

A model-based analysis of the AggregateEU mechanism: Implications of overbidding and non-commitment

Dávid Csercsik^{*1,2}, Borbála Takácsné Tóth³, Péter Kotek⁴, László Á.
Kóczy^{1,5}, and Anne Neumann⁶

¹*Institute of Economics, HUN-REN Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungary*

²*Department of Information Technology and Bionics, Pázmány Péter Catholic University,
Hungary*

³*Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary*

⁴*Regional Centre for Energy Policy Research, Budapest, Hungary*

⁵*Department of Finance, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest,
Hungary*

⁶*Department of Industrial Economics and Technology Management,
The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway*

Abstract

AggregateEU is a new centralised mechanism that provides a no-commitment platform to trade natural gas in the European Union. Throughout the consultation process, AggregateEU has been mocked as ‘Tinder of the European gas markets’ as it helps consumers and suppliers to find partners, but leaves it up to the matched partners to decide whether or not to contract on the possible trade. The non-commitment nature leads to substantial overbidding and many non-realised matches.

We propose a quantitative modelling framework to study the effect of overbidding in the AggregateEU demand aggregation or joint purchasing mechanism. We conclude that the mechanism is prone to overbidding and that overbidding has ambiguous effects on trade. Depending on the parameters, overbidding may facilitate trade, but may also result in highly inefficient outcomes when overbidding is combined with a miscoordination over the delivery points.

Suggested remedies include allowing for convex bids, restrictions on overbidding, or giving up part of the non-binding character of the market. Our results suggest that a potential future mechanism allowing the coordination of multiple delivery points could enhance the efficiency of gas markets.

Keywords— joint purchasing; natural gas; game theory; strategic behaviour

^{*} *Corresponding author: email; Address: Institute of Economics, HUN-REN Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungary*

1 Introduction

The European 2021—2022 energy crisis exposed the vulnerability of energy supply and the dependence of Europe on Russian natural gas. Russian pipeline gas accounted for approximately 40% of the EU27’s natural gas consumption, supplying about 160 bcm/year before the crisis. However, Russian gas supplies already started declining in 2021, before Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. In 2021, the Yamal pipeline ceased deliveries via Poland, leading to an unprecedented rise in European natural gas prices. Prices surged to €100/MWh—a sharp increase from the usual €25/MWh—and, for the first time in history, exceeded Asian natural gas prices. During the first half of 2022, as Russian gas deliveries continued to drop, European spot prices on the Title Transfer Facility (TTF) rose even further. In May 2022, the EU introduced the REPowerEU strategy [1], aiming to phase out Russian natural gas by 2027 and reduce Russian natural gas imports by 75% in 2022. The strategy outlined key measures such as:

- replacing pipeline gas with LNG,
- accelerating the development of missing infrastructure,
- implementing energy-saving measures and efficiency improvements,
- substituting natural gas with renewable energy sources.

In addition, the EU/2022/1032 Gas Storage Regulation [2] required EU countries to fill gas storage facilities to 80% of their capacity in order to prepare for winter 2022/23 and 90% for the subsequent winters. Since storage levels initially were very low as market players were reluctant to stockpile gas, this obligation triggered an enormous short-term surge in demand during the summer of 2022. Combined with supply shortages and reduced trading volumes, TTF gas prices skyrocketed to over €300/MWh. However, once the storage target was reached by August 2022, prices dropped sharply, stabilizing between €25–€50/MWh. In its ex-post evaluation of the 2022 price spike, ACER (the EU Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators) [3] finds that the storage requirement had intensified competition among European buyers, further driving up prices. As a result, voices demanding change in the energy policy of the EU have strengthened [4].

To address the challenges, the European Commission (EC) proposed the Aggregate EU Mechanism (Council Regulation 2022/2576)[5] that came into force in December 2022. The core idea of AggregateEU is to create a platform for European buyers to pool their demand for the upcoming winters, acting as an anonymous counterparty to increase coordination and strengthen their bargaining power against sellers. To trigger liquidity, a minimum volume requirement for EU member states was set to bid for at least 15% of their yearly storage obligation via the platform. On the supply side, Russian natural gas was explicitly banned from the platform. According to the EC’s perspective, while the mechanism does not seek to replace

existing trading platforms in the EU, it operates without financial clearing, making participation easier and potentially more cost-effective. As a result, matches on the platform did not lead to immediate contracts, as would typically happen in an exchange. Instead, the platform merely informed parties of a match, leaving them to negotiate and finalise contracts independently.

The non-binding nature of the AggregateEU (AEU) platform allows for overbidding (as the derived matches may be dropped later). Participants may be motivated to overbid either to (i) ensure a sufficient number of potential partners to match their desired demand/supply and/or to (ii) pursue bargain-hunting, that is, to cherry-pick the preferred cases from the determined matches.

The objective of this paper is to propose a quantitative modelling framework for describing the overbidding strategy in a non-binding demand aggregation/joint purchasing coordination platform with multiple delivery points (like AEU) and analysing its potential implications.

2 The AggregateEU framework

As of 2025, few academic contributions on the AggregateEU mechanism exist: the platform is relatively new and limited information is available on its effects and operation. Most publications are opinion pieces of traders and energy market experts, or summaries of the EC and news pieces on the results of auction rounds.

Since its launch in Q2/2023 to Q2/2024, there have been five short-term and one mid-term tendering rounds: short-term tenders delivered 43 bcm of matched gas, while the mid-term tender matched 33.65 bcm of gas. [6].

| Tender type (term) | Round period | Delivery period | Aggregated demand (bcm) | Supply offers (bcm) | Demand matched (bcm) |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| short | Apr - May 23 | Jun 23 - May 24 | 11.6 | 18.7 | 10.9 |
| short | Jun - Jul 23 | Aug 23 - Mar 25 | 15.9 | 15.2 | 12 |
| short | Sep - Oct 23 | Dec 23 - Mar 25 | 18.1 | 16.5 | 11.9 |
| short | Nov - Dec 23 | Jan 24 - Mar 25 | 9.1 | 10.7 | 7.4 |
| short | Mar - Mar 24 | May 24 - Mar 25 | 1.6 | 2.01 | 1.12 |
| mid | Feb - Feb 24 | Apr 24 - Sep 29 | 33.66 | 97.36 | 33.65 |
| Total short | - | - | 56.3 | 63.1 | 43.3 |

Table 1: Matched quantities under the AggregateEU mechanism

There is unconfirmed anecdotal evidence that out of the 43 bcm of matched short-term contracts by September 2024, contracts for only 1 bcm have been signed and reported to the Commission [7].

Krajnik et al. [8] provide a concise summary of the AggregateEU mechanism, detailing its main operation and the results of the first four short-term tenders as

well as the first mid-term tender. By characterising the mechanism as a buyers' group in economic literature, they provide a list of potential benefits, such as cost savings due to higher bargaining power, which can be passed on to consumers. At the same time, they also list potential inefficiencies, including the deadweight loss stemming from the monopsonic nature of a buyers' cartel as well as the so-called *waterbed effect*. The waterbed effect refers to the phenomenon whereby the price discount gained by the buyers' cartel is the supplier's loss, subsequently recuperated from other buyers. The authors conclude that due to a lack of data on auction results and concluded contracts, it is not possible to assess whether the price reduction for EU buyers occurred or not.

The International Gas Union [9] notes that a joint purchasing scheme helps to bolster supply security for smaller entities that pool demand, share infrastructure and risks, and optimise purchasing costs collectively. They refer to demand aggregation that has been used by Japanese LNG buyers, and state that the AggregateEU platform strengthened smaller European buyers' power to attract new sources to replace Russian natural gas, promote transparency and reduce price volatility. Based on these examples, in 2023, KOGAS and JERA, major LNG importers in South Korea and Japan, agreed to expand cooperation in joint LNG purchasing and trading, including emergency swap agreements to strengthen energy security in both markets.

Traders' and energy company associations' views have generally been negative on the platform. A letter [10] on the prolongation of the joint purchasing argues that the platform is not transparent, and "there is a lack of data justifying making it permanent." The signatories state that total matched volumes only make up 1 per cent of traded quantities at the reference trading hub TTF.

The energy trader's association argues that "market participants have been raising concerns that the mechanism, which is spearheaded by the European Commission, would cement the position of dominant players in certain EU countries" [11]. They also raise concerns regarding the confidential information of companies, which is relayed to the central buyer. In addition, they note that experienced traders are most likely to get market rates and offers, whereas smaller new entrants may be paying higher prices. Overall, they claim that the platform had, at best, a neutral effect and would wither without further regulation.¹

Barnes [12] criticises joint purchasing as i) the voluntary nature of taking part in demand aggregation makes it impractical. The total demand bid required makes up 15% of the 90% storage target for the winter of 2023–2024 [2], which is around 13.5 bcm. This is negligible compared to the 400 bcm/year European demand and does not constitute a significant volume with buying power; ii) the mechanism creates tensions between Member States and the Commission by taking over national matters; and iii) an additional platform constitutes competition for the existing,

¹"As long as people are not required to use it, it may die or it could be held as a backstop in case there was another emergency scenario." [11]

well-developed energy exchanges.

The design of the mechanism is also being challenged: Le Coq and Paltseva [13] argue that with non-binding matching, the buying power of aggregated demand is not realised at all. For smaller companies, the platform offers a central buyer or agent-on-behalf, who acts as an intermediary. This is unfavourable for both smaller and larger companies: smaller ones are discouraged from sharing sensitive information, while larger ones are hindered by the weak bargaining power of smaller companies [13].

