

Monopolistic Data Dumping^{*}

Kfir Eliaz and Ran Spiegler[†]

December 2, 2025

Abstract

A profit-maximizing monopolist curates a database for users seeking to learn a parameter. There are two user types: “Nowcasters” wish to learn the parameter’s current value, while “forecasters” target its long-run value. Data storage involves a constant marginal cost. The monopolist designs a menu of contracts described by fees and data-access levels. The profit-maximizing menu offers full access to historical data, while current data is fully provided to nowcasters but may be withheld from forecasters. Compared to the social optimum, the monopolist keeps too much historical data, too little current data, and may store too much data overall.

^{*}Financial support from the Foerder Institute and UKRI Frontier Research Grant no. EP/Y033361/1 is gratefully acknowledged. We thank Tova Milo for helpful comments. We also thank Alex Clyde, Yahel Menea, Emiliano Sandri, and Chet Geppetti for excellent research assistance. Finally, we acknowledge error-correction assistance from refine.ink.

[†]Eliaz: Tel Aviv University and King’s College London. Spiegler: Tel Aviv University and University College London

1 Introduction

Production of digital data has exploded in recent years, primarily because data usage has expanded to include consumption of both textual and audio-visual content, individual-specific information that facilitates targeted advertising, training predictive AI models, etc. Indeed, the current pace of data production may overtake our capacity to *store* it. According to a recent report by the IT firm Lightedge,

“The International Data Corporation (IDC) predicts that the world’s data will surpass 175 zettabytes by 2025 – more than tripling the volume of stored data in 2020. That’s a lot of data – 1 zettabyte alone would consume enough data center space to fill roughly 20% of Manhattan.”¹

This tremendous increase in data usage has a substantial impact on businesses’ storage costs. A recent report by the online magazine Tech Monitor quotes a survey of UK tech managers that “more than half of UK IT decision-makers say data storage costs are unsustainable.”² This is particularly true for firms that collect and store data for the purpose of selling data access to users. The costs associated with keeping data include power and cooling (storage hardware must be kept powered, cooled, and available 24/7, even if the demand for data access is not continuous), hardware refresh and depreciation (storage needs replacement just to hold data safely), replication, redundancy and reliability (to store data safely, one needs multiple copies and backups), and maintenance and operations (the overhead of making sure stored data remains accessible, safe and compliant). In 2024, the average annual cost to operate a large data center ranged from \$10 million

¹<https://lightedge.com/the-data-explosion-and-hidden-data-storage-costs-in-the-cloud-could-object-storage-be-the-answer/>

²<https://www.techmonitor.ai/technology/data/data-storage-costs-uk-it>

to \$25 million.³

If data storage and maintenance is a scarce and costly resource, then its allocation becomes an economic problem. How much data should society keep, and which kinds of data should it dump? How should this decision reflect the preferences of data users? Are there incentive issues that might distort the decision? How would a profit-maximizing owner of proprietary data price and allocate access to the stored data? This paper offers a simple theoretical model that addresses these questions.

A model of data-storage management should articulate its scope by defining three aspects: what the data is used for, what the data consists of, who curates the data and controls its access, and what their motivation is. Regarding aspect (1), demand for data in our model originates from users' interest in training statistical models. Our data users do not seek information about individuals; rather, they wish to learn parameters of some population-level statistical model. Demand is differentiated because different user types are interested in different parameters. In particular, users differ in the *specificity* of what they are trying to learn. For example, an AI language model may be trained to “understand” general text corpora, or texts in a specific professional domain such as math or medicine. Such models correspond to users who try to learn statistical parameters of broad and narrow domains, respectively.

For concreteness, we adopt the following specification. There are two user types: “nowcasters” and “forecasters”. The former want to learn the *current value* of a *parameter*, whereas the latter want to learn its underlying *long-run value*. We primarily think of this dichotomy as a metaphor for the general distinction between users who try to learn parameters of narrow vs. broad domains. However, it also has concrete economic interpretations. For example, a business may be interested in consumer data for the purposes of

³See <https://www.concretelogicpodcast.com/blog/the-economics-of-data-centers-a-deep-dive-into-costs-and-revenues/> and <https://www.hivenet.com/post/a-comprehensive-guide-to-datacenter-cost-management>.

pricing an existing product or for designing a new product; the former requires short-term diagnosis, while the latter requires long-term predictions. Likewise, academic researchers demand data for policy-oriented or basic research; the former is concerned with precise short-term predictions, while the latter aims at learning long-term fundamentals.

Regarding aspect (2), a database in our model consists of two random samples from two time periods: the present and the past. Each data point has both time-specific and idiosyncratic noise components. Thus, all observations from some time period share the same time-specific noise realization, while having independent idiosyncratic noise realizations. The parameter and noise terms are independent Gaussians. Each user type aims to minimize the mean squared error of the prediction he is interested in. This objective function induces a value that each user type attaches to a sample defined by the number of historical and current observations.

As to aspect (3), data in our model is curated by a monopolistic, profit-maximizing firm, which controls users' access to the data. This has real-life analogues. Companies such as NielsenIQ provide access to exclusive consumer data, partly for the purpose of general consumer research. A more recent example is the collaboration between Getty Images and Defined.AI, which involves creating exclusive datasets and providing access to them for training visual AI models.⁴ Such exclusive ownership of data for AI training seems to be an emerging trend in the information landscape.⁵

In our model, storing a data point has a constant marginal cost. This captures the physical costs of data storage and maintenance. The firm chooses the total size of its database and its composition, i.e. the fraction of current and historical data. If the firm were perfectly informed of users' type, it would offer all users full access to the data and charge each user his ex-ante

⁴See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NielsenIQ> and <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/defined-ai-announces-strategic-engagement-183000929.html>.

⁵See, e.g., <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kolawolesamueladebayo/2025/02/25/why-proprietary-data-is-the-new-gold-for-ai-companies/>

valuation of the information inherent in a sample of the given size and composition. Since users' type is their private information, the firm offers a menu of data-access plans. Each plan consists of a fee as well as a level of access to the database's two components.

Our main results characterize the monopolist's optimal menu. We first establish that nowcasters are like "high" types in a standard second-degree price discrimination model: Their willingness to pay for any sample always exceeds the forecasters'. However, our user typology does *not* satisfy a single-crossing property: The difference between the two types' willingness to pay increases with the size of the current sub-sample, but *decreases* with the size of the historical sub-sample.

Using this characterization, we show that the optimal menu gives universal access to historical data. Nowcasters get full access to current data as well. When forecasters' fraction in the population is above some threshold, the menu offers both types the same full-access plan. However, if forecasters' fraction is below the threshold, they get *no* access to current data, in return for a lower fee. These features are reminiscent of some real-life payment plans for financial data.⁶

We complete this analysis by studying the distortions of the database size and composition that arise from second-degree price discrimination. The historical sub-sample is too large and the current sub-sample is too small, relative to the social optimum. Indeed, we may end up having more historical than current data, unlike the social optimum. As to the total size of the database, there is no clear-cut comparison. We show numerically that the database may be *too large* relative to the social optimum. Thus, relying

⁶For financial data from the Gulf Mercantile Exchange, the CME group charges a premium fee for real-time data and a lower fee for historical data. A subscription for real-time data includes access to delayed and historical information. See <https://www.cmegroup.com/market-data/files/january-2025-market-data-fee-list.pdf>. Similarly, at Interactive Brokers, an account comes with delayed market data free of charge, but a paid subscription is required for real-time data. See <https://www.interactivebrokers.com/campus/trading-lessons/market-data-for-advisors/>.

on users' incentives to manage data access can give rise to insufficient data dumping.

Finally, we further explore the theme of “narrow” and “broad” data users as high- and low-valuation types, using an alternative state space. In this variant, each type wishes to learn a specific convex combination of two independently distributed parameters. A database consists of two independent samples, one for each parameter. User types whose convexification parameter is closer to $\frac{1}{2}$ are “broad” in the sense that they display similar interest in the two parameters. In contrast, types whose convexification parameter is close to 1 or 0 are “narrow” in the sense of being more single-minded. Narrow types have a higher valuation of symmetric databases than broad types. We characterize the optimal menu when there are four user types, symmetrically distributed around $\frac{1}{2}$. The narrow types get full data access, whereas the broad types either get full access or no access at all. The second-best database is symmetric and smaller than the social optimum. This variant demonstrates that our narrow/broad typology of data users may have broad relevance (no pun intended).

