i (a, S_a) \preceq_i (b, T_b) \implies s_b \geq t_b \quad (4)$$

and  $s_b > t_b$  if agent  $i$  improves strictly at  $Q$ . If all posts are occupied at  $P$  then (4) implies  $s = t$  and we have a contradiction..

If instead for some agent  $i$  goes from  $a$  at  $P$  to  $c$  at  $Q$  and  $c$  is empty at  $P$ ,  $s_c = 0$ , we have

$$(c, 1) \preceq_i (a, S_a) \preceq_i (c, T_c) \implies t_c = 1 \text{ and } (a, S_a) \simeq_i (c, 1) \quad (5)$$

If preferences are strict we conclude again that  $P$  is Pareto optimal. Even if they are not we see that  $i$  is a weak Pareto optimum (not all agent benefit strictly).

The argument above explains how a competitive assignment can be Pareto inferior: in the situation (5) moving  $i$  from  $a$  to  $c$  and changing nothing else is a Pareto improvement to a new assignment  $\tilde{P}$  where agent  $i$ 's competitive demand is now  $a$  if  $s_a \geq 2$  (because  $(a, s_a - 1) \succ_i (c, 1)$ ). If  $s_a = 1$  then  $\tilde{P}$  is still competitive and welfare-wise indifferent to  $P$ .

A simple example of this situation has two posts  $a, b$ , all but agent 1 refusing  $a$  and agent 1 indifferent between  $(a, 1)$  and  $(b, n)$ ; the unique competitive assignment has everyone at  $b$ , and moving agent 1 to  $a$  is Pareto improving. But only happens if  $\preceq_i$  has some indifference and some post is unoccupied. Moreover the PO improvement cannot be strict.

*iii)  $\lambda_i$ -Fairness* This follows from Lemma 1 and the remark that a competitive assignment is an FMEq (just before Proposition 2). ■

Dampening the appeal of competitive assignments explained by Proposition 2, it is easy to find examples where none exists.

**Example 4: two posts and no competitive assignment** The truthful reports by the four agents allow only two  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments:

$$\begin{array}{rcc} m = 2, n = 4 & a & b \\ \text{reports } \lambda: & \alpha, \alpha' & 2 \quad 2 \\ & \beta & 3 \quad 1 \\ & \gamma & 1 \quad 3 \end{array} \implies \lambda\text{-Fair: } \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ \alpha, \beta & \alpha', \gamma \end{array} \text{ and } \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ \alpha', \beta & \alpha, \gamma \end{array} \quad (6)$$

If both agents  $\alpha, \alpha'$  prefer  $(a, 2)$  to  $(b, 2)$  no assignment is competitive.

A similar situation happens in example 2 when the three  $\alpha$  agents have identical preferences over the 3 allocations  $(x, 4)$ .

### 2.2.2 fractional competitiveness

We assume now that the agents' preferences are represented by vNM expected utility functions  $u_i(a, s)$  over  $A \times [n]$ . For a finite set  $Z$  the notation  $\Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(Z; w)$  is the simplex of sum  $w$  with non negative real coordinates in  $Z$ .

We extend each  $u_i$  to a function  $u_i(a, x)$  by linear interpolation between the two rounded up and down values of  $x$ ,  $\lceil x \rceil$  and  $\lfloor x \rfloor$ :

$$u_i(a, x) = \frac{\lceil x \rceil - x}{\lceil x \rceil - \lfloor x \rfloor} u_i(a, \lfloor x \rfloor) + \frac{x - \lfloor x \rfloor}{\lceil x \rceil - \lfloor x \rfloor} u_i(a, \lceil x \rceil)$$

so  $u_i(a, x)$  is continuous and strictly decreasing in  $x \in [0, n]$ , the interval in  $\mathbb{R}$ . In what follows  $x$  is the expected congestion at some post  $a$  when a random (integer) congestion takes only the values  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  and  $\lceil x \rceil$  and  $u_i(a, x)$  is the corresponding vNM utility of agent  $i$ .

As in the proof of Proposition 2, we define agent  $i$ 's *competitive demand* at the expected congestion profile  $\sigma \in \Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(A; n)$ :

$$D(u_i, \sigma) = \arg \max_{x \in A} u_i(x, \sigma_x \vee 1)$$

This demand ignores the effect of agent  $i$ 's own presence at post  $x$  but correctly anticipates that the ex post congestion will round up or down the expected one  $\sigma_a$ .