In contrast, communication from the EC has been positive overall. Upon the closing of each tender round, the Commission delivered a press release on the matched quantities with a corresponding comment from the Vice-President Maroš Sefčovič on each round.:

First round:

“This is a remarkable success for an instrument that did not exist some five months ago. The Commission has played its role as aggregator and matchmaker, and now it is for the respective parties to conclude their agreements. It is a win-win for all parties.” [14]

Second round:

“The EU Energy Platform on joint gas purchasing is working well and shows Europe at its best. Joining forces is key to guarantee stable and affordable gas supplies to the EU market, for the benefit for our businesses and citizens. As we enter a crucial stage of the storage refilling season, I encourage both buyers and suppliers to make the best use of this new market place and further stabilise the European gas market ahead of the winter.” [15]

Third round:

“This year we are entering the winter with a much better outlook for our security of supply: our gas storage is nearly full, our supplies are more diverse and renewables are playing a more prominent role in our energy mix. However, the situation on the gas market remains tight, so we need to stay vigilant and continue purchasing gas together to guarantee stable and affordable supplies. I therefore invite European companies to once again join forces and work together to make sure we will get safely through this winter and already start preparing for the next one.” [16]

Fourth round:

“This round of gas demand aggregation is another opportunity for European companies to join forces to purchase the energy they need. As we begin the heating season for most of Europe, the EU Energy Platform

continues to contribute to our efforts to keep everybody warm this winter and keep energy at affordable prices, for citizens and European industry. The EU Energy Platform is a success story in terms of our collective response to last year's energy crisis, and it continues to serve us today."
[17]

The Commission provides a brief evaluation of the mechanism in its country factsheet report [18], including the volumes of aggregated demand for each Member State. Evidently, some Member States have greatly utilised the platform, aggregating over 25% of their annual natural gas consumption (AT, BG, CZ, EE, FI, GR, HR, LU, SI, SK). Many of these countries were highly dependent on Russian natural gas imports at the outset and relied on the platform to secure alternative sources. Other Member States, where Russian natural gas only represented a small share of imports, made little use of the platform, with below 25% demand aggregated (BE, CY, DK, ES, FR, IE, NL, MT, PT, SE). Some major consumers of Russian natural gas chose to procure supplies by alternative means and did not aggregate a considerable volume of their demand on the platform (DE, IT, HU, LT, LV, PL, RO).

In May 2024, the Commission launched a public consultation on the possible extension of the mechanism for long-term (over 20 years) tenders. Unfortunately, the results of the consultation are not publicly available. Overall, the AggregateEU mechanism seems to have received controversial opinions. Whereas the Commission is mostly positive (but does not back up its evaluation with any data), the major traders and trading associations are more sceptical.

In 2024, Frontier Economics has prepared an analysis of the first 4 rounds of AggregateEU [19]. In the first four rounds, 48 sellers participated, eight of which were trading with LNG. Concentration among the eight sellers was high, with 67% of the total LNG offered coming from one seller. Matches totalled 42.2 bcm for the four short-term rounds in total, of which 28.45 bcm was pipeline gas and 13.67 bcm was LNG. Matched demand was higher in more liquid Western European markets, while less liquid Eastern European countries reported lower demand and matching. Throughout the tenders, the share of unmatched demand increased from 18% to 37%.

Given the limited data availability, analyses and evaluations on the functioning and efficiency of the platform are lacking so far. Since we do not have access to auction results, our paper contributes to the ex-post evaluation of the policy by creating a stylized model that represents how the platform works. Based on the general observations made from the model and the formulation of the platform, we can identify the main advantages and disadvantages of the existing mechanism and potentially suggest adjustments.

| Country | Aggregate demand | Share in annual gas consumption | Annual gas consumption (bcm)* |
|---------|------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| AT | 2.35 | 28.70% | 8.2 |
| BE | 0.41 | 2.63% | 15.6 |
| BG | 0.81 | 29.86% | 2.7 |
| CY | 0 | 0.00% | 0.0 |
| CZ | 11.95 | 156.96% | 7.6 |
| DE | 4.13 | 4.61% | 89.6 |
| DK | 0 | 0.00% | 0.0 |
| EE | 0.22 | 60.54% | 0.4 |
| ES | 4.28 | 13.12% | 32.6 |
| FI | 0.45 | 33.63% | 1.3 |
| FR | 1.37 | 3.63% | 37.7 |
| GR | 6.15 | 118.90% | 5.2 |
| HR | 0.76 | 30.04% | 2.5 |
| HU | 0.64 | 6.59% | 9.7 |
| IE | 0.08 | 1.51% | 5.3 |
| IT | 8.32 | 12.11% | 68.7 |
| LT | 0.09 | 5.87% | 1.5 |
| LU | 0.22 | 37.13% | 0.6 |
| LV | 0.09 | 10.67% | 0.8 |
| MT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.0 |
| NL | 5.74 | 17.18% | 33.4 |
| PL | 1.29 | 6.55% | 19.7 |
| PT | 0.04 | 0.72% | 5.6 |
| RO | 0.14 | 1.40% | 10.0 |
| SE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.0 |
| SI | 0.25 | 29.53% | 0.8 |
| SK | 2.35 | 52.00% | 4.5 |
| Total | 52.13 | 14.32% | 364.00 |

Table 2: Aggregated demand per Member State [18]

*‘Annual gas consumption’ was calculated as the ratio of ‘Aggregated demand’ and ‘Share in annual gas consumption’

| Round | Matched | Unmatched | Total | Unmatched (%) |
|-------|---------|-----------|-------|---------------|
| 1 | 2.21 | 0.49 | 2.70 | 18% |
| 2 | 5.56 | 2.18 | 7.74 | 28% |
| 3 | 4.32 | 2.04 | 6.36 | 32% |
| 4 | 1.58 | 0.92 | 2.50 | 37% |
| Total | 13.67 | 5.63 | 19.3 | 29% |

Table 3: LNG bids and matches of the first 4 rounds on AggregateEU, in bcm [19]

2.1 Aspects of the non-binding nature

The platform matches the consumers to suppliers, among whom a potential deal seems realistic, and leaves the rest to the participants. As the matching is non-binding, any participant may withdraw from a potential deal at any time. As the EC often uses the expression ‘the Tinder of Gas market’ for the AggregateEU platform to emphasize its non-binding nature, we begin by showing our key ideas in a simple Tinder-model.

Example 1. This example illustrates that overbidding in a matching platform may help to establish connections between supply and demand, thus creating matches.

We consider a marriage problem [20] with non-complete preference lists, but we do not use the deferred acceptance (Gale-Shapley) algorithm, just a one-round ‘rapid matching’. Men give one or (in the case of overbidding) more offers according to their preference list, and women respond, according to their preference list: If a woman has multiple acceptable offers, she accepts the most preferred one (or in the case of overbidding, the most preferred ones). If a woman has only one acceptable offer, she accepts that. If there are no offers from acceptable partners, all offers are rejected.

Let us take 3 men (A , B , and C) and 3 women (D , E , F) with the following incomplete preference lists (Elements not present in the list are not acceptable.):

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 A : F \succ E \succ D & D : C \succ A \\
 B : D \succ F \succ E & E : A \succ B \\
 C : E \succ D \succ F & F : B \succ C
 \end{array}$$

Everyone is up to only 1 date.

Case 1 (No overbidding) No overbidding implies a single offer/acceptance response per person. We have the following offers:

$$A \rightarrow F, \quad B \rightarrow D, \quad C \rightarrow E$$

No woman receives an acceptable offer, no matches, no dates.

Case 2 (Overbidding) Under overbidding, we allow multiple (here: two) offers/acceptance replies per person. We have the following offers:

$$\begin{aligned} A &\rightarrow F, & B &\rightarrow D, & C &\rightarrow E \\ A &\rightarrow E, & B &\rightarrow F, & C &\rightarrow D \end{aligned}$$

Each woman receives one acceptable offer, and the following matches (dates) are established: $A - E, B - F, C - D$.

Example 2. In the previous example, as no participant was *overmatched* (matched with more than one partner), no matches were dropped. On the other hand, as illustrated here, more matches due to the overbidding of participants may also result in fewer dates (realized matches) if the configuration of how less preferred matches are unilaterally dropped is unfortunate.

$$\begin{array}{ll} A : D \succ E \succ F & D : C \succ A \\ B : E \succ F \succ D & E : A \succ B \\ C : F \succ D \succ E & F : B \succ C \end{array}$$

Case 1 (No overbidding) We have the following offers:

$$A \rightarrow D, \quad B \rightarrow E, \quad C \rightarrow F$$

As each woman receives only one offer, which is acceptable (no better alternatives are present), all offers are accepted, forming 3 matches. Each participant has exactly one match, no alternatives, all matches are realised resulting in 3 dates.

Case 2 (Overbidding) In this case, the offers are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A &\rightarrow D, & B &\rightarrow E, & C &\rightarrow F \\ A &\rightarrow E, & B &\rightarrow F, & C &\rightarrow D \end{aligned}$$

As two acceptance replies are allowed for women, and each incoming offer of each woman is from an acceptable man, all offers are accepted, resulting in 6 matches. Meanwhile, every participant is up to only 1 date, thus each participant drops the least preferred match. We assume that this happens simultaneously, such that no participant is informed whether he/she has been dropped in a match before he/she makes his/her decision regarding the drop of matches.

- A has 2 matches (D and E), prefers D , so he drops E .
- B has 2 matches (E and F), prefers E , so he drops F .
- C has 2 matches (D and F), prefers F , so he drops D .

