

# Market Definition in the Digital Era

## (Theoretical and) Measurement Issues

Gregory S. Crawford  
Dept. of Economics  
University of Zurich

E.CA Expert Forum 2017  
Brussels

May 31, 2017

# Market Definition in Digital Markets

I'll talk today about (theoretical and) measurement issues in market definition in digital markets.



# Market Definition: General Overview

- Pre-2010 US: Product and geographic market definition
  - ▶ SSNIP/HMT; Likelihood of entry
  - ▶ Calculate market shares given market definition
- Post-2010 US: Directly measure competitive effects
- **An open question: is market definition even necessary???**
  - ▶ Maybe just look for competitive effects?

# What's different about digital markets? I

There are three important economic characteristics about digital markets that can influence market definition:

## 1 Digital markets are frequently “two-sided”

- ▶ ≡ Connect two (or more) groups of consumers and exhibit direct and (especially) indirect network effects
  - ★ i.e. the value to consumers on one side depends on the number and/or types of users on the other side
  - ★ Examples: payment cards, auction/dating platforms, media industries
- ▶ Implications:
  - 1 Prices set to maximize profits on *both* sides of the market
  - 2 Prices can be zero on one side

# What's different about digital markets? II

- 2 Digital markets frequently exhibit “competitive frictions”:
  - ▶ Digital markets frequently “tip” to a single/small number of sellers
  - ▶ Digital markets frequently embody complementary services:
    - ★ Digital music (iTunes), Digital hardware (iPods, smartphones), Online music services (Spotify, Rhapsody, Apple Music)
    - ★ ⇒ Competition between “Ecosystems” (e.g. iOS v Android)
  - ▶ Digital market frequently exhibit switching costs
    - ★ e.g., due to non-portability of data across firms/ecosystems

# What's different about digital markets? III

## 3 Digital markets are typically *dynamic*

- ▶ Digital markets are often not in long-run equilibrium:
  - ★ Simultaneously exhibiting frequent turnover of leading firms...
  - ★ ...*and* the emergence of “Big Players”
- ▶ Firms that provide complementary services in the short-run may provide substitute services in the long-run

# Why might it matter?

Why might the different economic characteristics of digital markets matter for market definition?

# Why might it matter: Two-sidedness?

- Market definition should be considered for *both* sides and must reflect the interdependencies of the two sides
  - ▶ If not, **will tend to define too narrow a market**
    - ★ (Price increases on one side that lower participation lowers the value to the other side, reducing profits compared to a single-market analysis)
    - ★ (Underestimating profit losses from price increases ⇒ can conclude a HM could profitably raise price when it couldn't)
    - ★ (Causing *over-enforcement*?)
  - ▶ Filistrucchi et. al. (2014, *Journal of Competition Law and Economics*) survey a large number of cases from 2000-2012, some of which did and some of which did not
  - ▶ A (burgeoning?) consensus on this point?
    - ★ e.g. Bundeskartellamt Think Tank (2016)



# Why might it matter: Zero prices?

- That prices are zero on one side of a market does *not* mean it should be excluded from market definition
  - ▶ Example: free-to-air (FTA) television feedback effects
    - ★ A “price increase” of a FTA TV station will reduce its viewership
    - ★ → Reducing its attractiveness to advertisers (and thus its ad revenue)
    - ★ → Providing it with less funding to invest in content quality
    - ★ → Further lowering its viewership and profitability
  - ▶ Many case examples in Filistrucchi et. al. (2014)
  - ▶ Is there (again) a consensus on this point?

# How to measure: Two-sidedness and zero prices I

*How* then to account for both sides of a two-sided market?

- 1 The SSNIP/HM tests for markets with zero prices can use “quality” as a proxy\*
  - ▶ The key is to measure consumer substitutability; need not rely on prices to do so

## How to measure: Two-sidedness and zero prices II

- ② A particular challenge: defining advertising markets\*\*\*
  - ▶ Do Facebook/WhatsApp compete in the same market for audiences? Do CNBC and the Golf Channel?
  - ▶ Academic literature astonishingly thin regarding within- or cross-media substitutability
    - ★ General pre-disposition in US casework that different media (TV, print, radio, etc.) are separate (offline) advertising markets.
  - ▶ Online?
    - ★ What of substitution across demographic groups? Across different modes of consumer use?
    - ★ How to handle advertising market *auctions*???

## How to measure: Two-sidedness and zero prices III

- 3 Two-sided SSNIP/HM tests should account for feedback effects (if relevant)\*\*
  - ▶ Going *both ways*, e.g.
    - ★ From viewers to advertisers *and* from advertising to viewership
  - ▶ A measurement challenge:
    - ★ May not be any “natural experiments” in the data
    - ★ May need econometric modeling

# Why might it matter: Competitive frictions?

- Competitive frictions are all potentially important
  - ▶ Market tipping and switching costs an inherent feature of (some) digital markets
  - ▶ Will feed into consumer switching patterns and are therefore (in principle) measurable
    - ★ (Possibly raises difficult abuse of dominance questions)

# Why might it matter: Competitive dynamics I

Competitive dynamics particularly important

- Market definition is a *means to an end*
  - ▶ The “end” is to understand the extent of a firm’s market power...
    - ★ e.g. for an abuse of dominance case
  - ▶ ... and/or how it might change
    - ★ e.g. due to a merger

# Why might it matter: Competitive dynamics II

- Two (very) challenging implications:
  - ▶ Low *current* prices and/or high *current* shares may not be dispositive of the strength of competition in a market
    - ★ Are prices low because competition constrains them to be low or because a firm *chooses* to keep them low?
    - ★ Could consumers switch quickly to another provider even if market shares are high (as argued in *Microsoft/Skype*)?
  - ▶ “Complementors” today can be competitors tomorrow
    - ★ What if Comcast or AT&T wanted to buy Netflix?
    - ★ Is online video a complement or substitute for pay-TV bundles?
    - ★ **Critically:** Does the answer differ in the SR versus the LR?

# How to measure: Competitive dynamics

## ④ How to account for such competitive dynamics???

- ▶ This is at the frontier of academic research
  - ★ e.g., Besanko, Doraszelski, and Kryukov, “Is dynamic competition socially beneficial? The case of of price as investment.” (Working Paper, 2017)
- ▶ Even so, often can only be addressed using *computational theory*
  - ★ Can it be done in a compressed timeframe? How to adapt it to the facts of a case?
- ▶ Hard - but important - questions!



# Conclusion

- I've briefly summarized what I think are the measurement challenges regarding market definition in digital markets
  - ▶ Like many empirical activities, the right method is very case-dependent
- I welcome questions from the audience about cases in which the questioner faced a measurement problem they weren't able to resolve