**Definition 3:** *The fractional congestion profile  $\sigma^* \in \Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(A; n)$  is competitive iff*

$$\sigma^* \in \sum_{i \in N} \Delta^{\mathbb{R}}[D(u_i, \sigma^*); 1] \quad (7)$$

*The pair  $(\{P^k\}_{k=1}^K, \mathcal{L})$  of  $K$  deterministic assignments  $P^k$  together with a lottery  $\mathcal{L}$  over these, implements the competitive profile  $\sigma^*$  if, first, the expected congestion over these  $K$  assignments is  $\sigma^*$ :  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{L}}(s_a^k) = \sigma_a^*$  for all  $a$ ; and second for all  $k \in [K]$ , all  $i$  and all  $a$  we have:*

$$i \in S_a^k \implies a \in D(u_i, \sigma^*) \text{ and } s_a^k = \lfloor \sigma_a^* \rfloor \text{ or } \lceil \sigma_a^* \rceil \quad (8)$$

Property (7) means that we can achieve the expected congestion profile  $\sigma^*$  by assigning randomly each agent (with a well chosen probability distribution) over the posts in her competitive demand. Property (8) and the choice of the lottery explain how it will be done: together they provide an ex post test of fairness of which the next two results explain the power. After these statements we contrast our new concept with the ex ante envy freeness property familiar to the random assignment literature.

**Lemma 2** *In any problem  $(A, N, u_i, i \in N)$  there is a unique competitive congestion profile  $\sigma^*$ , except possibly at some posts where  $\sigma_a^* \leq 1$ . We can implement it by (typically several) pairs  $(\{P^k\}_{k=1}^K, \mathcal{L})$  as in Definition 3.*

**Proof:** The existence of a competitive profile  $\sigma^*$  follows by applying the Kakutani fixed point argument to the convex compact valued correspondence  $\Gamma(\sigma) = \sum_{i \in N} \Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(D(u_i, \sigma); 1)$  mapping  $\Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(A; n)$  into itself. To check that the graph of  $\Gamma$  is closed (implying that  $\Gamma$  is upper-semi-continuous) we take a sequence  $(\sigma^t, \tau^t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  converging to  $(\sigma, \tau)$  and s. t.

$$\tau^t = \sum_{i \in N} \tau_i^t \text{ and } \tau_i^t \in \Delta^{\mathbb{R}}[D(u_i, \sigma^t); 1]$$

We can find a subsequence such that all sequences  $\{\tau_i^t\}$  converge, and all sets  $D(u_i, \sigma^t)$  are constant in  $t$ , which proves the claim.

The proof that  $\sigma^*$  is unique, except perhaps when  $\sigma_a^* \leq 1$  follows exactly that of statement  $i$ ) in Proposition 2, so we omit it.

In the "left case" the set  $B$  is now where both  $s, s^*$  are  $\leq 1$ ; welfare equivalence holds: because we postulate that an agent evaluates being assigned to a post with expected congestion  $\leq 1$  as being alone there.

We turn to the existence of an implementing pair  $(\{P^k\}_{k=1}^K, \mathcal{L})$ . Property (?? means that there is a semi-stochastic (each row sums to 1) matrix  $\pi^* = [\pi_{ia}^*] \in [0, 1]^{N \times A}$  where each column  $a$  to  $\sigma_a$ , and  $\pi_{ia}^* > 0$  can only happen if  $a \in D(u_i, \sigma^*)$ . Define the set  $\Pi$  of semi-stochastic matrices  $\pi$  s.t. for all  $a$  and  $i$

$$\{\pi_{ia}^* > 0 \implies a \in D(u_i, \sigma^*)\} \text{ and } \lfloor \sigma_a^* \rfloor \leq \sum_{i \in N} \pi_{ia} \leq \lceil \sigma_a^* \rceil$$

This set is a convex compact polytope, non empty as it contains  $\pi^*$ . We claim that each extreme point of  $\Pi$  is deterministic, i. e., its entries are all integers or zero: then  $\pi$  represents a deterministic assignment  $P$  meeting (8) and  $\pi^*$  is a convex combination of such extreme points, which gives the desired collection  $P^k$  and lottery  $\mathcal{L}$ .