2 The Model

A monopolistic *firm* designs a dataset and controls its access to *users*. The population of users has measure one. There are two types of users: “*nowcasters*” (denoted S) interested in short-term prediction, and “*forecasters*” (denoted L) interested in long-term prediction. Let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ denote the fraction of type- S users in the population.

Let $\mu \sim N(0, \sigma_\mu^2)$ be a fixed *parameter* of interest. There are two *time periods*, denoted 1 (“the present”) and 0 (“the past”). A *database* is described by a pair (n_0, n_1) , where n_t indicates the size of a *sample* consisting of observations from period t . Each observation $i = 1, \dots, n_t$ from the period- t

sample is a realization

$$y_{t,i} = \mu + x_t + \varepsilon_{t,i}$$

where $x_t \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_{t,i} \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$. The variance of x_t is a normalization that entails no loss of generality. The value of x_t is drawn independently for each period t , but its value is the same for all observations that belong to the period- t sample. The value of $\varepsilon_{t,i}$ is drawn independently for every t, i . Each data point in the database carries a *storage cost* of $c > 0$.

In the analysis, we will normalize $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 1$. Although we have already normalized $\text{Var}(x_t)$, this additional normalization is without loss of generality, in the sense that we can regard it as a *redefinition* of the unit of measurement of database size: n_t is effectively measured in terms of multiples of σ_ε^2 .

The two user types differ in what they try to learn. After learning from whatever sample he gets access to, each type chooses an action $a \in \mathbb{R}$. The two types' payoff functions are:

$$\begin{aligned} u_S(a, \mu, x_1) &= -(a - \mu - x_1)^2 \\ u_L(a, \mu) &= -(a - \mu)^2 \end{aligned}$$

The interpretation is that $\mu + x_1$ is the true *current* value of a variable of interest. Nowcasters, with their short-term prediction horizon, try to learn this value. In comparison, μ is the variable's true *long-run* value. Forecasters, with their long-term prediction horizon, try to learn this value.

The nowcaster/forecaster dichotomy captures the general distinction between user types who differ in the *specificity* of their learning objective. Nowcasters narrowly focus on learning the parameter $\mu + x_1$ that governs current data. Forecasters have a broader objective of learning the underlying parameter μ that governs both present and historical data.

Users are Bayesian expected-utility maximizers. Type k 's willingness to pay for access to a sample (n_0, n_1) , denoted $V_k(n_0, n_1)$, is equal to the expected-utility gain that the information in the database generates. We

derive exact expressions for V_k in Section 3. For analytical convenience, we shall henceforth allow n_t to take any non-negative real value.

A perfect monopolist can identify user types and extract their willingness to pay. It is clear that users will receive full access, because their willingness to pay is increasing in the amount of information provided. Therefore, the perfect monopolist will choose the database (n_0, n_1) to solve the following maximization problem:

$$\max_{n_0, n_1} \{ \lambda V_S(n_0, n_1) + (1 - \lambda) V_L(n_0, n_1) - c(n_0 + n_1) \} \quad (1)$$

We refer to a solution to this problem as the *first-best solution*.

The main problem we analyze is based on the assumption that users' types are their *private information*. Consequently, applying the revelation principle, the monopolist offers a menu M of *access plans* $m^k = (q_0^k, q_1^k, p^k)$, where $q_t^k \in [0, n_t]$ represents the level of access that user type k gets to the period- t sample, and $p^k \geq 0$ is the fixed access fee he pays. The usual participation and incentive-compatibility constraints must hold.

Thus, our monopolist's second-best maximization problem is

$$\max_{n_0, n_1, (q_0^k, q_1^k, p^k)_{k=S, L}} \{ \lambda p^S + (1 - \lambda) p^L - c(n_0 + n_1) \} \quad (2)$$

subject to the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} n_t &\geq q_t^k \geq 0 \\ V_k(q_0^k, q_1^k) - p^k &\geq 0 \\ V_k(q_0^k, q_1^k) - p^k &\geq V_k(q_0^{-k}, q_1^{-k}) - p^{-k} \end{aligned}$$

for every $t = 0, 1$ and every $k = S, L$ ($-k$ denotes the other user type).

The first constraint means that users get potentially partial access to the database that the monopolist chooses to curate. The second constraint is user type k 's participation (IR) constraint, and the third constraint is type

k 's incentive-compatibility (IC) constraint. We refer to a solution to (2) as a *second-best solution*.

The monopolist in our model chooses the size and composition of a database, as well as how to price user access to the database. We regard the first component as a “data dumping” decision. Our interpretation is that the monopolist controls an extremely large set of data points from both time periods. The data is costly to store, and so the monopolist has to decide how much data from each time period to keep, while deleting the rest. It should be emphasized that storage costs are fixed and depend on the database (n_0, n_1) , rather than on the access granted to users as described by q .

3 Preliminary Analysis: Value of Data

In this section we derive formulas for users' willingness to pay for data access, and highlight their key properties.

Let θ^k denote user type k 's “target” — i.e., $\theta^S = \mu + x_1$ and $\theta^L = \mu$. Each type's prior belief over his target is Gaussian. Since signals are Gaussian as well, so is each type's posterior belief. By standard arguments, since a user's loss function is the squared error of his target prediction, the user's willingness to pay for (n_0, n_1) is equal to the *reduction in the variance* of his belief over his target. The prior variances over θ^S and θ^L are $\sigma_\mu^2 + 1$ and σ_μ^2 , respectively. Let us now calculate the variance of types' posterior beliefs.

From type L 's point of view, a period- t sample generates a signal $\bar{y}_t = \theta^L + x_t + \bar{\varepsilon}_t$, where

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_t = \sum \frac{\varepsilon_{t,i}}{n_t}$$

is the average observational noise in the period- t sample. The variance of the period- t signal conditional on θ^L is $1 + \sigma_\varepsilon^2/n_t$. From type S 's point of view, the two periods' samples generate the signals $\bar{y}_1 = \theta^S + \bar{\varepsilon}_1$ and $\bar{y}_0 = \theta^S + x_0 - x_1 + \bar{\varepsilon}_0$, where $\bar{\varepsilon}_0$ is defined as before. Note that unlike the

case of type L , the error term in \bar{y}_0 is not independent of θ^S because both include x_1 .

Applying the standard Gaussian signal extraction formula to the signals provided by the two periods' samples, we obtain the following result.

Remark 1 *The user types' willingness to pay for (n_0, n_1) is*

$$V_L(n_0, n_1) = \frac{\sigma_\mu^4(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1)}{\sigma_\mu^2(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1) + (1 + n_0)(1 + n_1)} \quad (3)$$

$$V_S(n_0, n_1) = V_L(n_0, n_1) + \frac{3\sigma_\mu^2n_0n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2n_1 + n_1 + n_0n_1}{\sigma_\mu^2(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1) + (1 + n_0)(1 + n_1)} \quad (4)$$

These formulas have simple, interpretable and useful properties, which the following result collects.

Remark 2 *The functions V_L and V_S satisfy the following properties:*

- (i) V_L and V_S are strictly increasing in both arguments.
- (ii) V_L and V_S are strictly concave. In particular, $\partial^2 V_k(n_0, n_1)/\partial n_t^2$ and $\partial^2 V_k(n_0, n_1)/\partial n_0 \partial n_1$ are strictly negative for every type k and period t .
- (iii) V_L is symmetric. In contrast, for every (n_0, n_1) , $V_S(x, y) > V_S(y, x)$ if $y > x$, and

$$\frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} > \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0}$$

- (iv) $V_S(0, 0) = V_L(0, 0) = 0$; $V_S(n_0, 0) = V_L(n_0, 0)$; and $V_S(n_0, n_1) > V_L(n_0, n_1)$ for every $n_0 \geq 0$ and $n_1 > 0$.