- D has 2 matches (A and C), prefers C , so she drops A .
- E has 2 matches (A and B), prefers A , so she drops B .
- F has 2 matches (B and C), prefers B , so she drops C .

As we can see, all matches are cancelled and no dates are realised.

Interpretation How can we interpret the above ‘Tinder’ examples in the framework of the Aggregate EU mechanism (AEU)? If we assume that every participant in the AEU may be characterised with a fixed quantity describing the available or required amount of natural gas, this amount corresponds to the assumption that the participant in question is up only to one (or a fixed number of) date(s), independent of the potential number of matches. Overbidding in the AEU (that is, submitting bids with an overall quantity exceeding the available/required quantity) corresponds to the ‘swipe a lot to the right, and we’ll see’ strategy: participating with a quota exceeding the number of possible realised matches in which the participant may eventually be involved. In such a case, overmatching implies that the participant will drop the least preferred matches.

Certain differences, however, limit the validity of this analogy. Delivery points (DPs) represent a third, intermediate party in the matching in the AEU. Consumers and suppliers have preferences over DPs (and not over each other) based on, for example, transfer costs and determine their bids based on these preferences. Multiple DPs may be interpreted as a ‘simultaneous presence’ in multiple matching platforms, each with limited accessibility to participants (as not every DP is available for each participant). Furthermore, while items (individuals) in the Tinder example/marriage problem are indivisible, natural gas is a divisible good.

For the AEU, only the matched but not the contracted quantities are reported, and therefore it is impossible to estimate the ratio of potential overbidding and dropped matches.

In the following, a simplified quantitative model is proposed, which allows the analysis of the phenomenon and the implications of overbidding in the AEU. With the use of this model we show that similar to the previously discussed ‘Tinder’ examples, overbidding in the AEU has unpredictable implications, too, depending on the parameters of the actual scenario. In addition, we give some insights regarding the strategic aspects of the implied game and its equilibrium properties.

3 Model

We model the interaction of buyers, sellers and delivery points by the following game. We consider n_C consumers (buyers) n_S suppliers (sellers), and n_{DP} trading/delivery points (DPs) In general, we consider both consumers and suppliers strategic actors and, therefore, players of the game. However, the proposed framework may be easily

modified to study the interactions of players on one side, where only consumers or suppliers are strategic, and the decisions of the other side are given.

3.1 Model parameters

Parameters of consumers and suppliers are denoted with the upper index C and S , respectively. Consumers, suppliers and DPs are indexed by $i \in \{1, ..n_C\}$, $j \in \{1, ..n_S\}$ and $t \in \{1, ..n_{DP}\}$ respectively. Each consumer $i \in \{1, .., n_C\}$ is characterized by the required quantity qr_i^C , the utility u_i^C , which describes the amount he is willing to pay for one unit of gas, and the vectors $\bar{q}_i^C, ct_i^C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{DP}}$, describing the access constraints and transfer costs corresponding to the various DPs respectively: $\bar{q}_{i,t}^C$ is the maximal quantity of consumer i can physically transfer from DP t — possibly 0 —; and $ct_{i,t}^C$ is the unit transfer cost consumer i pays if he buys gas at DP t .

Likewise, each supplier $j \in \{1, .., n_S\}$ is characterised by the available quantity qa_j^S , the unit production cost cp_j^S , and the vectors $\bar{q}_j^S, ct_j^S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{DP}}$, describing the access constraints and *transfer costs* corresponding to the various DPs $\bar{q}_{j,t}^S$ is the maximal quantity supplier j can physically transfer to DP t – again, possibly 0; and $ct_{j,t}^S$ is the unit transfer cost paid by supplier j experiences when buying gas at DP t .

3.2 Formal description of the submitted bids

As consumers submit only demand quantities for DPs in the AEU platform, the bids of consumers in the model are summarized by the matrix

$$BQ^C \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_C \times n_{DP}} \quad ,$$

where the entry $BQ^C(i, t)$ corresponds to the quantity of the demand (buy) bid submitted by consumer i for DP t . We assume that each demand bid submitted to a particular DP is bounded by the accessibility constraint and the total required quantity of the respective consumer, as described by equation (1).

$$BQ^C(i, t) \leq \bar{q}_{i,t}^C \quad BQ^C(i, t) \leq qr_i^C \quad \forall i, \forall t \quad (1)$$

Suppliers also have to provide bid prices, thus the bids of suppliers are summarized by the matrices

$$BQ^S \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_S \times n_{DP}} \quad \text{and} \quad BP^S \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_S \times n_{DP}} \quad ,$$

where $BQ^S(j, t)$ corresponds to the quantity of the supply (sell) bid submitted by supplier j for DP t and $BP^S(j, t)$ corresponds to the price of the bid submitted by supplier j for DP t .

Similarly to the demand side, we assume that each supply bid submitted to a particular DP is bounded by the the accessibility constraint and the total required quantity of the respective supplier, as described by equation (2).

$$BQ^S(j, t) \leq \bar{q}_{j,t}^S \quad BQ^S(j, t) \leq qa_j^S \quad \forall j, \forall t \quad (2)$$

The total quantity of submitted demand and supply bids for DP t is denoted by q_t^D and q_t^S and may be calculated as described by Equation (3).

$$q_t^D = \sum_i BQ^C(i, t), \quad q_t^S = \sum_j BQ^S(j, t) \quad (3)$$

3.3 Bidding strategies

We model the optional overbidding as a strategic decision. Each participant may choose from two options: (1) Not overbid and (2) Overbid. $S_i \in \{N, O\}$ denotes the strategy of player i , where N stands for non-overbidding and O stands for overbidding.

In the former case ('N'), the total quantity of the bids submitted by the participant will be equal to the required/available quantity (in the case of consumers and suppliers, respectively). If \bar{q}_i^C/\bar{q}_i^S limits the total quantity of bids, the participant will submit bids for the maximal total (deliverable) quantity. Formally, the non-overbidding strategy results in a total demanded/supplied quantity (denoted by TDQ_i^N and TSQ_j^N respectively)

$$TDQ_i^N = \min \left\{ qr_i^C, \sum \bar{q}_i^C \right\} \text{ for consumers, and}$$

$$TSQ_j^N = \min \left\{ qa_j^S, \sum \bar{q}_j^S \right\} \text{ for suppliers}$$

In the latter case ('O'), if the \bar{q}_i^C/\bar{q}_i^S constraints allow, the total bidded quantity will be equal to two times the required/available quantity. Again, if the accessibility constraint limits the total quantity of bids, the participant will submit bids for the maximal total (deliverable) quantity. In addition, according to inequalities (1) and (2) we assume that no consumer i or supplier j submits a bid greater than qr_i^C or qa_j^S , respectively, to any single DP, even if the the accessibility constraint would allow it, in the case of overbidding either. Formally, the overbidding strategy results in a total demanded/supplied quantity (denoted by TDQ_i^O and TSQ_j^O respectively)

$$TDQ_i^O = \min \left\{ 2qr_i^C, \sum \bar{q}_i^C \right\} \text{ for consumers, and}$$

$$TSQ_j^O = \min \left\{ 2qa_j^S, \sum \bar{q}_j^S \right\} \text{ for suppliers}$$

3.3.1 Bidding strategy of consumers

Irrespective of the overall bid quantities, the bidding protocol requires a consumer to specify the allocation of this total across delivery points.

We assume a straightforward bidding strategy for consumers. Once the total quantity of the submitted bids ($TDQ_i = TDQ_i^N$ or $TDQ_i = TDQ_i^O$) is determined by the actual strategy $S_i \in \{N, O\}$, we assume that consumer i allocates this quantity, minimising the total access cost. Formally, consumer i solves a linear programming (LP) problem described by equations (4 – 5) , where $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{DP}}$.

$$\min_x \sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, n_{DP}\}} x_t ct_{i,t}^C \quad st. \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_t x_t = TDQ_i \quad x_t \leq \bar{q}_{i,t}^C \quad \forall t, \quad x_t \leq qr_i^C \quad \forall t \quad (5)$$

The result of the LP will determine the bids of consumer i , i.e. the i -th row of the matrix BQ^C (denoted by $BQ^C(i, \cdot)$) as

$$BQ^C(i, \cdot) = x^T \quad .$$

Example 3. Let us consider a single consumer and 3 DPs, described by the parameters $qr_1^C = 10$, $\bar{q}_1^C = [6 \ 8 \ 9]$, $ct_1^C = [3 \ 2.5 \ 2]$. Since ct_1^C shows that DP 3 has the lowest access cost, followed by DP 2 and DP 1, in the case of the strategy $S_1 = N$, the submitted bids will be described by

$$BQ^{C,N}(1, \cdot) = [0 \ 1 \ 9] \quad .$$

In the case of overbidding ($S_1 = O$), the submitted bids will be

$$BQ^{C,O}(1, \cdot) = [3 \ 8 \ 9] \quad .$$

3.3.2 Bidding strategy of suppliers

Likewise, suppliers distribute the total bid quantity (equal to TSQ_j^N or TSQ_j^O , depending on S_j) among DPs, according to the same principle as consumers: DPs with lower access costs are preferred. The respective LP may be derived similarly. The solution of the LP of supplier j determines $BQ^S(j, \cdot)$. However, in the case of suppliers, a bid price has to be also determined for each bid.