We prove the claim by contradiction: pick an extreme point  $\pi$  of  $\Pi$  and represent  $\pi$  as the bipartite graph  $G$  on  $N \times A$  containing the edge  $ia$  iff  $\pi_{ia} > 0$ . Extract from  $G$  the subgraph  $G_0$  of its fractional entries  $ia : 0 < \pi_{ia} < 1$  and let  $F$  be the set of posts  $a$  s.t.  $\sum_{i \in N} \pi_{ia}$  is fractional (not an integer or zero). If  $F$  is non empty it contains some post  $a$ : at least one edge  $ia$  is in  $G_0$ ; then at least one other edge  $ib$  is in  $G_0$  ( $\pi$  is semi-stochastic at  $i$ ); if  $b \in F$  then we can add a small  $\varepsilon$  to  $\pi_{ia}$  and take away  $\varepsilon$  from  $\pi_{ib}$  without leaving  $\Pi$ ; or vice versa: this contradicts the extremality of  $\pi$ , so  $b$  is not in  $F$  after all. But then there is another edge  $jb$  in  $G_0$  because  $\sum_{i \in N} \pi_{ib}$  is an integer, and again there is some new edge  $jc$  in  $G_0$ ; if  $c = a$  or  $c \in F$  we can again perturb a little the entries of  $\pi$  in two opposite ways and reach a contradiction; this construction must stop at a new post in  $F$  or cycle back to  $a$ . The claim is proved and the proof is complete. ■

The key properties of the solution concept we just proved always exists are: first, that any two deterministic assignments  $P^k, P^\ell$  that can be selected ex post (both are in the support of  $\mathcal{L}$ ) yield approximately identical utilities; and second, each  $P^k$  shares (approximately) the properties of deterministic competitive assignments in Proposition 2. Agent  $i$ 's approximation parameter is her worst utility loss from one additional unit of congestion  $\delta_i = \max_{(a,s) \in A \times [n]} \{u_i(a, s) - u_i(a, s+1)\}$ .

**Theorem 1**

*i) For any set of deterministic assignments  $\{P^k\}_{k=1}^K$  as in Lemma 2 agent  $i$ 's utility at two such assignments  $P^k, P^\ell$  differ by at most  $2\delta_i$ : for all  $k, \ell \in [K]$*

$$i \in S_a^k \cap S_b^\ell \implies |u_i(a, s_a^k) - u_i(a, s_a^\ell)| \leq 2\delta_i$$

*Each deterministic assignment  $P^k$*

*ii) assigns each agent  $i$  to a post in her competitive demand  $D(u_i, \sigma^*)$ , and implements at each post the competitive congestion  $\sigma^*$  rounded up or down.*

iii) is  $2\delta_i$ -competitive:

$$\text{for all } a, i: i \in S_a^k \implies u_i(a, s_a^k) \geq u_i(x, s_x^k \vee 1) - 2\delta_i \text{ for all } x$$

iv) is weakly  $2\delta_i$ -efficient in utility: for any deterministic assignment  $Q = (T_a)_{a \in A}$  there is at least three agents  $i$  such that

$$i \in T_b \implies u_i(a, s_a^k) \geq u_i(b, t_b) - 2\delta_i \quad (9)$$

$2\delta_i$ -Pareto superior to  $P^k$ .

**Proof** Statement i) Fix  $P^k, P^\ell, a, b$  and  $i \in S_a^k \cap S_b^\ell$ . Then by (8)  $a, b$  are both in  $D(u_i, \sigma^*)$  hence  $u_i(a, \sigma_a^* \vee 1) = u_i(b, \sigma_b^* \vee 1)$ . By (8) again and the definition of  $\delta_i$

$$|u_i(a, s_a^k) - u_i(a, \sigma_a^* \vee 1)| \leq \delta_i \text{ and } |u_i(b, s_b^\ell) - u_i(b, \sigma_b^* \vee 1)| \leq \delta_i$$

and the desired inequality follows.

Statement ii) is in Lemma 2. For statement iii) we fix  $i \in S_a^k$  and  $x$  then use (8) one more time:  $a \in D(u_i, \sigma^*)$  gives  $u_i(a, \sigma_a^* \vee 1) \geq u_i(x, \sigma_x^* \vee 1)$ ;  $|s_a^k - \sigma_a^*| \leq 1$  implies  $|u_i(a, s_a^k) - u_i(a, \sigma_a^* \vee 1)| \leq \delta_i$  and similarly we get  $|u_i(x, s_x^k) - u_i(a, \sigma_x^* \vee 1)| \leq \delta_i$ ; finally we combine the three inequalities.