- (v) For every (n_0, n_1) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} &> \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} \\ \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} &> \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} \end{aligned}$$

The remarks' proofs are relegated to Appendix II. However, the intuition behind the properties in Remark 2 is important for the subsequent analysis. Parts (i) and (ii) are simple consequences of V_L and V_S being value-of-information functions. First, they are strictly increasing in sample size because information always has positive marginal value in this environment. Second, the functions are strictly concave because information has diminishing marginal value in this environment: The marginal variance reduction that an additional sample point from any period generates gets smaller as we increase any period's sample size.

Part (iii) articulates a difference in how the two types regard sample points from each period. For type L , the two periods are symmetric: If we permute n_0 and n_1 , the sample is equally informative for this type. In contrast, for type S , a present sample point is always more informative than a historical sample point, because the latter has another layer of independent noise (given by $x_0 - x_1$) relative to the former. This is unsurprising: A nowcaster, who is trying to learn something about the present, will intuitively prefer a current observation to a historical one.

Part (iv) means that type S is a "high" type relative to type L : His willingness to pay for non-null samples is always strictly higher. For an intuition behind this result, imagine that there is no observation-specific noise, such that the only sources of noise are the time-specific random variables x_0 and x_1 . For type L , the two samples provide two independent signals of variance 1 regarding his target. In contrast, for type S , the current sample offers a *perfect* signal of his target, while the historical sample offers a signal of variance 2. Clearly, the database is more informative for type S than for type L . This ranking continues to hold when we reintroduce the independent, observation-specific noise. It reflects a general convexity property: In the Gaussian context, having two independent signals of variance A and B is

more informative than having two independent signals of variance $\frac{1}{2}(A + B)$ each.

As part (v) articulates, the classification of the two types as “high” and “low” does not translate to a standard single-crossing property w.r.t the natural partial ordering of pairs (n_0, n_1) . On one hand, both V_L and V_S increase in this order (by part (i) of the remark). However, while an increase in n_1 leads to an increase in the difference $V_S(n_0, n_1) - V_L(n_0, n_1)$ — as a standard single-crossing property would prescribe — an increase in n_0 leads to a *decrease* in $V_S(n_0, n_1) - V_L(n_0, n_1)$, which goes against the single-crossing property.

The fact that nowcasters value statistical data more than forecasters, coupled with the two types’ radically different marginal attitude to the two kinds of statistical data, will drive our results in the next section.

4 Main Results

This section characterizes the monopolist’s optimal policy, including the size and composition of the database, the level of access offered to each user type, and the structure of access fees.

As a benchmark, let us present the solution to the first-best problem (1). Since V_L and V_S are strictly concave, the optimal database (n_0^*, n_1^*) is uniquely given by first-order conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} &= c \\ (1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} &= c \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

whenever $n_0^*, n_1^* > 0$. Moreover, it is optimal for the firm to offer users full access to the database, and charge each type k his willingness to pay $V_k(n_0^*, n_1^*)$ as an access fee. The following result characterizes the composition of the optimal database.

Remark 3 *The optimal database (n_0^*, n_1^*) satisfies $n_1^* \geq n_0^*$. Moreover, the inequality is strict when $n_0^* > 0$.*

Thus, the first-best database contains more current data points than historical ones.

We now turn to the second-best problem. Our first result characterizes the optimal menu for a given database (n_0, n_1) . Denote

$$\lambda^*(n_0) = \left(\frac{\sigma_\mu^2}{1 + \sigma_\mu^2 \frac{2n_0+1}{n_0+1}} \right)^2 \quad (6)$$

Observe that

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_\mu^2}{1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2} \right)^2 \leq \lambda^*(n_0) \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_\mu^2}{1 + \sigma_\mu^2} \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

for every n_0 . That is, $\lambda^*(n_0)$ is interior and bounded away from 0 and 1.

Proposition 1 *For fixed (n_0, n_1) , the second-best solution has the following properties:*

- (i) $q_0^S = q_0^L = n_0$.
- (ii) $q_1^S = n_1$; and $q_1^L = n_1$ if $\lambda \leq \lambda^*(n_0)$, while $q_1^L = 0$ if $\lambda > \lambda^*(n_0)$.
- (iii) *The access fees paid by each user type are*

$$\begin{aligned} p^L &= V_L(n_0, q_1^L) \\ p^S &= V_S(n_0, n_1) - V_S(n_0, q_1^L) + V_L(n_0, q_1^L) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, optimal second-degree discrimination exhibits a “bang-bang” property. When the fraction of nowcasters in the user population is below some threshold, there is no discrimination: Both types are offered full access to the data for a uniform fee that extracts the forecasters’ entire surplus. When the fraction of nowcasters exceeds the threshold, forecasters pay a relatively

low fee and in return forego their access to current data, while nowcasters pay a premium to get full access to all data.⁷

The structure of the second-best menu stems from the fact that V_L and V_S are value-of-information functions. By Remark 2, nowcasters and forecasters are effectively “high” and “low” types. Therefore, the former’s IC constraint and the latter’s IR constraint are the relevant ones and both bind. The systematic violation of the single-crossing property explains the structure of discriminatory data access. The difference between the high and low types’ valuations of data access (q_0, q_1) increases with q_1 but decreases with q_0 . As a result, there is no discrimination in historical data access, whereas discriminatory access to current data can arise. The latter’s bang-bang structure (as described in part (ii) of Proposition 1) arises from the fact that the ratio between the two types’ marginal valuation of current-data access is independent of its size.

We now turn to an analysis of an optimal second-best database (n'_0, n'_1) . We begin by addressing the relation between n'_0 and n'_1 and its dependence on the type distribution.

Proposition 2 *Suppose that c is not too large, such that in optimum $(n_0, n_1) \neq (0, 0)$. (i) If λ is sufficiently close to 1, then $n'_1 > n'_0 = 0$ and $q^L \neq q^S$. (ii) If $\lambda < \sigma_\mu^4 / (1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2)^2$, then $n'_0 = n'_1$ and $q^L = q^S$. (iii) When (n'_0, n'_1) is interior and $q^L \neq q^S$, n'_0 decreases in λ and n'_1 increases in λ .*

Thus, when the type distribution consists mostly of nowcasters, the current sample is larger than the historical sample in optimum, because nowcasters find the former more informative. In contrast, when the fraction of nowcasters is sufficiently low, there is no discrimination and the database is symmetric. The reason is that in this case, access is priced according to the

⁷Our characterizations of the first-best and second-best extend to a cost function that is increasing and convex in $n_0 + n_1$.

willingness-to-pay of the forecasters, for whom historical and current data are equally informative. In between, if the second-best solution is interior and with discrimination, increasing the fraction of nowcasters results in a smaller historical sample and a larger current sample.

While this collection of observations might give an impression that n'_1 is always weakly above n'_0 (as in the first-best), this turns out not to be the case. For some parameter values — e.g., when $c = 0.3$, $\sigma_\mu = 1.2$ and $\lambda \in (0.25, 0.3)$ — we have $n'_0 > n'_1$, i.e., there are more historical data points than current ones. The underlying reason is that the following result demonstrates, the second-best database distorts the data composition in favor of historical data. For brevity, we focus on the case in which the latter is interior.

Proposition 3 *Let (n_0^*, n_1^*) and (n'_0, n'_1) be the first-best and second-best databases, respectively. Suppose $n_t^* > 0$ for both $t = 0, 1$. Then, $n'_0 > n_0^*$ and $n'_1 < n_1^*$.*

Thus, relative to the social optimum, a profit-maximizing monopolist dumps too much current data and too little historical data. For an intuition behind this result, consider the first-best database (n_0^*, n_1^*) . Under the first-best, both types get full data access. Now suppose that forecasters are denied access to current data — as they are under the second-best when the fraction of nowcasters is sufficiently high. As a result, the marginal aggregate value of current data goes down, while that of historical data goes up. As a result, the second-best values of n_1 and n_0 will be adjusted downward and upward, respectively.

As to the total second-best database size $n'_0 + n'_1$, one might expect that the cost of screening user types will lead to an efficiency loss in the form of under-storage of data. It turns out that this is *not* the case: The comparison between the first-best and second-best total database size is not clear-cut. For instance, $n'_0 + n'_1 > n_0^* + n_1^*$ when $c = 0.1$, $\sigma_\mu^2 = 2$, and $\lambda > 0.4$. A

supplementary appendix provides numerical simulations that demonstrate this effect for a range of parameter values.