Pricing model: In the current work, we assume a very simple pricing mechanism as follows. Each supplier j determines a baseline price, denoted by p_j^{BL} , and a transfer/cost dependent additive component $pt_{j,t}^S$ for each DP t . According to our assumptions, the baseline price is equal to the lowest price, which ensures non-negative profit over all possible DPs, considering the costs of production and transfer, that is,

$$p_j^{BL} = cp_j^S + \max_t ct_{j,t}^S \quad .$$

Regarding the additive component, we assume that it is equal to half of the respective transfer cost.

$$p_{j,t}^T = \frac{1}{2}ct_{j,t}^S$$

The resulting bid price of supplier j for DP t ($BP^S(j,t)$) may be calculated as described by Equation (6).

$$BP^S(j,t) = p_j^{BL} + p_{j,t}^T \quad (6)$$

While the formula described by Equation (6) ensures positive profit at any DP for the supplier in question, it also reflects the different access costs of DPs in the bid prices.

3.4 Modelling the operation of the coordination platform and contracting

We study how the submitted bids determine the matches returned by the coordination platform, and how these matches determine the final contracts. As in the case of the AggregateEU, the matches determined by the coordination platform are non-binding, thus participants may cancel ('drop') a deal before contracting without further ado. In our model, each participant sticks to the best deals up to their desired or available quantity and drops the rest of the alternatives. For simplicity, we consider a single-period market consisting of three stages and assume that each participant may submit only one bid for each DP. In the following, we elaborate on these stages.

1. **Bidding** Participants choose their strategy ('N' or 'O') and submit their bids (BQ^C , BQ^S , and BP^S) to the coordination platform, according to the considerations described in subsection 3.3. The submitted bids determine the q_t^D and q_t^S values for the individual DPs as described by eq. (3).
2. **Matching** The coordination platform determines the matching of the submitted bids, according to the principles of the AggregateEU framework: (i) if there is oversupply in a DP, cheaper supply bids are given priority and (ii) to ensure fair access to cheap sources, all matched supply bids are distributed among consumers 'pro rata', that is, proportional to the quantity of their submitted demand bids. The matching process may be described in detail as follows.

In every DP, the total quantity of submitted demand and supply bids is determined. If the total demand is more than or equal to the total supply in the actual DP t (that is, $q_t^D > q_t^S$), the supply bids are matched to the demand bids *pro rata*: each supply bid is divided into n_t^C parts, where $n_t^C = |BQ^C(.,t) > 0|$ denotes the number of consumers, who submitted demand bids (with positive quantity) for the actual DP t . The volume of the parts is proportional to the

volume of the submitted demand bids. If the total quantity of the submitted supply bids exceeds the total quantity of the submitted demand bids (that is, $q_t^D < q_t^S$), the most expensive supply bids are fully or partially dropped, until the total quantities match, and the *pro rata* matching with demand bids is applied to the remaining supply bids. We denote a match by $(C_i - S_j, t)$, where i and j are the indices of the matched consumer and supplier, while t is the index of the DP where the match is established.

3. **Contracting** After the matches have been determined, it may happen for particular overbidding consumers (suppliers) that the matched or allocated quantity will be higher compared to the quantity required by the consumer (available by the supplier, respectively). In this case, as the mechanism is non-binding, it is straightforward to assume that the player in question drops all but the most preferred deals up to its capacity limit. If multiple matches are present for a participant implying the same utility, we assume they will be dropped at the same rate (partially or fully). According to the modelling assumption, matches, which are not dropped by either concerned participants (the respective consumer and supplier) are realized as contracts with the price determined by the matching.
4. **Utilities** Now the resulting utility values of consumers and suppliers may be calculated according to equations (7) and (8).

$$U_i^C = Q_i^C u_i^C - C_i^C \quad (7)$$

$$U_j^S = I_j^S - C_j^S, \quad (8)$$

where Q_i^C denotes the total amount of gas received by consumer i according to the realized contracts, I_j^S denotes the total income of supplier j according to the realized contracts, while C_i^C stands for the total cost of consumer i , i.e. the sum of expenses of the realized bargains and transfer costs and C_j^S denotes the total cost of supplier j , composed of production and transfer costs.

4 Results

4.1 The ambiguous effect of overbidding

First, similar to the Tinder examples discussed in the introduction, we limit our analysis to cases where all players follow the same strategy. They either truthfully bid their required/available quantities, or they all overbid and bid twice the required/available amount (subject to access constraints in both cases, but these will not be binding in our examples).

Example 4 (Scenario I). We consider two consumers, who in this case may be interpreted as Germany (DE) and France (FR), two suppliers, corresponding to

the United States of America (US) and Qatar (QT), and 3 DPs, corresponding to Brunsbüttel LNG (DE), Fos Tonkin and Cavaou LNG (FR, Mediterranean) and Rotterdam LNG (NL) respectively.

We assume the following parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} qr_1^C &= 400 & u_1^C &= 25 & \bar{q}_1^C &= [30 \ 140 \ 400] & ct_1^C &= [1.1 \ 3.3 \ 2] \\ qr_2^C &= 200 & u_2^C &= 25 & \bar{q}_2^C &= [50 \ 40 \ 120] & ct_2^C &= [3.6 \ 1.7 \ 2] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} qa_1^S &= 200 & cp_1^S &= 5 & \bar{q}_1^S &= [121 \ 446 \ 526] & ct_1^S &= [6 \ 6.6 \ 6.1] \\ qa_2^S &= 250 & cp_2^S &= 7.8 & \bar{q}_2^S &= [121 \ 446 \ 526] & ct_2^S &= [8 \ 6.1 \ 8.3] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Our setup is depicted in Figure 1. In the interpretation of the current example, the parameters qr^C and qa^S represent the quantities that the participants aim to buy or sell via the platform. The ct^C/ct^S parameters are determined by the distance of the buyers/sellers from the DPs, considering also the fees of the Suez Canal² while the cp^S values are determined based on World Bank data on natural gas rents³. In addition, the accesses of consumers to DPs are limited due to pre-allocated capacities, while there is no such limitation in the case of suppliers. In the latter case, we use the total capacity values of the corresponding LNG terminals (121, 446 and 526 GWh/day, respectively, according to ALSI⁴ Declared Total Reference Send-out (DTRS) of the terminals as of October 2024).

According to subsections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, the submitted bids may be calculated from the parameter values described in Equations (9) and (10), and they will be as summarised by eqs. (11), (12) and (13).

$$BQ^{C,N} = \begin{pmatrix} 30 & 0 & 370 \\ 40 & 40 & 120 \end{pmatrix} \quad BQ^{S,N} = \begin{pmatrix} 121 & 0 & 79 \\ 0 & 250 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

$$BQ^{C,O} = \begin{pmatrix} 30 & 140 & 400 \\ 50 & 40 & 120 \end{pmatrix} \quad BQ^{S,O} = \begin{pmatrix} 121 & 79 & 200 \\ 121 & 250 & 129 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

$$BP^{S,N} = BP^{S,O} = \begin{pmatrix} 14.6 & 14.9 & 14.65 \\ 20.1 & 19.15 & 20.15 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

| | DP_1 | | DP_2 | | DP_3 | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Strategy | q_1^D | q_1^S | q_2^D | q_2^S | q_3^D | q_3^S |
| N | 70 | 121 | 40 | 250 | 490 | 79 |
| O | 80 | 242 | 180 | 329 | 520 | 329 |

Table 4: q_j^D and q_j^S in the case of non-overbidding (N) and uniform overbidding (O) in Scenario I.

²<https://www.suezcanal.gov.eg/English/Navigation/Tolls/Pages/TollsTable.aspx>

³<https://databank.worldbank.org/metadataglossary/world-development-indicators/series/NY.GDP.NGAS.RT.ZS>

⁴<https://alsi.gie.eu/>




Figure 1: Setup of example Scenario I

| | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----|-------------|---|-------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|---|------|-------------|----|------|
| DP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| N | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| O | 30 | 0 | 153.8 | 0 | 140 | 99.2 | 50 | 0 | 46.2 | 0 | 40 | 29.8 |

Table 5: Matches by the *pro rata* (AEU) mechanism in Scenario I for uniform non-overbidding (N) and uniform overbidding (O)

| | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----|-------------|---|------|-------------|-------|------|-------------|---|------|-------------|----|------|
| DP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| N | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| O | 30 | 0 | 92.3 | 0 | 116.9 | 53.8 | 50 | 0 | 27.7 | 0 | 40 | 16.2 |

Table 6: Realized matches (contracted quantities) in Scenario I for uniform non-overbidding (N) and uniform overbidding (O)

Regarding the non-overbidding (N) case, the first row of Table 4 summarises the total quantity values of the submitted demand and supply bids for individual DPs in the case of non-overbidding (N). The offered quantities determine the total amount matched (TMQ) as $TMQ = \min \{q_1^D, q_1^S\} + \min \{q_2^D, q_2^S\} + \min \{q_3^D, q_3^S\} = 70 + 40 + 79 = 189$. As these quantities are fully allocated in the matching process (see Table 5) and, as in the case of non-overbidding no matches are dropped, this

| Strategy | U_1^C | U_2^C | U_1^S | U_2^S | TMQ | TCQ | TU |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| N | 777.1 | 599.5 | 532.5 | 210.0 | 189.0 | 189.0 | 2119.1 |
| O | 1496.0 | 781.7 | 714.0 | 1114.3 | 589.0 | 426.9 | 4106.0 |

Table 7: Individual utility values of players, total matched quantity (TMQ), total contracted quantity (TCQ) and total utility (TU) in the case of uniform non-overbidding (N) and overbidding (O).

value (189 units, significantly less than the total available supply of 450 units) will be equal to the resulting contracted quantity in the non-overbidding case as shown in Tables 6 and 7.