Statement iv) We fix  $P^k$  and  $Q = (T_x)_{x \in A}$ . Let  $B$  be the set of posts  $b$  such that  $s_b^k \leq t_b$  and  $t_b \geq 1$ ,  $B$  is clearly non empty. for any  $i$  in  $T_b$  let  $a$  be the post assigned to  $i$  by  $P^k$  ( $a = b$  is possible): by statement iii) above we have  $u_i(a, s_a^k) \geq u_i(b, s_b^k \vee 1) - 2\delta_i$  and  $u_i(b, s_b^k \vee 1) \geq u_i(b, t_b)$  by our choice of  $b$ . So  $Q$  does not improve  $P^k$  by more than  $2\delta_i$  for all agents in  $\cup_{b \in B} T_b$ .

In the following example with at least two posts:  $N = S_a, N \setminus \{1, 2, 3\} = T_a, \{1, 2, 3\} = T_b$ , the argument above shows that agents 1, 2, 3 meet (9) but other agents may not because they compare  $(a, n)$  to  $(a, n - 3)$ . We let the reader check that if  $\cup_{b \in B} T_b$  is of size 1 or 2 then (9) holds for every agent. ■

We illustrate fractional competitiveness in Example 4 ((6)) by choosing simple vNM utilities where one extra unit of congestion costs one unit of utility to everyone:

$$u_\alpha = u_{\alpha'} : \begin{bmatrix} s & a & b \\ 1 & 4 & 3\frac{1}{2} \\ 2 & 3 & 2\frac{1}{2} \\ 3 & 2 & 1\frac{1}{2} \\ 4 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad u_\beta : \begin{bmatrix} s & a & b \\ 1 & 4 & 2\frac{1}{2} \\ 2 & 3 & 1\frac{1}{2} \\ 3 & 2 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 4 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad u_\gamma : \begin{bmatrix} s & a & b \\ 1 & 2\frac{1}{2} & 4 \\ 2 & 1\frac{1}{2} & 3 \\ 3 & \frac{1}{2} & 2 \\ 4 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

After checking that the top four allocations of each agent match those given by (6) and that  $\alpha, \alpha'$  prefer  $(a, 2)$  to  $(b, 2)$ , we note that tossing a fair coin between the two  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments does not work: it maintain the congestion profile  $\sigma = (2, 2)$  and the competitive demands  $a$  for agents  $\alpha, \alpha', \beta$  and  $b$  for agent  $\gamma$ , so property (??) fails. To make  $a$  and  $b$  both competitively attractive to agents  $\alpha, \alpha'$  ( $D(u_\alpha; \sigma^*) = \{a, b\}$ ) we must implement a slightly larger congestion on  $a$  than on  $b$  adjusted so that  $u_\alpha(a, \sigma_a) = u_\alpha(b, \sigma_b)$ : this gives  $\sigma^* = (2\frac{1}{4}, 1\frac{3}{4})$ .

In addition to the  $\lambda$ -Fair assignments we must put a positive probability on the  $\lambda$ -unfair assignment  $S_a = \{\alpha, \alpha', \beta\}, S_b = \{\gamma\}$ , and we get the following pair  $(\{P^k\}_{k=1}^K, \mathcal{L})$

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{3}{8} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{3}{8} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \\ \alpha & 5/8 & 3/8 \\ \alpha' & 5/8 & 3/8 \\ \beta & 1 & 0 \\ \gamma & 0 & 1 \end{array} \quad (10)$$

delivering the expected utilities  $(u_\alpha, u_{\alpha'}, u_\beta, u_\gamma) = (2\frac{9}{16}, 2\frac{9}{16}, 2\frac{3}{4}, 3\frac{1}{4})$  different for agents  $\alpha, \alpha'$  than the competitive evaluations  $u_\alpha(a, \sigma_a^*) = u_\alpha(b, \sigma_b^*) = 2\frac{3}{4}$ : this “error” comes from the competitive approximation ignoring the impact of my actual post on the realised assignment.

The familiar ex ante concept of envy freeness does not make this error, but rests on a significantly more complicated argument. Upon learning the pair  $(\{P^k\}_{k=1}^K, \mathcal{L})$  in full detail, each agent  $i$  must prefer the probability distributions it implements over her own allocations to those distributions for other agents (preferences can be in the stochastic dominance or in the expected utility sense).