The reason over-storage of data may arise in the second-best problem is that to compensate for type L 's lack of access to current data, the firm inflates the historical database. This increase may be so big that it outweighs the reduction in the size of the current database. Thus, although incentive constraints dissipate the value of available data for some users (specifically, the forecasters who are interested in long-run predictions), the monopolist's reaction to this effect can result in too little data dumping relative to the social optimum.

Comment on the model's temporal interpretation

We have interpreted n_0 and n_1 as “old” and “current” data. If we think of the interaction between the monopolist and users as a one-off event, this interpretation is airtight. Alternatively, suppose that the monopolist is a long-run player interacting with a sequence of short-lived users. At every period t , there is an arbitrarily large inflow of new datapoints, and the monopolist decides how many of them to curate in the “current” database as well as how many of the previously stored datapoints to dump. Datapoints that are more than two-periods old are eliminated automatically. The pair (n_0, n_1) represents a stationary data policy: At every t , n_0 (n_1) represents the amount of data from period $t - 1$ (t) that is kept in the database.

Under this “Markovian” interpretation, “current” data at period t become “old” data at period $t+1$, hence $n_0 \leq n_1$. While this property holds anyway in our model under the first-best solution, the second-best solution can violate it. Therefore, if we want our model to be consistent with the Markovian interpretation, we should add the constraint $n_0 \leq n_1$ to the second-best problem.

As already noted, our model also has non-temporal interpretations, by which n_1 and n_0 represent databases that belong to narrow and broad domains, respectively. Such interpretations do not pose the problem discussed

here.

5 An Alternative Typology of Data Users

In this section, we consider an environment with a different typology of “narrow” and “broad” users. We present it to demonstrate the broader relevance of this distinction beyond the main model’s specification, as well as to further explore the incentive-compatibility constraints that arise when users with different interests seek access to a common database.

For each $i \in \{0, 1\}$, θ_i is an unknown constant that users wish to learn. The prior distribution of θ_i is $N(0, 1)$, independently across i . A user type is defined by $\beta \in [0, 1]$. As in the main model, a user chooses an action a after observing a sample. His objective is to minimize the quadratic loss function

$$[a - (\beta\theta_0 + (1 - \beta)\theta_1)]^2$$

One interpretation is that θ_0 and θ_1 are parameters that characterize two different demographics (young vs. old, liberals vs. conservatives, etc.). A user is interested in learning about a particular group (a target audience for some product, an electoral district, etc.), which is composed of different proportions of the two demographics. Thus, if $\beta > \beta' > \frac{1}{2}$ or $\beta < \beta' < \frac{1}{2}$, we can classify types β and β' as “narrow” and “broad”, respectively, because type β is relatively single-minded whereas type β' has relatively balanced interests.

As in our main model, the monopolist commits to a pair $(n_0, n_1) \geq (0, 0)$ such that $n_0 + n_1 = n$, where n_i is the size of a sample of independent observations of $y_i = \theta_i + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ is independently distributed noise. Let \bar{y}_i denote the sample average for i (given the sample size n_i). Then, $\bar{y}_i \sim N(\theta_i, \frac{\sigma^2}{n_i})$. A user evaluates a database (n_0, n_1) by the expected-loss reduction it generates.

Remark 4 *User β 's willingness to pay for the database (n_0, n_1) is*

$$U_\beta(n_0, n_1) \equiv \beta^2 \frac{n_0}{n_0 + \sigma^2} + (1 - \beta)^2 \frac{n_1}{n_1 + \sigma^2} \quad (8)$$

A key property of (8) is that when $n_1 = n_0$, it attains a minimum at $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$. In this sense, “narrow” and “broad” types are “high valuation” and “low valuation” types, respectively.

From now on, we assume that the set of user types is $B = \{r, s, 1-s, 1-r\}$, where $0 < r < s < \frac{1}{2}$. The type distribution p is symmetric: $p(\beta) = p(1 - \beta)$ for every $\beta \in B$. As in the main model, this type space violates the single-crossing property. Although there are four types, this specification is simpler than the one in the main model, for two reasons. First, the value of data access is separable in the two data components because they offer independent information about the two independently distributed constants. Second, the symmetry of the type distribution simplifies the characterization of binding constraints in the monopolist's problem.

Let us begin with the first-best. As usual, all types get full data access. The database (n_0, n_1) is chosen to maximize

$$\sum_{\beta} p(\beta) \left[\beta^2 \frac{n_0}{n_0 + \sigma^2} + (1 - \beta)^2 \frac{n_1}{n_1 + \sigma^2} \right] - c(n_0 + n_1)$$

The objective function is strictly concave, as well as separable and symmetric in n_0 and n_1 . Therefore, the optimal solution is symmetric, $n_0^* = n_1^* = N^*$, and given by first-order conditions as long as c is not too large.

We now turn to the second-best problem. The monopolist commits to a database (n_0, n_1) and a menu of access bundles and fees $\{(q_0(\beta), q_1(\beta), t(\beta))\}_{\beta \in B}$, to maximize

$$\sum_{\beta \in B} p(\beta) t(\beta) - c(n_0 + n_1)$$

subject to the feasibility constraints, $0 \leq q_i(\beta) \leq n_i$ for all $\beta \in B$, as well as

all participation and incentive-compatibility constraints.

Proposition 4 *The monopolist's second-best solution is characterized as follows:*

- (i) $n_0^{**} = n_1^{**} = N^{**} < N^*$.
- (ii) $q_i^{**}(r) = q_i^{**}(1 - r) = N^{**}$ for every $i = 0, 1$.
- (i) For every type $\beta \in \{s, 1 - s\}$ and every $i = 0, 1$,

$$q_i^{**}(\beta) = \begin{cases} N^{**} & \text{if } 2p(r) \leq \frac{s^2 + (1-s)^2}{r^2 + (1-r)^2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This characterization is consistent with the main model's theme that narrow types have high willingness to pay and therefore receive full data access, while broad types have low willingness to pay and may therefore get restricted data access. Here, broad types either get full or no access, whereas in the main model the broad type was given full access to one dataset and potentially no access to the other. This difference arises from the symmetries of the present specification. It also leads to the clear-cut conclusion that the size of both components of the second-best database is unambiguously *below* their first-best level.

6 Related Literature

Computer scientists have begun addressing the data-storage challenge in the age of big data (e.g., Milo (2019), and Davidson et al. (2023)), by attempting to develop effective and computationally efficient algorithms for determining which pieces of data to delete. For examples of recent attempts to quantify the cost of training AI models (which is partly a function of training-set size), see Guerra et al. (2023) and Cottier et al. (2024).

Within economic theory and IO, our paper is closest to the growing literature on markets for data and computing services. To our knowledge, our

focus on the data-dumping problem is new to this literature. Bergemann, Bonatti and Smolin (2018) analyze a monopolist who designs a menu of Blackwell experiments for buyers with the same state-dependent utility, but whose private type is their prior belief over the states. Bergemann, Bonatti and Smolin (2025) consider a monopolist who offers LLM models, which are used to compute a set of tasks. An LLM model is characterized by three quantities that are costly to supply: the number of input and output tokens to be allocated between the tasks, and the number of “fine tuning” tokens that can improve the model’s overall performance. The paper analyzes the design of the optimal menu of LLM models for a population of consumers whose private types are the weights they assign to each of the tasks. A similar typology of consumers appears in Bergemann and Deb (2025), who consider monopolistic screening of consumers who use a cloud service for a set of tasks.

A feature that is common to these papers and ours is the idea that buyers require data to perform certain tasks. One crucial difference is the public-good aspect of our model: Our monopolist first needs to determine the size and composition of the data to hold, and screening is then done by offering different degrees of access to this data for different fees. A second major distinction is the buyer typology: Buyers differ in the parameters they seek to infer from the dataset. This implies a difference in their willingness-to-pay for data.