In the case of overbidding, the submitted bids result in the total matched quantity of $TMQ = \min \{q_1^D, q_1^S\} + \min \{q_2^D, q_2^S\} + \min \{q_3^D, q_3^S\} = 80 + 180 + 329 = 589$. According to Table 5, players S_1 and S_2 will be overmatched (as $30 + 153.846 + 50 + 46.154 = 280 > 200 = qa_1^S$ and $140 + 99.231 + 50 + 29.769 = 319 > 250 = qa_2^S$) by 80 and 69 units, respectively.

For S_1 , transactions in DP_3 imply less utility compared to transactions in DP_1 ($3.6 = 14.6 - 8$ vs $3.55 = 14.65 - 8.3$), so S_1 prefers DP_1 compared to DP_3 . Accordingly, the quantity of the matches in DP_3 will be decreased from the side of S_1 by 40 % resulting in amounts 92.3077 and 27.692 for matches $(C_1 - S_1, 3)$ – that is, the match of players C_1 and S_1 in DP 3 – and $(C_2 - S_1, 3)$, respectively. This way S_1 is up to trade $30 + 50 + 92.3077 + 27.692 = 200$ units, equal to its total available capacity qa_1^S .

Similarly, S_2 prefers DP_2 over DP_3 , thus the matches $(C_1 - S_2, 3)$ and $(C_2 - S_2, 3)$ will be decreased to 53.846 and 16.154 units, respectively. With the quantities of the matches $(C_1 - S_2, 2)$ and $(C_2 - S_2, 2)$ (140 and 40 respectively), S_2 is up to trade $qs_4^S = 250$ units.

The contracted quantities, determined by the minimum of the amounts that the matched participants are up to trade in the given transaction, are summarized in Table 6. The resulting total traded quantity will be equal to 426.923 units.

Overall, in this particular case, as Table 12 shows, uniform overbidding increases the total contracted quantity (TCQ) and total resulting utility (TU) compared to the non-overbidding case by 125.89 % and 93.76 %, respectively.

Example 5 (Scenario II). We consider an alternative Scenario with parameters described in Equations (14 – 15). The problem is depicted in Figure 2.

The submitted bids are summarised in eqs. (16), (17) and (18). As in the case of non-overbidding all matches are realised, the resulting $TCQ = TMQ = 140 + 165 + 115 = 420$.




Figure 2: Setup of example Scenario II

$$\begin{array}{llll}
qr_1^C = 320 & u_1^C = 25 & \bar{q}_1^C = [234 \ 257 \ 121] & ct_1^C = [1.6 \ 1.5 \ 1.3] \\
qr_2^C = 150 & u_2^C = 25 & \bar{q}_2^C = [294 \ 35 \ 155] & ct_2^C = [2.1 \ 3.1 \ 2.7] \quad (14)
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{llll}
qa_1^S = 240 & cp_1^S = 5.7 & \bar{q}_1^S = [228 \ 125 \ 184] & ct_1^S = [7.3 \ 5.4 \ 5.9] \\
qa_2^S = 180 & cp_2^S = 8 & \bar{q}_2^S = [144 \ 40 \ 205] & ct_2^S = [8 \ 6.1 \ 8.4] \quad (15)
\end{array}$$

$$BQ^{C,N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 199 & 121 \\ 150 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad BQ^{S,N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 125 & 115 \\ 140 & 40 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

$$BQ^{C,O} = \begin{pmatrix} 234 & 257 & 121 \\ 150 & 0 & 150 \end{pmatrix} \quad BQ^{S,O} = \begin{pmatrix} 171 & 125 & 184 \\ 144 & 40 & 176 \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

$$BP^{S,N} = BP^{S,O} = \begin{pmatrix} 16.65 & 15.7 & 15.95 \\ 20.4 & 19.45 & 20.6 \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

In the case of overbidding, all players are overmatched. While all players stick to their most preferred matches, they drop the least preferred ones as detailed in Table 10, where the matches of all players are ordered according to the implied utility values U .

As Table 10 shows, the match $(C_1 - S_2, 2)$ is partially dropped by C_1 , the match $(C_1 - S_2, 3)$ is fully dropped by both C_1 and S_2 . The match $(C_1 - S_2, 1)$ is

| | DP1 | | DP2 | | DP3 | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Strategy | q_1^D | q_1^S | q_2^D | q_2^S | q_3^D | q_3^S |
| N | 150 | 140 | 199 | 165 | 121 | 115 |
| O | 384 | 315 | 257 | 165 | 271 | 360 |

Table 8: q_j^D and q_j^S for non-overbidding (N) and uniform overbidding (O) in Scenario II.

| | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----|-------------|-----|------|-------------|----|------|-------------|---|-------|-------------|---|------|
| DP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| N | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 |
| O | 104.2 | 125 | 82.2 | 87.8 | 40 | 38.8 | 66.8 | 0 | 101.8 | 56.3 | 0 | 48.2 |

Table 9: Matches by the *pro rata* (AEU) mechanism in the case of Scenario II in the case of uniform non-overbidding (N) and uniform overbidding (O).

fully dropped by C_1 as well as the match $(C_2 - S_2, 1)$ by C_2 . $(C_2 - S_2, 3)$ is dropped by C_2 and S_2 as well, while $(C_1 - S_1, 1)$ and $(C_2 - S_1, 1)$ by S_1 . This results in the realised matches summarised in Table 11.

As Table 12 shows, uniform overbidding reduces the total contracted quantity (TCQ) and the total resulting utility (TU) by 40.8 and 31.51%, respectively, as compared to the non-overbidding case.

Looking at the utilities of the two scenarios, it becomes apparent that uniform overbidding may benefit some players while harming others. In the following subsection, we relax the uniformity assumption and let players choose their bidding strategies.

4.2 Strategic and equilibrium aspects

While in subsection 4.1, we have assumed that the bidding strategy of participants is uniform, in this subsection we consider the case when the participants may individually choose their strategy.

The first observation we can make is the following. If all other participants follow the non-overbidding strategy, overbidding (O) is at least as beneficial as non-overbidding (N). If only one player is overbidding, he/she may be the only one overmatched, thus the only one who has the potential to choose from the matches according to his/her preferences. As other players do not drop any bids (since they played ‘N’), it is sure that the matches chosen according to the preferences of the overbidding player will be realized as well. In other words, considering 4 players as before, the strategy profile ‘NNNN’ is generally not an equilibrium of the implied strategic game (it may be when nobody gets better options by overbidding). However, as Scenario II (Example 5) shows, switching from ‘N’ to ‘O’ is not necessarily

| player | match | transaction price | c^T | U | q^{MO} | q^{MU} |
|--------|------------------|-------------------|-------|------|----------|----------|
| C_1 | $(C_1 - S_1, 2)$ | 15.70 | 1.5 | 7.80 | 125 | 125 |
| | $(C_1 - S_1, 3)$ | 15.95 | 1.3 | 7.75 | 82.2 | 82.2 |
| | $(C_1 - S_1, 1)$ | 16.65 | 1.6 | 6.75 | 104.2 | 104.2 |
| | $(C_1 - S_2, 2)$ | 19.45 | 1.5 | 4.05 | 40 | 8.6 |
| | $(C_1 - S_2, 3)$ | 20.60 | 1.3 | 3.10 | 38.8 | 0 |
| | $(C_1 - S_2, 1)$ | 20.40 | 1.6 | 3 | 87.8 | 0 |
| C_2 | $(C_2 - S_1, 3)$ | 15.95 | 2.7 | 6.35 | 101.8 | 101.8 |
| | $(C_2 - S_1, 1)$ | 16.65 | 2.1 | 6.25 | 66.8 | 48.2 |
| | $(C_2 - S_2, 1)$ | 20.40 | 2.1 | 2.50 | 56.3 | 0 |
| | $(C_2 - S_2, 3)$ | 20.60 | 2.7 | 1.70 | 48.2 | 0 |
| S_1 | $(C_1 - S_1, 2)$ | 15.70 | 5.4 | 4.60 | 125 | 125 |
| | $(C_1 - S_1, 3)$ | 15.95 | 5.9 | 4.35 | 82.2 | 51.3 |
| | $(C_2 - S_1, 3)$ | 15.95 | 5.9 | 4.35 | 101.8 | 63.7 |
| | $(C_1 - S_1, 1)$ | 16.65 | 7.3 | 3.65 | 104.2 | 0 |
| | $(C_2 - S_1, 1)$ | 16.65 | 7.3 | 3.65 | 66.8 | 0 |
| S_2 | $(C_1 - S_2, 2)$ | 19.45 | 6.1 | 5.35 | 40 | 40 |
| | $(C_1 - S_2, 1)$ | 20.40 | 8 | 4.40 | 87.8 | 85.3 |
| | $(C_2 - S_2, 1)$ | 20.40 | 8 | 4.40 | 56.3 | 54.7 |
| | $(C_1 - S_2, 3)$ | 20.60 | 8.4 | 4.20 | 38.8 | 0 |
| | $(C_2 - S_2, 3)$ | 20.60 | 8.4 | 4.20 | 48.2 | 0 |

Table 10: How matches are held or dropped according to the implied utility value for the corresponding player in Scenario II. Each match is described by a triplet: (consumer–supplier, DP). U denotes the implied utility for the respective player. q^{MO} stands for the original matched quantity, while q^{MU} denotes the updated matched quantity (the most preferred matches cover the required/available quantity, the rest is dropped).

| | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|---|-------------|---|------|-------------|---|---|
| DP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| N | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 |
| O | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 11: Realized matches (contracted quantities) in Scenario II for uniform non-overbidding (N) and uniform overbidding (O)

beneficial anymore if some (or all) of the other players are also overbidding. For example a consumer may get better matches (with access to sources with lower overall cost) via overbidding, but there is no benefit if these matches are subsequently dropped by the other party.