In the example the fair draw of a  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment resolves the envy between  $\alpha, \alpha'$ , but they both envy  $\beta$ . Lottery (10) does not work either because  $\alpha, \alpha'$  envy both  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  at lottery (10).<sup>4</sup> The set of envy free *and efficient*<sup>5</sup> fractional assignments is in fact the segment

$$x \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + y \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + y \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + y \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where } x + 3y = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{2}{11}$$

quite different from our competitive recommendation.

Two problems already apparent in our simple example are the multiplicity of envy free fractional assignments, and the increased complexity to compute them.

### 3 the canonical guarantee with weighted congestion

Each agent  $i$  brings now a congestion weight  $w_i$ , a strictly positive real number, to her assigned post. The total congestion  $W = \sum_{i \in N} w_i$  plays the role of the number  $n$  of agents before: it is a known parameter to every agent.

An assignment is as before a partition  $P = (S_a)_{a \in A}$  of  $N$  where  $S_a$  is the set of agents assigned to post  $a$  and at most  $m - 1$  of these sets can be empty.

<sup>4</sup>They prefer  $\frac{1}{4}(a, 3) + \frac{3}{4}(a, 2)$  to their own lottery  $\frac{1}{4}(a, 3) + \frac{3}{8}(a, 2) + \frac{3}{8}(b, 2)$  in the stochastic dominance sense, but  $\frac{1}{4}(b, 1) + \frac{3}{4}(b, 2)$  only in the expected utility sense.

<sup>5</sup>Recall that we must exclude trivial assignments with everyone in the same post.

Agent  $i$ 's preferences only depends upon her assigned post  $a$  and the congestion  $\sum_{i \in S_a} w_i$  denoted  $w_{S_a}$  at that post. They are represented by a utility function  $u_i(a, x)$  over the set the set  $A \times [w_i, W]$  of agent  $i$ 's feasible allocations; the function  $u_i$  is continuous and strictly decreasing in  $x$ .

In the Ex Ante state Agent  $i$  only knows her own weight  $w_i$ , the total congestion  $W$  and the set of posts  $A$ ; in particular she does not know from how many other agents the congestion  $W - w_i$  will come. Thus the weighted model is not a direct generalisation of the anonymous congestion one: here an agent must consider that the weights of other participants could be (much) bigger or smaller than her own, a more complicated challenge.

As before each agent selects a profile of caps  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_{ia})_{a \in A}$  on the congestion she accepts on every post. The report  $\lambda_{ia} = 0$  still allows her to refuse to be assigned at  $a$ . If she potentially accepts post  $a$  the cap  $\lambda_{ia}$  is a real number in  $[w_i, W]$ :  $\lambda_{ia} = w_i$  means she only accepts  $a$  if she is alone there, while by reporting  $\lambda_{ia} = W$  she accepts any congestion at post  $a$ .

**Definition 4** Fix  $A, N$  and  $(w_i)_{i \in N}$ . Given the report  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_{ia}) \in [w_i, W]^A$  by each agent  $i$ , an assignment  $P$  is  $\lambda$ -Fair iff

$$w_{S_a} \leq \lambda_{ia} \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ and all } i \in S_a$$

To achieve as in Proposition 1 feasibility of decentralised individual reports the constraints we must impose on  $\lambda_i$  are more complicated. With the notation  $[[z]]$  for the number of strictly positive coordinates of  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^A$ , we limit agent  $i$ 's choice to the following subset  $\mathcal{G}(A; w_i; W)$  of  $(\{0\} \cup [w_i, W])^A$ :

$$\text{for each } a : \lambda_{ia} = 0 \text{ or } w_i \leq \lambda_{ia} \leq W; \text{ and } \sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{ia} = W + ([[ \lambda_i ]] - 1)w_i \quad (11)$$

Agent  $i$  chooses first the (strict and possibly empty) subset  $B$  of the posts she refuses, then the sum of the positive caps on  $A \setminus B$  decreases in  $|B|$  as  $W + (m - 1 - |B|)w_i$ . The smallest sum is  $W$  when she insists on being assigned to a certain post but cannot limit congestion there; the largest sum is  $W + (m - 1)w_i$  when she does not rule out any post; becoming more flexible in the sense of accepting one more post adds  $w_i$  to the total sum of caps.

For instance our agent improves her options by reporting  $\lambda_{ia} = W, \lambda_{ib} = w_i, \lambda_{ix} = 0$  for  $x \neq a, b$ , rather than  $\lambda_{ia} = W, \lambda_{ix} = 0$  for  $x \neq a$ , if she prefers post  $b$  alone to post  $a$  with full congestion  $W$ .

