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Introduction

- Welfare effects of vertical integration are among the most contentious areas in antitrust.
  - Hospital acquisitions of physician groups
  - Google acquisitions of vertical search engines (supply of data to search rivals)
  - Comcast - NBCU, Time Warner Cable – Turner, DirecTV – News Corp

- Trade-off between greater efficiency in production against increased market power in merger policy.
  - reduced double marginalization
  - improved investment incentives
  - Foreclosure/raising rivals costs incentives

- Almost no work examining pro and anticompetitive effects of vertical integration, and allowing a welfare evaluation.
Research Question

• **Our specific focus:** What are the welfare effects of vertical integration (content and distribution) for *regional sports programming* in the multichannel television industry?

  – What would happen if vertically integrated firms were split?

  – What would happen if un-integrated firms became vertically integrated?

  – What are the effects of existing regulatory policy towards vertically integrated content and distribution?
Approach

• Estimate a model of consumer demand and viewership, downstream pricing, downstream carriage, and upstream-downstream bargaining over terms of carriage.

• Estimate degree of internalization by upstream and downstream divisions within integrated firm.
  – In setting prices and carriage (double marginalization)
  – In foreclosing access to downstream rivals (foreclosure)

• Simulate: VI, and strengthening and relaxing rules on serving rivals
Institutions

- RSNs - carry professional sports most notably NBA, MLB, and NHL

- Second highest fees after ESPN (2-3x CNN, Fox News, TNT, USA).

- Aggregate $4B per year in 2010.

- And growing around 10% per year over last decade.
  - TWC SportsNet LA paid $8.35 billion for rights to air Dodgers over twenty five years
Regional Sports Networks (RSN’s)
Institutions

- Linear fee contracts
- Program access rules / “unfair acts”
- Terrestrial loophole

- Current situations in:
  - Houston: Comcast RSN with NBA and MLB rights. Unavailable on satellite.
  - Los Angeles: TWC RSN with NBA and MLB rights. Unavailable on satellite
  - New England: Comcast RSN with NBA rights. Dropped from Dish Network on 8/4/2014
  - Northwest: Comcast RSN with NBA rights. Unavailable on satellite.
Data sets

• Cable system locations, channel carriage, total subscribers from Nielsen FOCUS, 2000-2010

• Prices from TNS Bill Harvest, newspaper archives, and rate card archives by cable system-year

• Channel ratings from Nielsen (DMA-year) and Mediamark/Simmons (individual-year)

• Input fee and advertising revenue by channel-year (including separately by RSN) from SNL Kagan

• State excise tax on satellite by state-year
Model – Overview and Timing

1a. Content and distribution bargain over terms of carriage.
1b. Distribution systems decide pricing and carriage at the market level.

2. Consumers choose downstream firm.
3. Consumers choose how much to watch content available to them.

Similar on many dimensions to Crawford and Yurukoglu (2012), but with some important modifications.
# Model – Data Combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewership</td>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>1. Elasticity of demand with respect to price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Choice</td>
<td>Market shares</td>
<td>2. Change in demand from adding and removing channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Pricing</td>
<td>Prices</td>
<td>3. Degree of internalization within firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Carriage</td>
<td>Channel Carriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>Input Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model - Viewership

- Consumer i on firm j:

\[
\max_{t_{ij}} v_{ij}(t_{ij}) = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{B}_j \cup \{0\}} \frac{\gamma_{ict}}{1 - \nu_{ic}} (t_{ijc})^{1 - \nu_{ic}}
\]

\[s.t.:
\begin{align*}
& t_{ijc} \geq 0 \quad \forall c \\
& t_{ijc} = 0 \quad \forall c \notin \{\mathcal{B}_j \cup \{0\}\} \\
& \sum_{c \in \mathcal{B}_j \cup \{0\}} t_{ijc} \leq T
\end{align*}
\]

- Allows for consumers to have high WTP relative to time spent watching for different channels.
- Sports channels have high marginal valuation for initial time which decays quicker than non-sports.
- RSN tastes scaled down by distance to teams and parameter.
Model - Viewership

Monthly Input Fees vs Ratings
Sports and Non-Sports
Model – Downstream Choice

\[ u_{ijt} = \beta^v v^*_{ijt} + \beta^x x_{jt} + \beta^s_{ij} \chi_{ij} + \alpha_{ij} p_{jt} + \xi_{jt} + \epsilon_{ijt} \]

\[ s_{ijmt} = \frac{\exp(\beta^v v^*_{ijt} + \beta^x x_{jt} + \beta^s_{ij} \chi_{ij} + \alpha_{ij} p_{jt} + \xi_{jt})}{1 + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{F}_{mt}} \exp(\beta^v v^*_{ikt} + \beta^x x_{kt} + \beta^s_{ik} \chi_{ik} + \alpha_{ik} p_{kt} + \xi_{kt})} \]

- Integrate over distribution of channel taste parameters and \( \alpha_i \) to obtain predicted market shares for each firm.
Model – Distributor Payoffs

- Downstream firm $f$ in market $m$ in year $t$:

\[
\Pi_{fmt}^M(B_{mt}, p_{mt}, \tau_t; \mu) = D_{fmt}(p_{fmt} - \sum_{c \in C_{fmt}} \tau_{fct} - \omega_{ft}) + \mu \sum_{c \in \mathcal{V}_f} \left[ \sum_{g \in \mathcal{F}_{mt}: c \in \mathcal{B}_{gmt}} D_{gmt}(\tau_{gct} + a_{cmt}) \right]
\]

