

**Statement of the Federal Trade Commission<sup>1</sup>**  
***In the Matter of Nielsen Holdings N.V. and Arbitron Inc.***  
**File No. 131-0058**  
**September 20, 2013**

Today, the Commission is taking remedial action concerning the proposed acquisition of Arbitron Inc. by Nielsen Holdings N.V. We believe Nielsen's acquisition of Arbitron is likely to deprive media companies and advertisers of the benefits of competition between two firms that are currently developing, and are most likely to be effective suppliers of, syndicated cross-platform audience measurement services.<sup>2</sup> Our remedy is tailored to counteract the likely anticompetitive effects of the proposed acquisition while leaving intact any efficiencies that might be gained from the combination of the two companies. The remedy is consistent with the analytical framework through which we evaluate the effects of all mergers that come before us, whether those effects are likely to occur immediately or in the foreseeable future.

Nielsen and Arbitron are best known for their respective single-platform TV and radio audience measurement services. Nielsen ratings are the industry benchmark for determining the size and demographics of television audiences. Nielsen maintains a national panel of 20,000 households, comprising nearly 50,000 individuals whose television programming consumption is monitored on a continual basis. Arbitron provides radio ratings for traditional, or "terrestrial," radio that are similar to Nielsen's television ratings. Arbitron's panel covers 48 local markets and consists of approximately 70,000 people whose exposure to programming is captured by its proprietary Personal People Meter ("PPM") technology. In addition to measuring radio consumption, Arbitron measures panelists' television consumption and provides out-of-home audience measurement data to television broadcasters.

As television viewership has shifted from traditional television screens to mobile devices, tablets, and personal computers, traditional television measurement is capturing a decreasing portion of the total viewing audience. As a result, media companies and advertisers are now seeking measurement services that account for the entire audience. Specifically, they seek a cross-platform solution that measures audiences across multiple platforms as well as determines the extent of audience duplication (e.g., whether the same individual is watching a program on both traditional TV and on the Internet). Media companies and advertisers would then use those measurements to determine the relative value of advertising inventory. This type of cross-platform measurement product has yet to be developed and marketed. But there is wide consensus among media companies and advertisers that Nielsen and Arbitron are best-positioned to provide this service because they are the only two companies that operate large and demographically representative panels that are capable of reporting television programming viewership, which is critical to developing a cross-platform product that meets likely customer demand. While other companies provide estimates of aggregate cross-platform viewership, only

---

<sup>1</sup> This statement reflects the majority view of Chairwoman Ramirez and Commissioner Brill. Commissioner Ohlhausen is recused and took no part in the decision on this matter.

<sup>2</sup> A syndicated cross-platform audience measurement product is one that provides all subscribers with each programmer's unduplicated audience across platforms.

Nielsen and Arbitron provide individual demographic data, such as age and gender information, for television and, hence, cross-platform measurement.

The Commission also has reason to believe that Nielsen and Arbitron are the best-positioned firms to develop (or partner with others to develop) such a service. Nielsen already offers several products that provide audience measurement across different media platforms, including its Extended Screen and Cross-Platform Campaign Ratings (“XCR”) products. Extended Screen measures television and online viewing for a subset of its national panel. XCR is an advertising campaign measurement tool that combines online viewership data with Nielsen’s national television measurement product. Nielsen is in the process of introducing a product targeted at programmers, called Digital Program Ratings, that will measure the audiences for television programs that appear on line, and plans to launch a cross-platform measurement product, Cross-Platform Program Ratings, next year.

Arbitron is also developing a cross-platform audience measurement solution. Last year, it began a collaboration with comScore known as “Project Blueprint” to develop a product for ESPN. Arbitron is contributing in-home and out-of-home television audience demographic data sourced from its PPM radio panel, radio audience data, and a “calibration” panel recruited from its PPM panel to measure audience duplication across platforms. comScore is providing online measurement and set-top box data. Arbitron has stated that Project Blueprint is “a major jumping off point” toward a “syndicable type [cross-platform] service,” and both ESPN and comScore are enthusiastic about the project. There is considerable industry interest in participating in the next phase of Project Blueprint.

Networks and advertisers believe that any syndicated cross-platform measurement services of Nielsen and Arbitron would compete directly. The proposed transaction would eliminate that competition. Although this is a future market, with an amount of concomitant uncertainty, effective merger enforcement always requires a forward-looking analysis of likely competitive effects. On the evidence here, the Commission has reason to believe that the proposed remedy is necessary to address the likely competitive harm that would result from the acquisition.

The proposed Consent Order is designed to address these specific competitive concerns by requiring divestiture of assets relating to Arbitron’s cross-platform audience measurement services business, including audience data with individual-level demographic information and related technology, software, and intellectual property. The Consent Agreement also requires that the combined firm provide the acquirer with any needed technical assistance, and provide the acquirer with the tools and ability to expand the PPM panel to obtain additional data it deems necessary. With the divested assets, the acquirer will be well-positioned to step into Arbitron’s shoes and replace the future competition between Nielsen and Arbitron that will be lost as a result of the proposed acquisition.

We agree with Commissioner Wright that the analysis of a merger’s competitive effects in any market, including markets where the products are still in the development phase, must always be strongly rooted in the evidence. Where the product at issue is not yet on the market, it can be difficult to develop the evidence necessary to predict accurately the nature and extent of

competition. Nevertheless, the 2010 Guidelines specifically indicate that the agencies will consider whether the merging firms have been or likely will become “substantial head-to-head competitors” absent the merger. § 2.1.4.<sup>3</sup>

Here, there is considerable evidence from which to predict that an anticompetitive effect is likely to occur if these two companies are allowed to merge without a remedy. Both companies meet the standard to be considered actual potential entrants.<sup>4</sup> As evidenced in both internal documents and statements they have made publicly and to potential customers, Nielsen and Arbitron (with comScore) both have invested significant time and resources to develop a national syndicated cross-platform audience measurement service. There is extensive evidence from customers that Nielsen and Arbitron are best positioned to compete in this area given their ability to provide individual-level demographic data. This forms the basis for our concern that there would be anticompetitive consequences from the combination, despite the fact that others are trying to develop cross-platform measurement services of their own. Customer views that Nielsen and Arbitron would be by far the two strongest competitors are supported by Nielsen and Arbitron statements about the products they are each developing and, in some cases, already beta testing with customers.

As with any transaction, the Commission does not merely accept a remedy because it is able to obtain one. We have accepted this consent because we have reason to believe that the transaction will harm competition, and because it is in the public interest to do so.

We recognize that the overall combination of Nielsen and Arbitron could yield efficiencies outside of the market that concerns us. The proposed consent does not affect those efficiencies. We also took into account the parties’ predictions that national syndicated cross-platform measurement services were likely to have relatively modest sales for some time. Weighing these considerations and the evidence of likely harm, we have concluded that the public interest is best served by allowing the transaction to proceed while remedying the competitive concerns. The remedy proposed in this matter does just that.

---

<sup>3</sup> In particular, the 2010 Horizontal Merger Guidelines explain that “[m]ost merger analysis is necessarily predictive, requiring an assessment of what will likely happen if a merger proceeds as compared to what will likely happen if it does not. Given this inherent need for prediction, these Guidelines reflect the congressional intent that merger enforcement should interdict competitive problems in their incipiency, and that certainty about anticompetitive effect is seldom possible and not required for a merger to be illegal.” § 1.

<sup>4</sup> Commissioner Wright cites *B.A.T Indus.*, 104 F.T.C. 852 (1984), as the applicable standard for actual potential entry. Most federal courts have applied a less stringent standard.