The two definitions of permissible congestion caps in the unweighted and weighted models give equal veto rights to each participant. Given  $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{G}(A; w_i; W)$  the set of allocations acceptable to agent  $i$  is the union of intervals  $[w_i, \lambda_{ia}]$  for each post she does not reject: in view of (11) its size is

$$\sum_{a: \lambda_{ia} > 0} (\lambda_{ia} - w_i) = W - w_i$$

while the size of the set of agent  $i$ 's feasible allocations  $A \times [w_i, W]$  is  $m(W - w_i)$ : the report  $\lambda_i$  accepts  $\frac{1}{m}$ -th of all feasible allocations, just like in our anonymous congestion model where  $\lambda_i$  accepts  $n$  allocations out of  $n \times m$  feasible ones.

**Theorem 2** Given  $A, N$  and  $(w_i)_{i \in N}$  let each agent  $i$  choose a profile of caps  $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{G}(A; w_i; W)$ . Then there exists at least one  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment  $P$ .

*Maximality property:* Fix  $A, W$ , an agent  $i^*$  with weight  $w_{i^*}$  and an arbitrary vector of caps  $\lambda_{i^*} \in \mathcal{G}(A; w_{i^*}; W)$ . Then there is a set of agents  $N \setminus \{i^*\}$  with weights  $w_i$  s. t.  $\sum_{i \in N \setminus \{i^*\}} w_i = W - w_{i^*}$ , and caps  $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{G}(A; w_i; W)$ , such that in any  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment agent  $i^*$  is at a where the congestion arbitrarily close to  $\lambda_{i^*}$ .

**Proof**

**Existence.** As in Proposition 1 we combine a greedy algorithm and an induction on the number of agents.

*Step A.* We can clearly get rid of the “inactive” posts s. t.  $\lambda_{ia} = 0$  for all  $i$ . As this causes no confusion we still write  $A$  for the set of active posts. We pick an arbitrary active post  $a$  and construct recursively a set  $S \subseteq A$  s. t.

$$\forall i \in S : \lambda_{ia} \geq w_S \text{ and } \forall j \in N \setminus S : \lambda_{ja} < w_S + w_j \quad (12)$$

Label the agents from 1 to  $n$  so that  $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in [n-1]$ . For any two disjoint subsets  $S, T$  in  $> 0??$  we say that  $S$  rejects  $T$  if  $\lambda_{ia} < w_S + w_T$  for some  $i \in S$ ; otherwise we say that  $S$  accepts  $T$ . Note that if all labels in  $T$  are (weakly) smaller than all in  $S$ , and  $S$  rejects  $T$ , then  $T$  rejects  $S$  as well; and  $S$  accepts  $T$  if  $T$  accepts  $S$ . We construct the desired set  $S$  recursively. In each step we either find  $S$  or add one agent to the provisional set of the previous step.

step 1. If all single agents  $j \geq 2$  reject  $\{1\}$  then  $S = \{1\}$  meets (12) and we are done. Otherwise we pick the smallest label  $\ell^1$  accepting  $\{1\}$ , which implies that  $\{1\}$  accepts  $\{\ell^1\}$  as well, and we form the provisional set  $S^1 = \{1, \ell^1\}$ . If  $\ell^1 = n$  we are done by choosing  $S^1$  so going into step 2 we have  $\ell^1 < n$ .

step  $k+1$ . Because a subset  $S$  has not yet been found, in the provisional set  $S^k$  with largest label  $\ell^k < n$  all agents  $i$  accept  $S^k \setminus \{i\}$ :  $\lambda_{ia} \geq w_{S^k}$  for all  $i \in S^k$ . Moreover all agents  $j < \ell^k$  outside  $S^k$  have rejected some earlier  $S^{k'}$ , so they also reject the larger set  $S^k$ .

If all agents  $j > \ell^k$  reject  $S^k$  as well we are done by choosing  $S^k$ . Otherwise we pick the smallest label  $\ell^{k+1}$  after  $\ell^k$  s.t.  $\ell^{k+1}$  accepts  $S^k$ : this implies that  $S^k$  accepts  $\ell^{k+1}$  as well, so we set  $S^{k+1} = S^k \cup \{\ell^{k+1}\}$  and we have  $\lambda_{ia} \geq w_{S^{k+1}}$  for all  $i \in S^{k+1}$ . We are done if  $\ell^{k+1} = n$  otherwise we go to the next step.