Let us first analyze Scenario I (Example 4). The bids submitted in the case of

| Strategy | U_1^C | U_2^C | U_1^S | U_2^S | TMQ | TCQ | TU |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| N | 2028.3 | 350.0 | 1075.3 | 830.0 | 420.0 | 420.0 | 4283.5 |
| O | 1407.9 | 404.2 | 1075.3 | 46.2 | 751.0 | 248.6 | 2933.6 |

Table 12: Individual utility values of players, total matched quantity (TMQ), total contracted quantity (TCQ) and total utility (TU) for uniform non-overbidding (N) and overbidding (O) – Scenario II.

various strategy profiles and the resulting matches (initial and realized) are summarized in Table 15 of Appendix A.

In this particular case, overbidding is a strictly dominant strategy: changing the strategy to overbidding is always beneficial for the respective player, regardless of the actual strategy profile, since the utility value strictly increases when changing the strategy to ‘O’, irrespective of the strategy of other players. Thus, as we may see in Table 13, in this case, the universal overbidding (‘OOOO’) turns out to be a (dominant and unique) Nash equilibrium (NE) since none of the players are incentivised to deviate.

| Strategy | U_1^C | U_2^C | U_1^S | U_2^S | TMQ | TCQ | TU |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----|-------|--------|
| NNNN | 777.1 | 599.5 | 532.5 | 210 | 189 | 189 | 2119.1 |
| ONNN | 1143.4 | 590.2 | 532.5 | 945 | 329 | 329 | 3211.1 |
| NONN | 777.1 | 667.5 | 568.5 | 210 | 199 | 199 | 2223.1 |
| NNON | 1098.7 | 703.8 | 713.5 | 210 | 310 | 240 | 2726 |
| NNNO | 1045 | 686.4 | 532.5 | 745.4 | 318 | 318 | 3009.2 |
| OONN | 1143.4 | 658.2 | 568.5 | 945 | 339 | 339 | 3315.1 |
| ONON | 1471 | 688.5 | 713.5 | 945 | 450 | 380 | 3818 |
| ONNO | 1291.5 | 634.7 | 532.5 | 1235.5 | 458 | 399 | 3694.1 |
| NOON | 1035.6 | 751.4 | 714 | 210 | 320 | 240 | 2711 |
| NONO | 1045 | 754.4 | 568.5 | 745.4 | 328 | 328 | 3113.2 |
| NNOO | 1366.5 | 790.7 | 713.5 | 745.4 | 439 | 369 | 3616.1 |
| OOON | 1406.8 | 737.2 | 714 | 945 | 460 | 380 | 3803 |
| OONO | 1291.5 | 702.7 | 568.5 | 1235.5 | 468 | 409 | 3798.1 |
| ONOO | 1560.2 | 732.9 | 713.5 | 1114.3 | 579 | 426.9 | 4121 |
| NOOO | 1303.5 | 838.3 | 714 | 745.4 | 449 | 369 | 3601.1 |
| OOOO | 1496 | 781.7 | 714 | 1114.3 | 589 | 426.9 | 4106 |

Table 13: Utility values of individual players, total matched quantity (TMQ), total contracted quantity (TCQ) and total utility in the case of example scenario I for all strategy profiles of (C_1, C_2, S_1, S_2) .

In general, however, as illustrated by Scenario II this is not the case. Table 14 summarizes the utility values of the players in the case of various strategy profiles

considering Scenario II (the bid and matching Tables are detailed in Appendix B).

| Strategy | U_1^C | U_2^C | U_1^S | U_2^S | TMQ | TCQ | TU |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----|-------|--------|
| NNNN | 2028.3 | 350 | 1075.3 | 830 | 420 | 420 | 4283.5 |
| ONNN | 2148.3 | 136.7 | 1075.3 | 630.6 | 420 | 374.7 | 3990.8 |
| NONN | 1534.9 | 620.1 | 1075.3 | 593.9 | 420 | 366.3 | 3824.2 |
| NNON | 2028.3 | 0 | 1075.3 | 214 | 436 | 280 | 3317.5 |
| NNNO | 1137 | 350 | 575 | 830 | 430 | 305 | 2892 |
| OONN | 1790.9 | 540.9 | 1075.3 | 830 | 420 | 420 | 4237 |
| ONON | 1866.3 | 136.7 | 1075.3 | 240.6 | 597 | 294.7 | 3318.8 |
| ONNO | 1239 | 136.7 | 575 | 604.2 | 430 | 253.7 | 2554.9 |
| NOON | 1534.9 | 404.2 | 1075.3 | 214 | 499 | 280 | 3228.4 |
| NONO | 1465.7 | 577.4 | 988.3 | 642.6 | 580 | 357.4 | 3674.1 |
| NNOO | 2028.3 | 0 | 1075.3 | 214 | 436 | 280 | 3317.5 |
| OONN | 1407.9 | 404.2 | 1075.3 | 46.2 | 660 | 248.6 | 2933.6 |
| OONO | 1567.7 | 470.6 | 988.3 | 604.2 | 580 | 348.7 | 3630.8 |
| ONOO | 1866.3 | 136.7 | 1075.3 | 240.6 | 601 | 294.7 | 3318.8 |
| NOOO | 1655.4 | 404.2 | 1075.3 | 377.1 | 586 | 318.8 | 3512 |
| Oooo | 1407.9 | 404.2 | 1075.3 | 46.2 | 751 | 248.6 | 2933.6 |

Table 14: Utility values of individual players, total matched quantity (TMQ), total contracted quantity (TCQ) and total utility in the case of example scenario II for all strategy profiles

The ‘Oooo’ strategy profile is not a NE anymore (C_1 gets off better by deviating), overbidding is not always beneficial in this case. This may be seen in the case of other strategy profiles as well, for example in the case of the ‘NNON’ \rightarrow ‘ONON’ or by the ‘NNOO’ \rightarrow ‘ONOO’ transition, where the change of the strategy ‘N’ to ‘O’ by C_1 results in a decreased utility (2028.25 *versus* 1866.25). The strategy profiles ‘OONN’ and ‘NOOO’ are both NEs, thus this example also illustrates the potential existence of multiple equilibria in the implied strategic game. Furthermore, let us note that while the NE ‘OONN’ is efficient in terms of the total contracted quantity (TCQ = 420, which is the theoretical maximum in this case since $qa_1^S + qa_2^S = 420$), and gives only slightly less utility than ‘NNNN’ (4237 instead of 4283.5), the strategy profile ‘NOOO’ is inefficient both in terms of TCQ (318.8) and total utility (3511.9).

5 Discussion

5.1 The relevance of the model

To what extent should we be concerned about our findings? What is the applicability of our results to AggregateEU?

The scenarios we presented go beyond the oversimplified examples often characteristic of academic literature in the sense that they present realistic market situations among some of the main stakeholders with realistic costs and strategic dilemmas. While reality presents us with a larger player set and a richer strategy space, the effects captured by our examples are still present; the players we focus on face the described decision problems, potentially resulting in the highlighted inefficiencies.

At the same time, our model has a number of necessary simplifications, and now we look into the possibility of relaxing them.

In the current model, participants drop unfavourable matches simultaneously. If excess matches are dropped iteratively, one after the other, with plenty of time to inform other players, more, previously less preferred deals are kept as well. This would imply more realised matches compared to the results provided by our model.

In reality, the exact time when a deal is dropped may get blurred by, for example, additional rounds of negotiations before opting out, not to mention challenges to transfer this information into common knowledge. Taking this iterative aspect of bargaining into account would add much to the complexity of the model and make calculations excessively challenging.

Likewise, allowing for a richer set of strategies for overbidding beyond the 100% studied here would make the model more realistic, but also substantially more complex.

5.2 Characterising inefficient scenarios

Our two realistic, though naturally simplified examples only differ in some parameters and yet one exhibits inefficiencies while the other does not. Understanding the differences between such scenarios helps to overcome inefficiencies. While a comprehensive analysis fully characterising the gas markets under the AggregateEU mechanism is beyond the scope of this paper, in the following, we highlight a common conflict of interest in two-sided platforms. Indeed, while AggregateEU coordinates the entire mechanism, trade takes place at the delivery points that, as a result, act as platforms.

Seminal papers on two-sided platforms show that the optimal business strategies on platforms can differ fundamentally from those in classic markets [21, 22, 23, 24]. More recent contributions to this literature explore the role of bounded rationality of some agents [25] and the degree of competition between sellers [26, 27].

In the case of the AggregateEU mechanism, some of the miscoordination is due to the opposing preferences of buyers and sellers in a multihoming setup [28]. For an illustration, consider the following example: A shop offers cash or card payments, these being the two platforms for the transaction. Cash payments are cumbersome for the buyer, while card payments have higher costs for the shop. Under the current mechanism both options are dropped, since the shop prefers cash — and drops the card option — the customer prefers card payment — and drops cash as the means of payment.

This type of miscoordination is a common problem for platforms as well, not the least because of the pricing strategies of the platforms themselves for the two sides. If, for example, credit card users get rebates, customers stop carrying cash and the shops must accept to complete the transaction over a less favourable platform. Here: consumers and/or suppliers must take the other side’s preferences into account when dropping matches.

In the following subsection we present some modified algorithms to improve efficiency.

5.3 Alternative mechanisms

While overbidding can be an efficient tool to link supply and demand, we find that it may also backfire due to the non-binding nature of the AEU, which allows dropping matches.