One strand of the literature on information markets focuses on buying and selling of personal data, mainly for personalized advertising and price discrimination. A notable paper that belongs to this strand is Bergemann and Bonatti (2015), who study a market in which firms face uncertainty about the match value with different consumer types. If a firm knew its match value with a particular consumer type, it could optimally choose a marketing campaign targeting that type. Firms can purchase this information from a single data provider who charges a price per “match-value query”, which

provides a firm with the set of consumer types who generate the requested match value. The authors characterize firms’ query demand and the data provider’s price-setting decision. Unlike our setting, data buyers in Bergemann and Bonatti (2015) have no private information, hence the monopolist does not face a screening problem. See Bergemann and Bonatti (2019) for an extensive review of related works.

Another strand in this literature studies intermediaries who can provide hard evidence on the quality of a product, whose provider can then decide whether to disclose the evidence (see Ali et al. (2022) and the references therein). By contrast, our focus is on the use of statistical data for general (i.e., not individual-specific) predictions. Such usage of data was recently studied in a different context by Gans (2024): He asked whether users who freely contribute training data for generative AI may have an incentive to stop doing so once they start relying on the AI.

Our model is an example of monopolistic pricing of excludable public goods (Brito and Oakland (1980), Norman (2004)). What is new here is that the public good in our model is statistical data. It has two dimensions (historical and current data), and users’ demand for it originates from the informational value of statistical data, which generates a structured violation of the single-crossing property.

As an example of a two-type monopolistic screening problem without single crossing, our paper is also related to Haghpahan and Siegel (2025), who characterize the optimal menu for this case. A key lemma in that paper concerns the notion of an “uncontested type”, whose willingness-to-pay for his efficient option is higher than the other type’s willingness-to-pay for that same option. In an optimal menu, an uncontested type is allocated his efficient outcome, while the other type’s IR constraint binds. In our framework, the monopolist first needs to decide on the size and composition of the entire database. Given this database, all costs are sunk and it is efficient to give everyone full data access.

Thus, one implication of Haghpanah and Siegel (2025) for our model is that *if* there is a high type, then given a database, that type will get full access and the low type will have no surplus. Their model is silent on the question of the optimal size and composition of the database. However, once we fix a database and have identified that the nowcaster is the high type, Haghpanah and Siegel (2025) provide a characterization of the alternatives that are assigned to each type, in terms of new notions that they define. Mapping these notions to our framework is more involved and less transparent than giving a direct characterization of the optimal menu, as we did here. Finally, since the Haghpanah-Siegel methods apply to two-type environments, they are inapplicable to the model of Section 5.

7 Conclusion

This paper analyzed the management of anonymous statistical data as a mechanism-design problem of allocating access to a non-rival public good, taking into account fixed data management costs. Our focus here was on data storage costs, but in general one could study variants on our model that involve other data-management activities (such as data processing, which would imply variable rather than fixed costs). By treating the allocation of access to statistical data as a non-rival public good provision problem, our paper naturally opens the door for follow-up questions: How would a benevolent social planner price data access? How would the data-management industry operate under different market structures? What would be the implications for the regulation of this industry? Finally, the data storage dilemma is also relevant when data users have other motivations, such as retrieving their personal memories. In future work, we plan to develop an economic approach to the data dumping problem for such environments.

References

- [1] Ali, S.N., Haghpanah, N., Lin, X. & Siegel, R. (2022). How to sell hard information. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 137(1), pp.619-678.
- [2] Bergemann, D., & Bonatti, A. (2015). Selling cookies. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2015(7), 259-294
- [3] Bergemann, D., & Bonatti, A. (2019). Markets for information: An introduction. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1), 85-107.
- [4] Bergemann, D., Bonatti, A., & Smolin, A. (2018). The Design and Price of Information. *American Economic Review*, 2018(108), 1-45,
- [5] Bergemann, D., Bonatti, A., & Smolin, A. (2025). The Economics of Large Language Models: Token Allocation, Fine-Tuning and Optimal Pricing, forthcoming, *ACM EC Conference Proceedings 2025*.
- [6] Bergemann, D., & Deb, R. (2025). Robust pricing for cloud computing. Working paper.
- [7] Brito, D. L., & Oakland, W. H. (1980). On the monopolistic provision of excludable public goods. *The American Economic Review*, 70(4), 691-704.
- [8] Cottier, B., Rahman, R., Fattorini, L., Maslej, N., & Owen, D. (2024). The rising costs of training frontier AI models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21015*.
- [9] Davidson, S. B., Gershtein, S., Milo, T., Novgorodov, S., & Shoshan, M. (2023). Efficiently Archiving Photos under Storage Constraints. In *EDBT* (pp. 591-603).
- [10] Gans, J.S. (2024). Will user-contributed AI training data eat its own tail?. *Economics Letters*, 242, p.111868.

- [11] Guerra, E., Wilhelmi, F., Miozzo, M., & Dini, P. (2023). The cost of training machine learning models over distributed data sources. IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society, 4, 1111-1126.
- [12] Haghpanah, N., & R. Siegel (2025). Screening Two Types. Working paper.
- [13] Milo, T. (2019). Getting rid of data. Journal of Data and Information Quality (JDIQ), 12(1), 1-7.
- [14] Norman, P. (2004). Efficient mechanisms for public goods with use exclusions. The Review of Economic Studies, 71(4), 1163-1188.

Appendix I: Proofs

Remark 3

Suppose $n_0^* > n_1^*$. Suppose the firm deviates to (n'_0, n'_1) such that $n'_0 = n_1^*$ and $n'_1 = n_0^*$. By Remark 2(iii), $V_L(n'_0, n'_1) = V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)$, whereas $V_S(n'_0, n'_1) > V_S(n_0^*, n_1^*)$. Obviously, $c(n'_0 + n'_1) = c(n_0^* + n_1^*)$. Therefore, the deviation increases the value of the objective function given by (1).

Now suppose $n_0^* = n_1^* > 0$. Then, the optimum is given by (5). By Remark 2(iii),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_1} &= \frac{\partial V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_0} \\ \frac{\partial V_S(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_1} &> \frac{\partial V_S(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_0} \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (5). ■

Proposition 1

Fix (n_0, n_1) . We first solve the relaxed problem in which we impose only three constraints: IR_L , IC_S and the feasibility constraint $n_t \geq q_t^k \geq 0$ for

$t = 0, 1$ and $k = L, S$. In the relaxed problem, IR_L and IC_S must bind: If IR_L has slack, the monopolist can increase p^L and p^S by the same amount without violating IC_S ; and if IC_S has slack, the monopolist can increase p^S without violating IR_L .

Define the function

$$\Delta(q_0, q_1) := V_S(q_0, q_1) - V_L(q_0, q_1)$$

This is the difference between the two types' willingness to pay. Substituting the binding constraints into the monopolist's objective function reduces the relaxed problem to the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{(q_0^L, q_1^L, q_0^S, q_1^S)} \lambda [V_S(q_0^S, q_1^S) - \Delta(q_0^L, q_1^L)] + (1 - \lambda) V_L(q_0^L, q_1^L) \quad (9)$$

subject to $n_t \geq q_t^k \geq 0$ for $t = 0, 1$ and $k = L, S$. Since V_S increases in both its arguments, $(q_0^S, q_1^S) = (n_0, n_1)$ in optimum. Since $\Delta(q_0^L, q_1^L)$ decreases in q_0^L and V_L increases in q_0^L , we must have $q_0^L = n_0$ in optimum. For IR_L and IC_S to bind, $p^L = V_L(n_0, q_1^L)$ and $p^S = V_S(n_0, n_1) - \Delta(n_0, q_1^L)$. It is now easy to verify that these prices, together with the allocation identified above, satisfy the remaining constraints: IR_S and IC_L . Therefore, it is also a solution to (2) for the fixed (n_0, n_1) .