*Step B.* We assign  $S$  found in step A to post  $a$ , and consider the residual problem in  $\tilde{A} = A \setminus \{a\}$  with the agents in  $N \setminus S$  and total congestion  $\tilde{W} = W - w_S$ . For each  $j \in \tilde{A}$  such that  $\lambda_{ja} > 0$  inequality (12) and equation (11) give

$$\lambda_{j\tilde{A}} > W - w_S + ([[\lambda_j]] - 2)w_j = \tilde{W} + ([[\tilde{\lambda}_j]] - 1)w_j$$

where in  $\tilde{\lambda}_j$  we drop  $\lambda_{ja}$ .

For each  $j \in \tilde{A}$  such that  $\lambda_{ja} = 0$  inequality (12) has no bite and equation (11) give

$$\lambda_{j\tilde{A}} = W + ([[\lambda_i]] - 1)w_i > \tilde{W} + ([[\lambda_j]] - 1)w_j = \tilde{W} + ([[\tilde{\lambda}_j]] - 1)w_j$$



So in the reduced problem the induction argument shows that we can assign  $\lambda$ -Fairly  $N \setminus S$  to  $\tilde{A}$ .

**Maximality** We fix  $W$  an agent  $i^*$  with weight  $w^*$  and a report  $\lambda_{i^*}$ . Call  $B$  the set of posts  $a$  s.t.  $\lambda_{i^*a} > 0$  and  $q$  is its size so equation (11) is  $\lambda_{i^*B} = W + (q - 1)w_{i^*}$ .

We add  $q$  agents, one written  $i_b$  for each  $b \in B$  and their weight is  $w_{i_b} = \lambda_{i_b} - w^*$ ; the total congestion is then  $w_{i^*} + \sum_{b \in B} (\lambda_{i_b} - w_{i^*}) = W$  as desired.

Next assume each agent  $i_b$  reports  $W$  on  $b$  and zero elsewhere. In each  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment of the problem and the reports we just constructed, each  $i_b$  is at  $b$  and  $i^*$  can be at any post in  $B$ . If we pick an arbitrary post  $b^*$  in  $B$  and a small enough positive  $\varepsilon$ , we can subtract  $(q - 1)\varepsilon$  from from  $w_{i_{b^*}}$  and add  $\varepsilon$  to each other  $w_{i_b}$  without changing any report: then the only  $\lambda$ -Fair assignment has  $i^*$  at  $b^*$  experiencing a congestion very close to  $\lambda_{i_{b^*}}$ . ■

As explained above, agent  $i$ 's truthful report  $\lambda_i$  identifies the subset of her top  $W - w_i$  allocations (a well defined unique subset of  $A \times [w_i, W]$ ). For exactly the same reason as when congestion is anonymous, in any equilibrium of the free mobility game each agent  $i$  consumes an allocation in her top- $(W - w_i)$  set (statement *ii*) in Lemma 1). But we know from [15] that FMEq do not always exist when congestion is weighted, which makes the FMGame less relevant.

When congestion is weighted, the analysis of  $\lambda$ -Fairness is more difficult already with two posts: while in the unweighted model there is only one  $\lambda$ -Fair congestion profile (Example 1 section 2), we have three in the following three agent example:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & w \\ \lambda_1 & 9 & 7 & 6 \\ \lambda_2 & 6 & 6 & 2 \\ \lambda_3 & 8 & 4 & 2 \end{array} \implies \lambda\text{-Fair } \begin{array}{ccc} a & b & a & b & a & b \\ 1 & 2,3 & 1,3 & 2 & 2,3 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$D(i; \sigma) = \arg \max_a \{u_i(a, \sigma_a \vee w_i)\}$$

## 4 Concluding comments

**take home points** Whether congestion is anonymous or weighted, the canonical guarantee allows each participant to independently veto all but  $\frac{1}{m}$  of the set of feasible allocations, where  $m$  is the number of posts (Proposition 1 and Theorem 2).

Competitiveness, when it exists in the deterministic model with anonymous congestion, identifies a single assignment in terms of congestion and welfare: combining efficiency with natural ex ante and ex post fairness properties, it is an appealing normative solution to the congested assignment problem (Proposition 2).

Randomised competitiveness achieves similar results up to an approximation factor capturing the influence of one unit of congestion on welfare (Theorem 1).

**open questions** When congestion is weighted competitiveness is easy to define in the deterministic model and its impact is similar to what Proposition 2 describes. But a plausible definition in the randomised model is elusive.