Convex bid sets Even if the nonbinding nature of the bids is required by the policy makers, we may improve efficiency without overbidding and the related outcome uncertainty. *Convex bid sets* [29], allow participants to bid at several different DPs an overall quantity greater than qr^C or qa^S while also avoiding overmatching by ensuring that at the end of the process, a convex combination of the submitted bids will be assigned to each participant, i.e. the total matched quantity of the participant is limited.

Delivery constraints The current AggregateEU mechanism does not account for the capacity constraints of LNG terminals (DPs) in the matching process. In the absence of such a constraint, a match using one or more DPs beyond their physical capacities is theoretically possible. A clearing mechanism with complex bid sets and DP-related constraints could avoid this.

Binding mechanisms If partially or fully binding mechanisms are options, there are multiple alternatives.

(i) The first possibility is to complement the non-binding round of the AggregateEU with a binding second round, in which participants may update their previous offers subject to limitations (for example, by not more than 50% of the first round offers), but the results of this second round are already binding.

(ii) Alternatively, the first round could already be binding. A binding framework makes overbidding impossible (if penalties for non-delivery are high enough). Such a framework should include more complex offer types incorporating alternatives for consumers and suppliers in the context of DPs, such as the convex bid sets discussed above. A single-round binding mechanism should also include ways to avoid matches that are simply too expensive, for example, by allowing buyers to set a reservation price or negotiate deals.

No overbidding for suppliers Overbidding under the AggregateEU mechanism can lead to inefficiencies in an unfortunate combination with miscoordinated drops of matches. Removing the coordination problem by disallowing suppliers to overbid removes the uncertainty at the heart of the problem. When suppliers cannot overbid, they have no interest in dropping the matches found by the mechanism, and therefore buyers can count on the realisation of all the matches. As buyers keep their matches up to their demand, the total contracted quantity TCQ would be maximal, and even the costs under the realised contracts would be near optimal due to the buyers' preferences. In equilibrium, buyers would select suppliers with the lowest total prices, while a coordination failure across DPs may persist with some DPs only served by high-cost suppliers.

Delayed acceptance of offers The Gale-Shapley or *delayed acceptance algorithm* [20] has been introduced for the marriage market but it is fairly easy to generalise it for the current problem, assuming every participant may define a strict ordering on its matches, and no ties appear (like in the proposed model implied by equal utility values).

Step 0 The Aggregate EU mechanism establishes a list of matches specifying the parties, the quantities and, in the case of the sellers, the prices.

Step 1 Consumers each rank the matches and signal their intent to contract on the most favoured ones up to their capacities, taking both the capacities to the delivery points and the overall required quantity into account. Such offers will typically include a last match where the offer is only about a fraction of the matched quantity.

Step 2 Suppliers rank the offers and select the most favoured ones up to their capacities, taking both the capacities to the delivery points and the overall supply capacity into account. These offers are kept. Again, the kept offers will typically include a last one where only a fraction of the offered quantity is kept and the rest gets rejected. Rejected matches (or parts thereof) are dropped for good.

Step n Consumers whose offers got rejected each rank the unused matches and signal their intent to contract on the most favoured ones up to their remaining capacities (that is, the total capacity rejected by sellers), taking capacity constraints into account. If no unused matches are available, the algorithm stops.

Step $n + 1$ Suppliers compare these new offers and the ones kept in the previous round and select the most favoured ones up to their capacities, taking capacity constraints into account. These offers are kept while the rest get rejected. If no offers get rejected, the algorithm stops, otherwise it continues at Step n .

The stable allocation problem was originally introduced in [30], generalised in [31] with more efficient algorithms given by [32].

Due to the well-established properties of the algorithm, the resulting contracts are stable. Since this version is the consumer-proposing algorithm, the contracts are optimal for the consumers. There is a natural counterpart where the producers are proposing, with the final contracts optimal for the producers.

This approach requires the ranking of matches by the suppliers. While suppliers may easily rank matches corresponding to various DPs, based on the respective transfer costs, it is not trivial how a supplier would rank multiple matches within the same DP, which could limit the applicability of such a method.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we study the overbidding phenomenon in the framework of the AggregateEU mechanism. Using a simple quantitative model, we show that overbidding, which is possible in the current design, has an ambiguous effect on the outcomes. On the one hand, it can facilitate trade and increase market efficiency by helping to connect otherwise unmatched supply and demand. On the other hand, an unfortunate combination of overmatching and the uncoordinated drop of excess matches (as illustrated by Scenario II) can result in efficiency loss, where the total contracted quantity (TCQ) falls below the uniform non-overbidding case despite a higher total quantity of matches established by the platform.

In this analysis, we *assume* that market participants are overbidding. Seeing that this is not always in their interest, we study the AggregateEU mechanism with overbidding as a strategic choice. We analyse the strategy space of the implied noncooperative game where we allow participants to choose to either bid truthfully or to overbid, and study two parameterisations (Scenarios I and II). The results show that, while it is possible that overbidding is a dominant strategy resulting in an efficient Nash equilibrium, multiple equilibria with significantly different efficiency may also arise.

Finally, in Subsection 5.3, we discuss a number of remedies. While even the current non-binding type framework can be improved with the introduction of convex bid sets or restrictions on overbidding, partially or fully binding alternatives may also lead to efficiency gains. Such options should be considered with great caution, as our goal is not to reinvent traditional markets but to create additional trading platforms. The optimal solution would be an innovative, albeit complex, trading framework that incorporates and coordinates multiple bid types, including conventional bid types of natural gas exchanges and novel convex bids over multiple DPs as well, and provides a unified clearing solution ensuring flexibility, efficiency, and fairness.

7 Acknowledgements

The authors thank discussions with Péter Biró and Róbert Somogyi. This work has been supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under its Momentum Programme LP2021-2 and by the Grant K146320 of the Hungarian National Research, Development, and Innovation Office.

References

- [1] European Commission. COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS REPowerEU Plan. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52022DC0230>, 5 2022.
- [2] European Commission. Regulation (EU) 2022/1032 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 June 2022 amending Regulations (EU) 2017/1938 and (EC) No 715/2009 with regard to gas storage (Text with EEA relevance). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/1032/oj>, 5 2022.
- [3] ACER. European gas market trends and price drivers 2023 Market Monitoring Report October 2023. https://www.acer.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Publications/ACER_MMR_2023_2023.
- [4] Matúš Mišík. The EU needs to improve its external energy security. *Energy Policy*, 165:112930, 2022.
- [5] European Council. Council Regulation (EU) 2022/2576 of 19 December 2022 enhancing solidarity through better coordination of gas purchases, reliable price benchmarks and exchanges of gas across borders . <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2576/oj>, 2022.
- [6] ACER. Analysis of the European LNG market developments 2024 Market Monitoring Report, 19 April 2024. https://www.acer.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Publications/ACER_2024_MMR_2024.
- [7] Alice Hancock and Shotaro Tani. EU joint gas-buying effort fails to ignite market, 9 2024. URL <https://www.ft.com/content/59068634-636b-4ddf-b37a-0007067c85cf>.
- [8] J Krajník, J Mišič Jančar, and M Jeran. Demand aggregation and joint purchasing of natural gas in the European Union: Analysis of the aggregateEU mechanism. *Proceedings of Socratic Lectures*, 11:103–111, 2024.

- [9] International Gas Union. IGU 2024 world LNG report. <https://www.igu.org/resources/2024-world-lng-report/>, 9 2024.
- [10] IOGP Europe, EFET, Europex, CEFIC, IFIEC Europe, Eurogas, and IGU. Industry views regarding the prolongation of the joint purchasing & demand aggregation mechanism. <https://www.europex.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Industry-views-regarding-the-prol> 2024.
- [11] Aura Sabadus. AggregateEU market impact should be independently assessed – EFET. <https://www.icis.com/explore/resources/news/2023/07/04/10902274/aggregateeu-market-i> 2023.
- [12] Alex Barnes. Eu commission proposal for joint gas purchasing, price caps and collective allocation of gas: An assessment. Oxford Institute for Energy Studies Working Paper NG179, 2022.
- [13] Chloé Le Coq and Elena Paltseva. The EU Gas Purchasing Mechanism: A Game-Changer or a Storm in a Teacup? <https://freepolicybriefs.org/2023/11/06/eu-gas-purchasing-mechanism/>, 2023.
- [14] Directorate-General for Energy. EU Energy Platform (1): EU attracted over 13.4 bcm of gas in first joint gas purchasing tender. <https://energy.ec.europa.eu/news/eu-energy-platform-eu-attracted-over-134-bcm-gas-f> 2023.
- [15] Directorate-General for Energy. EU Energy Platform (2): Commission launches second round of demand pooling for joint gas purchases. <https://energy.ec.europa.eu/news/eu-energy-platform-commission-launches-second-round> 2023.
- [16] Directorate-General for Energy. EU Energy Platform (3): Commission launches third round of demand pooling for joint gas purchases. <https://energy.ec.europa.eu/news/eu-energy-platform-commission-launches-third-round> 2023.
- [17] Directorate-General for Energy. EU Energy Platform (4): Fourth round of demand aggregation for joint gas purchasing starts today. <https://energy.ec.europa.eu/news/fourth-round-demand-aggregation-joint-gas-purchasin> 2023.
- [18] European Commission. REPowerEU - 2 years on. Country Factsheets. https://energy.ec.europa.eu/publications/repowereu-2-years_en, 2024.