From (3) and (4), it follows that

$$\frac{\partial V_L(q_0^L, q_1^L)/\partial q_1^L}{\partial V_S(q_0^L, q_1^L)/\partial q_1^L} = \sigma_\mu^4 \left(\frac{q_0^L + 1}{q_0^L + 1 + \sigma_\mu^2(2q_0^L + 1)} \right)^2 = \lambda^*(q_0^L)$$

where λ^* is as defined given by (6). We have seen that $q_0^L = n_0$. Note that $\lambda^*(n_0)$ is independent of q_1^L . It follows that the derivative of the objective function in the relaxed problem is positive for $\lambda < \lambda^*(n_0)$ and negative for $\lambda > \lambda^*(n_0)$. This means that the optimal solution for q_1^L is extreme: $q_1^L = n_1$ for $\lambda < \lambda^*(n_0)$, and $q_1^L = 0$ for $\lambda > \lambda^*(n_0)$. ■

Proposition 2

(i) By Proposition 1 and (6)-(7), for $\lambda > \sigma_\mu^4/(1+\sigma_\mu^2)^2$, the second-best values of q are $q^L = (n_0, 0)$ and $q^S = (n_0, n_1)$. Plugging these values in (9), and using the fact that $V_S(n_0, 0) = V_L(n_0, 0)$, the monopolist's second-best payoff for given (n_0, n_1) is

$$\lambda V_S(n_0, n_1) + (1 - \lambda)V_L(n_0, 0) - c(n_0 + n_1) \quad (10)$$

Property (iii) in Remark 2 states that $\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)/\partial n_1 > \partial V_S(n_0, n_1)/\partial n_0$. Moreover, the derivatives of V_S and V_L w.r.t n_0 and n_1 are all continuous. Therefore, for λ sufficiently close to one, $n_0 = 0$ in optimum, whereas $n_1 > 0$ is c is not too large.

(ii) By Proposition 1, for $\lambda < \sigma_\mu^4/(1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2)^2$, $q^L = q^S = (n_0, n_1)$. The monopolist's second-best payoff thus becomes

$$V_L(n_0, n_1) - c(n_0 + n_1)$$

Since V_L is symmetric and strictly concave, the optimal solution satisfies $n_0 = n_1$.

(iii) When the second-best solution is interior and exhibits discrimination between the two types, the optimal (n_0, n_1) is derived by applying first-order conditions to the strictly concave function (10):

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} &= c \\ (1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, 0)}{\partial n_0} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} &= c \end{aligned}$$

which by (3) and (4) are given by

$$\frac{\lambda (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + 1)^2}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + n_1\sigma_\mu^2 + n_0n_1 + 2n_0n_1\sigma_\mu^2 + 1)^2} = c \quad (11)$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda\sigma_\mu^4}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + n_1\sigma_\mu^2 + n_0n_1 + 2n_0n_1\sigma_\mu^2 + 1)^2} + \frac{(1-\lambda)\sigma_\mu^4}{(n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + n_0 + 1)^2} = c \quad (12)$$

From these equations it follows that

$$n_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{c}} - \frac{n_0 + n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + 1}{n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + 1} \quad (13)$$

Differentiating the R.H.S. w.r.t n_0 , we can see that as n_0 decreases, n_1 increases. Thus, if n_0 decreases when λ increases, then whenever $n_1 > n_0$ for some (λ, σ_μ, c) , this continues to be true for $\lambda' > \lambda$.

We now show that indeed, n_0 decreases in λ . Plugging equation (13) into equation (12) and rearranging yields

$$(1-\lambda) \frac{\sigma_\mu^4}{(n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + n_0 + 1)^2} + c \frac{\sigma_\mu^4}{(n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2n_0\sigma_\mu^2 + 1)^2} = c$$

Note that the L.H.S. of this equation decreases in λ and also decreases in n_0 . Hence, if λ increases, n_0 decreases and so n_1 increases. ■

Proposition 3

Throughout this proof, we take it as given that the first-best and second-best databases are strictly positive.

Let $f_1(n_0; x)$ be a function that maps each value of n_0 to a value of n_1

that solves the equation,

$$(1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} = x \quad (14)$$

Likewise, let $f_0(n_0; y)$ be a function that maps each value of n_0 to a value of n_1 that solves the equation,

$$(1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} = y \quad (15)$$

The L.H.S. of equations (14) and (15) are the derivatives of the first-best objective function (1) w.r.t n_1 and n_0 , respectively.

We can regard $f_0(n_0; x)$ and $f_1(n_0; y)$ as downward-sloping “iso-marginal value” curves in the space \mathbb{R}_+^2 , where the horizontal and vertical axes represent n_0 and n_1 , respectively, as in Figure 1.

We first establish that the curve that represents $f_1(n_0; c)$ intersects the curve that represents $f_0(n_0; c)$ from below at a single point (n_0^*, n_1^*) . By part (ii) of Remark 2, $f_0(n_0; x)$ and $f_1(n_0; y)$ are both decreasing in n_0 for every x and y , and there is a unique pair (n_0^*, n_1^*) (the unique solution to the first-best problem, which is interior by assumption) satisfying $n_1^* = f_1(n_0^*; c) = f_0(n_0^*; c)$. We claim that $f_1(n_0; c) < f_0(n_0; c)$ for $n_0 < n_0^*$ and $f_1(n_0; c) > f_0(n_0; c)$ for $n_0 > n_0^*$. To see why, recall that $n_1^* > n_0^*$ for all $\lambda > 0$. By part (iii) of Remark 2, for $n_0 = n_1 = a$ satisfying $a = f_1(a; c)$ we have $a = f_0(a; c')$ for some $c' < c$. Hence, by part (ii) of Remark 2, $f_0(a; c) < a$. Since there is a unique solution to $f_1(n_0^*; c) = f_0(n_0^*; c)$, it follows that $f_1(n_0; c) > f_0(n_0; c)$ for $n_0 > n_0^*$ while $f_1(n_0; c) < f_0(n_0; c)$ for $n_0 < n_0^*$.

We now argue that the second-best database (n'_0, n'_1) satisfies $n'_0 > n_0^*$ and $n'_1 < n_1^*$ when the second-best solution satisfies $q_1^L = 0$. To see this, let $g_1(n_0; x)$ and $g_0(n_0; y)$ be the functions that map each value of n_0 to the

values of n_1 that solve the equations

$$\lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} = x \quad (16)$$

and

$$(1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0, 0)}{\partial n_0} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0} = y \quad (17)$$

respectively. The L.H.S. of equations (16) and (17) are the derivatives of the relaxed second-best objective function (10) w.r.t n_1 and n_0 , respectively. By part (ii) of Remark 2, both $g_1(n_0; x)$ and $g_0(n_0; y)$ are decreasing in n_0 . Thus, both are represented by downward-sloping “iso-marginal value” curves in the same \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 space we used to represent $f_0(n_0; x)$ and $f_1(n_0; y)$. As we saw in the proof of Proposition 1, there exists a unique (n'_0, n'_1) satisfying $n'_1 = g_1(n'_0; c) = g_0(n'_0; c)$. We will now show that $n'_0 > n_0^*$ and $n'_1 < n_1^*$ when $q_1^L = 0$.

For any (n_0, n_1) , the L.H.S. of (16) is lower than the L.H.S. of (14). By part (ii) of Remark 2, $\frac{\partial}{\partial n_1} V_S(n_0, n_1)$ is decreasing in n_1 . Therefore, the curve that represents $g_1(n_0; x)$ lies *below* the curve that represents $f_1(n_0; x)$. In a similar vein, part (ii) of Remark 2 implies that $\frac{\partial}{\partial n_0} V_L(n_0, n_1) < \frac{\partial}{\partial n_0} V_L(n_0, 0)$, such that the L.H.S. of (17) is higher than the L.H.S. of (15). Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial n_1} V_S(n_0, n_1)$ is decreasing in n_1 , it follows that the iso-marginal value curve that represents $g_0(n_0; x)$ lies *above* the curve that represents $f_0(n_0; x)$. Figure 1 illustrates these curve shifts.

Insert Figure 1

As a result of the directions in which the curves that represent $g_1(n_0; x)$ and $g_0(n_0; y)$ are shifted relative to the curves that represent $f_1(n_0; x)$ and $f_0(n_0; y)$, the unique intersection (n'_0, n'_1) of the curves that represent $g_1(n_0; c)$ and $g_0(n_0; c)$ satisfies $n'_0 > n_0^*$ and $n'_1 < n_1^*$.