In the extent literature a *non congested* random assignment is envy free if, ex ante, the distribution over my ex post allocations stochastically dominates that of any other participant: is this property feasible in the randomised model with congestion (together with efficiency)? The probabilistic serial algorithm ([6]) gives a constructive proof of existence in the absence of congestion but has no obvious analog when congestion must be taken into account.

In synthetic or empirical data for the deterministic model with anonymous congestion, how likely is the existence of a competitive assignment?

**extensions of the model** The addition of post-specific lower and upper capacity constraints is natural in most of our motivating examples. Under anonymous congestion we generalise the canonical guarantee simply by asking each profile of caps to respect these constraints. But it is not clear how to adapt competitiveness even in the deterministic case.

More general preferences about the congestion level, in particular single-peaked, are common in the literature on the formation of coalitions (e. g. [3]). Initiating a normative discussion of congested assignment in this entirely realistic context is a very tall challenge that will hopefully inspire further research.

## References

- [1] Abdulkadiroglu A. and T. Sonmez. 2003. School Choice: A Mechanism Design Approach, *American Economic Review*, 93 (3), 729–747.
- [2] Banerjee S., Konishi, H. and Sonmez, T. 2001. Core in a Simple Coalition Formation Game, *Social Choice Welfare* 18, 135–153.
- [3] Bogomolnaia A. and M. O. Jackson. 2002. The stability of hedonic coalition structures, *Games & Economic Behavior*, 38,2, 201-230.
- [4] Bogomolnaia A., Le Breton M., Savvateev A. and S. Weber. 2007. Stability under unanimous consent, free mobility and core, *International Journal of Game Theory*, 35,2,185-204.
- [5] Bogomolnaia A., Le Breton M., Savvateev A. and S. Weber. 2008. Stability of jurisdiction structures under the equal share and median rules, *Economic Theory*, 34, 525–543.
- [6] Bogomolnaia A. and H. Moulin. 2001. A new solution to the random assignment problem, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 100,2,201-230.
- [7] Budish, E. 2011. The combinatorial assignment problem: Approximate competitive equilibrium from equal incomes, *J. Political Economy*, 119, 6, 1061-1103.

- [8] Cacchiani V., Iori M., Locatelli M. and Martello S. 2022. Knapsack problems, an overview of recent advances, Part II: Multiple, multidimensional, and quadratic knapsack problems, *Computers and Operations Research*, 143, 105693.
- [9] Caragiannis C., Kaklamanis C., Kanellopoulos P. and E. Papaioannou. 2008. Scheduling to maximize participation, *Theoretical Computer Science*, 402, 142-155.
- [10] Correa J.R. and Stier-Moses N. E. 2010. Wardrop equilibria, *Wiley Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science*, ed. James J. Cochran, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [11] Foley, D. K. 1966. Resource allocation and the public sector, Yale University.
- [12] Hafalir I. E., Yenmez M. B. and M. A. Yildirim. 2013. Effective affirmative action in school choice, *Theoretical Economics*, 8, 2, 325-363.
- [13] Konishi H., Le Breton M., and S. Weber. 1997. Equilibrium in a Model with Partial Rivalry, *Journal of Economic Theory* 72, 225]237.
- [14] Koutsoupias E. and C. H. Papadimitriou. 1999. Worst-case equilibria, *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, 404-413.
- [15] Milchtaich I. 1996. Congestion games with player-specific payoff functions, *Games & Economic Behavior*, 13, 1, 111-124.
- [16] Monderer D., and Shapley L. S. 1996. Potential Games, *Games & Economic Behavior*, 14, 1, 124-143.
- [17] Nisan N. and A. Ronen. 1999. Algorithmic mechanism design, *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, 129-140.
- [18] Papai S. 2000. Strategyproof assignment by hierarchical exchange, *Econometrica*, 68, 6, 1403-1433.
- [19] Rosenthal R. W. 1973. A Class of Games Possessing Pure-Strategy Nash Equilibria, *Int. J. Game Theory* 2, 65-67.
- [20] Roughgarden T. and E. Tardos. 2002. How bad is selfish routing? *Journal of the ACM*, 49(2), 236-259.
- [21] Shapley L. and H. Scarf. 1974. On Cores and Indivisibility, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 1, 23-37.
- [22] Steinhaus H. 1948. The Problem of Fair Division. *Econometrica*, 16(1), 101-4.

- [23] Varian H. 1974. Equity, Envy and Efficiency, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 29(2), 217-244.