- [19] European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy, V Balachandar, D Bothe, G Braendle, J Goročovskij, M Gehrung, M Janssen, A Lenz, C Riechmann, U Scholz, and H Wessling. *Design, development and implementation of joint purchasing options under EU energy platform – Final report*. Publications Office of the European Union, 2024. doi: doi/10.2833/4362329.
- [20] David Gale and Lloyd S Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.
- [21] Mark Armstrong. Competition in two-sided markets. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 37:668–691, 2006.
- [22] Bernard Caillaud and Bruno Jullien. Chicken & egg: Competition among intermediation service providers. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 34:309–328, 2003.
- [23] Jean Charles Rochet and Jean Tirole. Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1:990–1029, 6 2003. ISSN 15424766. doi: 10.1162/154247603322493212.
- [24] Jean-Charles Rochet and Jean Tirole. Two-sided markets: a progress report. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 37:645–667, 2006. doi: 10.1111/j.1756-2171.2006.tb00036.x. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1756-2171.2006.tb00036.x>.
- [25] Johannes Johnen and Robert Somogyi. Deceptive features on platforms. *The Economic Journal*, 134:2470–2493, 8 2024. ISSN 0013-0133. doi: 10.1093/ej/ueae016.
- [26] Paul Belleflamme and Martin Peitz. Managing competition on a two-sided platform. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 28:5–22, 1 2019. ISSN 1058-6407. doi: 10.1111/jems.12311.
- [27] Heiko Karle, Martin Peitz, and Markus Reisinger. Segmentation versus agglomeration: Competition between platforms with competitive sellers. *Journal of Political Economy*, 128:2329–2374, 6 2020. ISSN 0022-3808. doi: 10.1086/705720.
- [28] Yannis Bakos and Hanna Halaburda. Platform competition with multihoming on both sides: Subsidize or not? *Management Science*, 66:5599–5607, 12 2020. ISSN 0025-1909. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.2020.3636.
- [29] Dávid Csercsik. Convex combinatorial auction of pipeline network capacities. *Energy Economics*, 111:106084, 2022.

- [30] Mourad Baïou and Michel Balinski. The stable allocation (or ordinal transportation) problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 27:485–503, 8 2002. ISSN 0364-765X. doi: 10.1287/moor.27.3.485.310.
- [31] Péter Biró and Tamás Fleiner. The integral stable allocation problem on graphs. *Discrete Optimization*, 7:64–73, 2 2010. ISSN 15725286. doi: 10.1016/j.disopt.2010.02.002.
- [32] Brian C. Dean and Siddharth Munshi. Faster algorithms for stable allocation problems. *Algorithmica*, 58:59–81, 9 2010. ISSN 0178-4617. doi: 10.1007/s00453-010-9416-y.

A Supporting calculations for Scenario I

| DP SP | | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | | | Price | | | | | |
|----------|----|----------|-----|----|-------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|-----|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|---|
| | | C_1 | | | C_2 | | | S_1 | | | S_2 | | | S_1 | | | S_2 | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| NNNN | 30 | 0 | 370 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| ONNN | 30 | 140 | 400 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| NONN | 30 | 0 | 370 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| NNON | 30 | 0 | 370 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| NNNO | 30 | 0 | 370 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| OONN | 30 | 140 | 400 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| ONON | 30 | 140 | 400 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| ONNO | 30 | 140 | 400 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| NOON | 30 | 0 | 370 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| NONO | 30 | 0 | 370 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| NNOO | 30 | 0 | 370 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| OOON | 30 | 140 | 400 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 0 | 19.2 | 0 | |
| OONO | 30 | 140 | 400 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 79 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 0 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| ONOO | 30 | 140 | 400 | 40 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| NOOO | 30 | 0 | 370 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |
| OOOO | 30 | 140 | 400 | 50 | 40 | 120 | 121 | 79 | 200 | 121 | 250 | 129 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 20.1 | 19.2 | 20.3 | |

Table 15: Bids of Scenario I in the case of various strategy profiles (SPs).

| DP SP | | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----------|----|-------------|-------|---|-------------|------|----|-------------|------|---|-------------|------|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| NNNN | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| ONNN | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| NONN | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| NNON | 30 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| NNNO | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 40 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 | |
| OONN | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| ONON | 30 | 0 | 153.8 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 46.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| ONNO | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 99.2 | 40 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 29.8 | |
| NOON | 30 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| NONO | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 50 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 | |
| NNOO | 30 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 40 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 | |
| OOON | 30 | 0 | 153.8 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 46.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | |
| OONO | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 99.2 | 50 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 29.8 | |
| ONOO | 30 | 0 | 153.8 | 0 | 140 | 99.2 | 40 | 0 | 46.2 | 0 | 40 | 29.8 | |
| NOOO | 30 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 50 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 | |
| OOOO | 30 | 0 | 153.8 | 0 | 140 | 99.2 | 50 | 0 | 46.2 | 0 | 40 | 29.8 | |

Table 16: Matches by AEU in Scenario I per strategy profiles (SPs).

| | | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|------|------|-------------|----|------|-------------|-------|------|-------------|----|------|-------------|----|------|
| SP | DP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | NNNN | | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 |
| ONNN | | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| NONN | | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| NNON | | 30 | 0 | 98.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 31.8 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| NNNO | | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 40 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 |
| OONN | | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| ONON | | 30 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| ONNO | | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 53.8 | 40 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 16.2 |
| NOON | | 30 | 0 | 90.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 29.4 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| NONO | | 30 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 50 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 |
| NNOO | | 30 | 0 | 98.2 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 40 | 0 | 31.8 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 |
| OONN | | 30 | 0 | 92.3 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 27.7 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| OONO | | 30 | 0 | 60.8 | 0 | 140 | 53.8 | 50 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 40 | 16.2 |
| ONOO | | 30 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 116.9 | 53.8 | 40 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 40 | 16.2 |
| NOOO | | 30 | 0 | 90.6 | 0 | 0 | 97.4 | 50 | 0 | 29.4 | 0 | 40 | 31.6 |
| Oooo | | 30 | 0 | 92.3 | 0 | 116.9 | 53.8 | 50 | 0 | 27.7 | 0 | 40 | 16.2 |

Table 17: Realized (contracted) matches in the case of example I in the case of various strategy profiles (SPs).

B Supporting calculations for Scenario II

| | | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | | | Price | | | | | |
|------|------|----------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | | C_1 | | | C_2 | | | S_1 | | | S_2 | | | S_1 | | | S_2 | | |
| SP | DP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | NNNN | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 |
| ONNN | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| NONN | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| NNON | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| NNNO | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| OONN | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| ONON | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| ONNO | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| NOON | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| NONO | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| NNOO | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| OONN | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 140 | 40 | 0 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 0 |
| OONO | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 125 | 115 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 0 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| ONOO | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| NOOO | | 0 | 199 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |
| Oooo | | 234 | 257 | 121 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 171 | 125 | 184 | 144 | 40 | 176 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 20.6 |

Table 18: Bids of Example scenario II in the case of various strategy profiles (SPs).

| DP SP | | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----------|-------|-------------|------|------|-------------|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------------|------|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| NNNN | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONNN | 0 | 125 | 115 | 85.3 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| NONN | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 140 | 0 | 0 | |
| NNON | 0 | 125 | 121 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| NNNO | 0 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 0 | |
| OONN | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 85.3 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONON | 104.2 | 125 | 121 | 85.3 | 40 | 0 | 66.8 | 0 | 0 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONNO | 0 | 125 | 0 | 87.8 | 40 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56.3 | 0 | 0 | |
| NOON | 0 | 125 | 82.2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 101.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| NONO | 0 | 125 | 42.4 | 0 | 40 | 78.6 | 0 | 0 | 52.6 | 144 | 0 | 97.4 | |
| NNOO | 0 | 125 | 121 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| OOON | 104.2 | 125 | 82.2 | 85.3 | 40 | 0 | 66.8 | 0 | 101.8 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| OONO | 0 | 125 | 42.4 | 87.8 | 40 | 78.6 | 0 | 0 | 52.6 | 56.3 | 0 | 97.4 | |
| ONOO | 104.2 | 125 | 121 | 87.8 | 40 | 0 | 66.8 | 0 | 0 | 56.3 | 0 | 0 | |
| NOOO | 0 | 125 | 82.2 | 0 | 40 | 38.8 | 150 | 0 | 101.8 | 0 | 0 | 48.2 | |
| OOOO | 104.2 | 125 | 82.2 | 87.8 | 40 | 38.8 | 66.8 | 0 | 101.8 | 56.3 | 0 | 48.2 | |

Table 19: matches by AEU in the case of example II in the case of various strategy profiles (SPs).

| DP SP | | $C_1 - S_1$ | | | $C_1 - S_2$ | | | $C_2 - S_1$ | | | $C_2 - S_2$ | | |
|----------|---|-------------|------|------|-------------|------|---|-------------|------|------|-------------|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| NNNN | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONNN | 0 | 125 | 115 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| NONN | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 86.3 | 0 | 0 | |
| NNON | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| NNNO | 0 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | |
| OONN | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 85.3 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONON | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONNO | 0 | 125 | 0 | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| NOON | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| NONO | 0 | 125 | 42.4 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52.6 | 97.4 | 0 | 0 | |
| NNOO | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| OONN | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| OONO | 0 | 125 | 42.4 | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52.6 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| ONOO | 0 | 125 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.7 | 0 | 0 | |
| NOOO | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 40 | 38.8 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Oooo | 0 | 125 | 51.3 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Table 20: Realized (contracted) matches in the case of example II in the case of various strategy profiles (SPs).