We next show that $n'_0 > n_0^*$ and $n'_1 < n_1^*$ also when $q_1^L = n_1$. Recall that in this case, the monopolist offers a single contract (n'_0, n'_1, p) , where

$p = V_L(n'_0, n'_1)$. Therefore, since V_L is strictly concave, (n'_0, n'_1) solve

$$\frac{\partial V_L}{\partial n_0}(n'_0, n'_1) = \frac{\partial V_L}{\partial n_1}(n'_0, n'_1) = c \quad (18)$$

By the symmetry of V_L , $n'_0 = n'_1 = b$. We claim that $n_0^* < b < n_1^*$. To see why, assume first that $b \geq n_1^*$ (which implies that $b > n_0^*$ since $n_1^* > n_0^*$). Then,

$$c = (1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_1} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_1} > \frac{\partial V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_1} > \frac{\partial V_L(b, b)}{\partial n_1}$$

where the first and second inequalities follow from parts (v) and (ii), respectively, of Remark 2. But the above inequality violates equation (18), a contradiction.

Next, assume $b \leq n_0^*$ (and hence, $b < n_1^*$). Then again by Remark 2,

$$c = (1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_0} + \lambda \frac{\partial V_S(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_0} < \frac{\partial V_L(n_0^*, n_1^*)}{\partial n_0} < \frac{\partial V_L(b, b)}{\partial n_0}$$

violating equation (18). ■

Remark 4

In the absence of any sample data, type β 's optimal action is $a = E(\beta\theta_0 + (1 - \beta)\theta_1) = 0$. His prior expected loss is $\beta^2 + (1 - \beta)^2$. To derive the user's expected loss given the posterior belief induced by (n_0, n_1) , note that his action given the sample outcome is

$$a = \beta E(\theta_0 \mid \bar{y}_0) + (1 - \beta) E(\theta_0 \mid \bar{y}_1)$$

This follows immediately from the quadratic loss function. Under the Gaussian specification,

$$E(\theta_x \mid \bar{y}_x) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_x}} \bar{y}_x$$

The user's ex-ante expected loss is

$$E [\beta(E(\theta_0 | \bar{y}_0) - \theta_0) + (1 - \beta)(E(\theta_1 | \bar{y}_1) - \theta_1)]^2$$

where the ex-ante expectation is taken w.r.t. both the distributions over the parameters θ_0 , θ_1 and the sampling error ε . Using the fact that these distributions are mutually independent, all have mean zero, and implementing some algebra, we obtain that the expected loss is given by

$$\beta^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{n_0 + \sigma^2} + (1 - \beta)^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{n_1 + \sigma^2}$$

Hence, the expected loss reduction from (n_0, n_1) is given by (8). ■

Proposition 4

For our purposes, we can consider a relaxed problem that only examines a selection of the IR and IC constraints. The heuristic is to treat s and $1 - s$ (r and $1 - r$) as “low” (“high”) types, such that the IR constraints of s and $1 - s$, and the IC constraints of r and $1 - r$, should be considered. Two additional IC constraints prevent types s and $1 - s$ from mimicking each other. We will later verify that the other IR and IC constraints can be ignored.

The following notation will be convenient:

$$x_i(\beta) = \frac{q_i(\beta)}{q_i(\beta) + \sigma^2}$$

Note that $x_i(\beta)$ is strictly increasing and strictly concave in $q_i(\beta)$. We have the following six constraints in addition to the feasibility constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & s^2 x_0(s) + (1-s)^2 x_1(s) - t(s) \geq 0 \\
(2) \quad & (1-s)^2 x_0(1-s) + s^2 x_1(1-s) - t(1-s) \geq 0 \\
(3) \quad & s^2 x_0(s) + (1-s)^2 x_1(s) - t(s) \geq s^2 x_0(1-s) + (1-s)^2 x_1(1-s) - t(1-s) \\
(4) \quad & (1-s)^2 x_0(1-s) + s^2 x_1(1-s) - t(1-s) \geq (1-s)^2 x_0(s) + s^2 x_1(s) - t(s) \\
(5) \quad & r^2 x_0(r) + (1-r)^2 x_1(r) - t(r) \geq r^2 x_0(s) + (1-r)^2 x_1(s) - t(s) \\
(6) \quad & (1-r)^2 x_0(1-r) + r^2 x_1(1-r) - t(1-r) \geq (1-r)^2 x_0(1-s) + r^2 x_1(1-s) - t(1-s)
\end{aligned}$$

Constraints (1)-(2) are the IR constraints of types s and $1-s$. Constraints (3)-(4) are the IC constraints that prevent them from mimicking one another. Finally, constraints (5)-(6) are the IC constraints that prevent types r and $1-r$ from mimicking types s and $1-s$, respectively.

We first establish that the optimal solution is symmetric in the sense that for every i, β , $n_1 = n_0$, $q_i(\beta) = q_{1-i}(1-\beta)$, and $t(\beta) = t(1-\beta)$. To see why, assume the contrary. Note that if the profile $(n_i, q_i(\beta), t(\beta))_{i,\beta}$ is optimal (and therefore satisfies all the constraints), then the permutation $n'_i = n_{1-i}$, $q'_i(\beta) = q_{1-i}(1-\beta)$, and $t'(\beta) = t(1-\beta)$, is feasible and induces the same profit for the monopolist. Now define $q''_i(\beta)$ such that

$$x''_i(\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(x_i(\beta) + x'_i(\beta))$$

for every i, β . Since $x_i(\beta)$ is a one-to-one function of $q_i(\beta)$, this defines q'' unambiguously. Likewise, define

$$\begin{aligned}
t''_i(\beta) &= \frac{1}{2}(t_i(\beta) + t'_i(\beta)) \\
n''_i &= \frac{1}{2}(n_i + n'_i)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that constraints (1)-(6) above are all linear in x and t . Therefore, since (x, t) and (x', t') satisfy the constraints, so does (x'', t'') . Since $x_i(\beta)$ is strictly

concave in $q_i(\beta)$,

$$x_i''(\beta) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{q_i(\beta)}{q_i(\beta) + \sigma^2} + \frac{q_{1-i}(1-\beta)}{q_{1-i}(1-\beta) + \sigma^2} \right] < \frac{\frac{1}{2}q_i(\beta) + \frac{1}{2}q_{1-i}(1-\beta)}{\frac{1}{2}q_i(\beta) + \frac{1}{2}q_{1-i}(1-\beta) + \sigma^2}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} q_i''(\beta) &< \frac{1}{2}q_i(\beta) + \frac{1}{2}q_{1-i}(1-\beta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}q_i(\beta) + \frac{1}{2}q_i'(\beta) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}n_i + \frac{1}{2}n_i' \\ &= n_i'' \end{aligned}$$

This means that (q'', t'') replicates the monopolist's revenue from (q, t) , but it can be attained with a strictly lower total database than $n_0 + n_1$ — contradicting the optimality of (n, q, t) and (n', q', t') . From now on, we use N to denote the value of $n_0 = n_1$.

Now observe that by the symmetry, constraints (3)-(4) together imply $x_1(s) \geq x_1(1-s)$ and (equivalently) $x_0(1-s) \geq x_0(s)$. Also by symmetry, constraints (1), (3) and (5) are equivalent to constraints (2), (4) and (6), respectively. Therefore, we can retain only the former. By standard arguments, constraints (1) and (5) are binding, and type r 's data access is efficient:

$$x_0(r) = x_1(r) = \frac{N}{N + \sigma^2}$$

Plugging these in the objective function, and the constraint $x_1(s) \geq x_1(1-s)$, we can restate the monopolist's problem as finding N , $x_1(s)$, $x_1(1-s)$, to maximize

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{1}{2}(1-s)^2 - p_r(1-r)^2 \right] x_1(s) + \left[\frac{1}{2}s^2 - p_r r^2 \right] x_1(1-s) \\ & + p_r[r^2 + (1-r)^2] \frac{N}{N + \sigma^2} - 2cN \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

subject to the constraint that $x_1(s) \geq x_1(1-s)$. This constraint must bind in optimum: Since $s > r$ and $p(r) < \frac{1}{2}$, expression (19) strictly increases in $x_1(1-s)$. It follows that $q_1(s) = q_0(s) = q_1(1-s) = q_0(1-s) = Q$.

