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1 Introduction
Hunger is a major problem worldwide. Food banks around the globe combine forces with various welfare agencies towards alleviating the hunger by assisting people in need. For example, Foodbank Australia cooperates with local charities in order to effectively allocate food as it is donated. In 2014, nearly 10% of these relief organizations could not meet the demand and thus left around 24,000 children with no breakfast in their schools; see [Byrne and Anderson, 2014]. Can we improve the food allocation? Further, the Foodbanking network in Canada has a long-standing tradition in handling customer demands, but in the last year 60% of their sponsorship covered the delivery of the food; see [Carter, 2014]. Can we reduce the transportation costs implied by the food allocation? Finally, the Meal Gap in New York reached 250 millions in 2014; see [Agi, 2015]. How do we allocate food in cities that “never sleep” and in which there are high time and spatial dynamics? Evidently, a food bank needs an allocation mechanism that takes all these features into account. Such a mechanism should be able to (1) allocate resources online, (2) be robust to stochastic changes in the allocation preferences and (3) inform dispatching solutions. I address exactly such complex real-world features in here.

2 Related Work and Research Plan
A greatly investigated topic in resource allocation is offline fair division. Since [Steinhaus, 1948], various mechanisms have been developed that allocate goods offline; see e.g. [Brams and Taylor, 1996]. Today, however, we witness the age of high technologies that enable us to solve complex online problems efficiently. We therefore turn our attention to online fair division. For example, [Walsh, 2011] cut cake online by exploiting offline fair division procedures. Further, we cooperate with Foodbank Australia to improve the food allocation to charities. The food arrives online and is allocated immediately to the charities. [Walsh, 2015] formulated an online model for this setting in which there is a number of agents and indivisible items arrive in rounds. Each agent has some (private) utility for each of the items. As an item arrives, they then bid for the item thus revealing their valuations for it and a mechanism allocates it to one of the agents. [Walsh, 2015] proposed two such mechanisms. LIKE gives uniformly at random an item to an agent that bids positively. The allocations of LIKE can be greatly unfair as an agent can get all items. BALANCED LIKE achieves fairer allocations as it allocates uniformly at random an item to an agent with fewest items among those agents that bid positively. This model provides a simple abstraction of clearly more complex fair division problem that can greatly benefit from the use of a number of existing optimal online matching algorithms; see e.g. [Jaillet and Lu, 2014]. Based on previous work, my thesis addresses a number of more complex features of this online fair division problem and focuses on the development of sophisticated and novel mechanisms for it. I next list my research plan that extends the initial one in [Aleksandrov, 2015].

- model with one item at a time and mechanisms; see [Aleksandrov et al., 2015]
- model with unequal entitlements and mechanisms
- model with multiple items at a time and mechanisms;
- model with divisible items and quotas and mechanisms; see e.g. [Walsh, 2011]
- model with budget-constrained agents and mechanisms; see e.g. [Goel et al., 2013]
- model with coalition formations and mechanisms
- mixed model with vehicle-routing constraints and mechanisms; see e.g. [Aleksandrov et al., 2013]

To analyse mechanisms, I study axioms such as strategyproofness, envy-freeness, efficiency among many others. In addition, I validate their competitiveness against the optimal (offline or online) mechanism using generated and real-world data; see e.g. [Dubey, 1986; Koutsoupias and Papadimitriou, 2009; Matei and Walsh, 2013]. Moreover, I investigate complexity questions around computing outcomes, optimal strategies and manipulations; see e.g. [Aziz et al., 2015; Bouwer and Lang, 2014].

3 Results
BALANCED LIKE outputs fairer allocations than LIKE, see [Aleksandrov et al., 2015]. However, BALANCED LIKE is not strategyproof. Ideally, a mechanism is strategyproof and fair. In support, the BALANCED QUEUE mechanism computes a subset of agents that have fewest items among those bidding positively and a priority queue that orders the agents using “first-in-first-out” principle given their last items or uniformly at random if they have zero items. It then allocates the new item using this queue.
Theorem 1 The Balanced Queue mechanism is strategyproof and bounded envy-free ex post with 0/1 utilities.

Proof sketch. For strategyproofness, note that to choose an agent uniformly at random is the same as to draw an ordering of the agents uniformly at random. Hence, we can draw an ordering prior round 1 and then use it resolve ties when some agents have zero items. No agent has incentive to bid 1 for items they sincerely value with 0. Each agent gets most items if they bid 1 for items they sincerely value with 1. Otherwise, they are placed later in the queue. For bounded envy-freeness, see Theorem 8 from [Aleksandrov et al., 2015].

The mechanisms above allocate a single item at each round. But, in practice, we might expect multiple items to arrive simultaneously. At each round, the Balanced Draft mechanism then computes a balanced ordering of the agents that gives greater priority to agents with fewer items. Ties are broken uniformly. When a single item arrives per round, Balanced Draft degenerates to Balanced Like. Hence, it is bounded envy-free ex post, but not strategyproof. Next, suppose we give virtual budgets to our agents. We can do this prior the allocation process or at each round. At each round, we now run an auction. Adaptive clinching reveals the item price and an agent that values it but offers a better price. The auctioneer then picks uniformly at random an agent with the greatest budget and bid, and charges them the item price. Adaptive Clinching is budget-feasible, budget-monotonic, individually-rational, efficient and strategyproof with fixed budgets, see [Goel et al., 2013]. I show that it is no longer strategyproof with increasing budgets.

Theorem 2 The Adaptive Clinching mechanism is not strategyproof with increasing budgets.

Proof. Let us consider the alphabetical division of items $a$ and $b$ between agents 1 and 2. Suppose $a$ and $b$ cost 0.25$ and 1$. Further, suppose 1 and 2 receive 1$ prior round 1, 1 and 2 receive 1.25$ and 1$ prior round 2, 1 values both items with 1$, and 2 values $a$ with 0.75$ and $b$ with 1.25$. Sincerely, 1 gets $a$ and 2 gets $b$. Suppose next 1 and 2 bid strategically their total remaining budgets of 2$ at round 2. Then, 1 gets $b$ with probability 5/7. This is strict improvement.

I further look into computational questions. Balanced Queue is equivalent to Balanced Like when each agent gets exactly one item in each possible ex post allocation. Adaptive Clinching is equivalent to Balanced Like when all budgets, positive bids and item prices are the same. Consequently, computing expected outcomes with Balanced Queue or Adaptive Clinching is at least as hard as with Balanced Like. The latter mechanism resembles the popular random priority dictatorship whose exact expected outcomes are hard; see e.g. [Saban and Sethuraman, 2013]. However, computing ex post outcomes with any of these mechanisms is easy.

To sum up, I presented a strategyproof and bounded envy-free ex post mechanism for the model in [Walsh, 2015], a bounded envy-free ex post mechanism for the extended model with multiple items and a strategyproof repeated auction mechanism for the model with budget-constrained agents when the budgets are fixed.

4 Conclusion

I presented my postgraduate research plan and several new results that extend my previous work. Despite the novelty of my thesis, many interesting questions remain open. For instance, how do we allocate costs to the charities? Perhaps some of them are more profitable to the business than others.
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