The problem is thus to find N and $Q \leq N$ to maximize

$$\left[\frac{1}{2}(s^2 + (1-s)^2) - p(r)(r^2 + (1-r)^2) \right] \frac{Q}{Q + \sigma^2} + p(r)[r^2 + (1-r)^2] \frac{N}{N + \sigma^2} - 2cN$$

Therefore, the solution for Q is

$$Q = \begin{cases} N & \text{if } 2p(r) \leq \frac{s^2 + (1-s)^2}{r^2 + (1-r)^2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This solution trivially satisfies the IR and IC constraints omitted from the relaxed problem.

When $Q = N$, this means that all types get full access and pay an amount equal to the “low” types’ willingness to pay:

$$t(\beta) = (s^2 + (1-s)^2) \frac{N}{N + \sigma^2}$$

for all β . When $Q = 0$, this means that the “low” types s and $1-s$ are entirely excluded (and therefore pay nothing), while the “high” types get full access and pay their willingness to pay:

$$t(r) = t(1-r) = (r^2 + (1-r)^2) \frac{N}{N + \sigma^2}$$

In either case, the optimal value of N will be sub-optimally below the first-

best level, as can be easily verified by taking first-order conditions in the first-best and the reduced second-best problems. ■

Appendix II: Other Derivations

Derivation of Posterior Variances in Section 3

Recall the following independent Gaussian variables: $\mu \sim N(0, \sigma_\mu^2)$, $x_t \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_{t,i} \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$, where $t = 0, 1$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n_t\}$. Also recall that an observation i from the period- t sample is a realization $y_{t,i} = \mu + x_t + \varepsilon_{t,i}$, and that types S and L are interested in forecasting $\theta^S = \mu + x_1$ and $\theta^L = \mu$, respectively. The prior variances over θ^S and θ^L are $\sigma_\mu^2 + 1$ and σ_μ^2 , respectively.

From type L 's point of view, a period- t sample generates a conditionally independent signal $\bar{y}_t = \theta^L + x_t + \bar{\varepsilon}_t$, where $\bar{\varepsilon}_t$ is the average observational noise in the period- t sample. The variance of the period- t signal conditional on θ^L is $1 + \sigma_\varepsilon^2/n_t$. From S 's point of view, the two periods' samples generate the signals $\bar{y}_1 = \theta^S + \bar{\varepsilon}_1$ and $\bar{y}_0 = \theta^S + x_0 - x_1 + \bar{\varepsilon}_0$. We now calculate the variance of the types' posterior beliefs.

For $c \in \{0, 1\}$, we have the following joint normal distribution (where $c = 0$ gives us the joint distribution with μ as the first variable and $c = 1$ gives us the joint distribution with $\mu + x_1$ as the first variable).

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu + cx_1 \\ \bar{y}_0 \\ \bar{y}_1 \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\mu^2 + c & \sigma_\mu^2 & \sigma_\mu^2 + c \\ \sigma_\mu^2 & \sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_0} & \sigma_\mu^2 \\ \sigma_\mu^2 + c & \sigma_\mu^2 & \sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_1} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Denote

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_0} & \sigma_\mu^2 \\ \sigma_\mu^2 & \sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then,

$$\det(A) = (\sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_0})(\sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_1}) - \sigma_\mu^4 \quad (20)$$

and

$$A^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_1} & -\sigma_\mu^2 \\ -\sigma_\mu^2 & \sigma_\mu^2 + 1 + \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n_0} \end{pmatrix} (\det(A))^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(\mu + cx_1 \mid \bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \sigma_\mu^2 + c - \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\mu^2 & \sigma_\mu^2 + c \end{pmatrix} A^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\mu^2 \\ \sigma_\mu^2 + c \end{pmatrix}$$

Plugging (21) and $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 1$ into this expression, and then simplifying, yields the desired expressions for each type's variance reduction. For $c = 0$, we have

$$\text{Var}(\mu) - \text{Var}(\mu \mid \bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \frac{\sigma_\mu^4(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1)}{\sigma_\mu^2(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1) + (1 + n_0)(1 + n_1)}.$$

For $c = 1$, we have

$$\text{Var}(\mu + x_1) - \text{Var}(\mu + x_1 \mid \bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \frac{\sigma_\mu^4(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1) + 3\sigma_\mu^2n_0n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2n_1 + n_1 + n_0n_1}{\sigma_\mu^2(n_1 + n_0 + 2n_0n_1) + (1 + n_0)(1 + n_1)}.$$

Proof of Remark 2

Proof of (i). This follows from noting that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n_0} V_L(n_0, n_1) = \frac{\sigma_\mu^4 (n_1 + 1)^2}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^2} > 0 \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n_1} V_L(n_0, n_1) = \frac{\sigma_\mu^4 (n_0 + 1)^2}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^2} > 0 \quad (23)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n_0} V_S(n_0, n_1) = \frac{\sigma_\mu^4}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^2} > 0 \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n_1} V_S(n_0, n_1) = \frac{(n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1)^2}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^2} > 0 \quad (25)$$

Proof of (ii). We begin by verifying that $V_L(n_0, n_1)$ is strictly concave. Its Hessian matrix is given by

$$\begin{array}{cc} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial n_1 \partial n_0} V_L(n_0, n_1) \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial n_1 \partial n_0} V_L(n_0, n_1) & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_1)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) \end{array}$$

The expressions for the terms in each cell are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) &= \frac{-2\sigma_\mu^4 (n_1 + 1)^2 (n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 1)}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^3} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial n_0 \partial n_1} V_L(n_0, n_1) &= \frac{-2\sigma_\mu^6 (n_0 + 1) (n_1 + 1)}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^3} \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_1)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) &= \frac{-2\sigma_\mu^4 (n_0 + 1)^2 (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1)}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^3}\end{aligned}$$

The function $V_L(n_0, n_1)$ is strictly concave if its Hessian matrix is negative definite. To confirm this, note first that the first principal minor is negative: $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) < 0$. Second, note that the determinant of the Hessian matrix is positive:

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) \cdot \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_1)^2} V_L(n_0, n_1) - \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial n_1 \partial n_0} V_L(n_0, n_1) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{4\sigma_\mu^8 (n_0 + 1)^2 (n_1 + 1)^2 ((n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 1) (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1) - \sigma_\mu^4)}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^6} \\ &> 0\end{aligned}$$

We next turn to verifying that $V_S(n_0, n_1)$ is strictly concave. Its Hessian matrix is

$$\begin{array}{cc}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1) & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial n_1 \partial n_0} V_S(n_0, n_1) \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial n_1 \partial n_0} V_S(n_0, n_1) & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_1)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1)\end{array}$$

The expressions for the terms in each cell are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1) &= \frac{-2\sigma_\mu^4 (n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 1)}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^3} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial n_0 \partial n_1} V_S(n_0, n_1) &= \frac{-2\sigma_\mu^4 (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1)}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^3} \\
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_1)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1) &= \frac{-2 (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1)^3}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^3}
\end{aligned}$$

$V_S(n_0, n_1)$ is strictly concave since $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1) < 0$ — i.e., the first principal minor is negative — and the determinant of the Hessian matrix is positive:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_0)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1) \cdot \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (n_1)^2} V_S(n_0, n_1) - \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial n_1 \partial n_0} V_S(n_0, n_1) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{4\sigma_\mu^4 (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1)^2 [(n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 1) (n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + 1) - \sigma_\mu^4]}{(n_0 + n_1 + n_0 n_1 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_0 + \sigma_\mu^2 n_1 + 2\sigma_\mu^2 n_0 n_1 + 1)^6} \\
&> 0
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (iii). From inspection of (3) it is easy to see that $V_L(x, y) = V_L(y, x)$. To see that $V_S(x, y) > V_S(y, x)$ for $y > x$, note that

$$V_S(x, y) - V_S(y, x) = \frac{(y - x) (2\sigma_\mu^2 + 1)}{\sigma_\mu^2 (y + x + 2xy) + (1 + x)(1 + y)} > 0$$

The observation that $\frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_1} > \frac{\partial V_S(n_0, n_1)}{\partial n_0}$ follows from comparing equation (24) to equation (25).

Proof of (iv). Follows immediately from equations (3) and (4).

Proof of (v). Follows immediately from equations (22)-(25).