- Choose price and channel carriage as best response to other firms’ prices and carriage and input fees.
Model – Channel Payoffs

- Channel c in market m in year t considers payoff as:

\[
\Pi_{cm}^{C}(B_{mt}, p_{mt}, \tau; \mu, \lambda_R) = \sum_{g \in F_{mt}: c \in B_{gmt}} D_{gmt} \left[ \tau_{gct} + a_{cmt} \right] \\
+ \mu \lambda_{R:fc}[\mathbb{I}_{c \in \mathcal{V}_{gt}}(p_{gmt} - m_{c_{gmt}}) + \sum_{d \in B_{gmt} \setminus c} \mathbb{I}_{h:cd \in \mathcal{V}_{ht}}(\tau_{gdt} + a_{gdt})]
\]
Model – Bargaining

\[
\hat{v}_{fct}(\tau_{-fc,t}, B_t, p_t) = \arg \max_{\tau_{fct}} \left[ \sum_m \left[ \Delta_{fc} \Pi_{fmt}^M(B_{mt}, p_{mt}, \{\tau_{fct}, \tau_{-fc,t}\}; \mu) \right] \right]^{\zeta_{fct}} \\
\times \left[ \sum_m \left[ \Delta_{fc} \Pi_{cmt}^C(B_{mt}, p_{mt}, \{\tau_{fct}, \tau_{-fc,t}\}; \mu, \lambda_R) \right] \right]^{1-\zeta_{fct}}
\]

- Interconnected Nash bargains with Horn and Wolinsky “Nash-in-Nash” equilibrium.
Model – Timing

• We assume that bargaining, pricing, and carriage happens simultaneously (Nocke-White).

• This is different than Crawford-Yurukoglu where bargaining happens first, then pricing and carriage.

• Tractability benefit
• Open question as to which is more realistic under which circumstances.
Moments in Estimation

- Average ratings by channel
- Fraction of viewers who watch zero by channel
- Cov(\(\xi\), satellite taxes) = 0

- Optimal downstream pricing
  - (2007) Margin over content input costs from 10k reports

- Optimal carriage
  - (2007) RSNs

- Average input fees
  - (2007), RSNs + ESPN, ABC Family, TNT, USA
Elements of Estimation

• $\gamma$ parameters off of time spent watching, market shares, prices, and input fees

• $\nu$ from ratio of input fees to time watched for sports vs non-sports

• $\alpha$ from market share changes wrt satellite taxes

• $\mu$ from integrated and non-integrated carriage differences, conditional on distance

• $\lambda_r$ from non-carriage in Philadelphia and San Diego
Estimates - Distributions of Monthly WTP

- WTP for channels is driven by viewership time, fraction of consumers who watch, and channel input costs.
- Median viewership for most channels is 0.
- Model strikes a balance between viewership and input fee if they don’t accord exactly.
Estimates – Input Fees and Time Watched

\[ \nu_{\text{sports}} = 0.93 \]
\[ \nu_{\text{non-sports}} = 0.64 \]

- Implies marginal utility of extra minute falls faster for sports than non-sports.
- Model needs to explain higher fees with comparable ratings for sports.
Estimates - RSN WTP and Distance

- RSN distance decay parameter = -6.03

- Estimate that WTP drops by 2/3 at 200 miles from team.

- Carriage less likely at distance (map coming up).
Estimates – Price Sensitivity

*Estimated Mean Own Price Elasticity*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable:</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite:</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Use within state differences in tax on satellite as instrument for price

- **OLS**: \[-.0046^{**} (t: -2.40)\]
- **IV**: \[-.0987^{***} (t: -6.17)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Switcher States</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Change in Tax Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimates - $\mu$ and RSN Decay

- Estimate:
  
  $\mu = 0.79$
  
  distance decay = 6.03

- Integrated RSN more likely to be carried by integrated firm, conditional on distance.

- All systems less likely to carry RSN at distance.
Estimates - $\mu$ and RSN Decay

- Estimate:
  $\mu = 0.79$
  distance decay = 6.03

- Integrated RSN more likely to be carried by integrated firm, conditional on distance.

- All systems less likely to carry RSN at distance.
Estimates - $\mu$ and RSN Decay

### RSN Carriage Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated with RSN</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to RSN (mi)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N MLB Teams on RSN</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N NBA Teams on RSN</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N NHL Teams on RSN</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSN-Year FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSO FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>= 0.5704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>= 11063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Estimate:
  \[ \mu = 0.79 \]
  distance decay = 6.03

- Integrated RSN more likely to be carried by integrated firm, conditional on distance.

- All systems less likely to carry RSN at distance.
Estimates - $\mu$ and RSN Decay

Comcast SportsNet New England - (New Haven, CT area)

Is there a reason why we in the New Haven area do not get this channel? We live in New England, and have Comcast as our cable provider. I have called Comcast several times about this. Can an administrator/moderator provide me with some reasoning, PLEASE?!

ComcastTeds
Official Employee

I talked with the team that oversees cable TV programming in your area of Connecticut.

While Comcast SportsNet New England is one of many regional sports networks owned and operated by Comcast, carriage of this network still requires significant monthly fees in order to provide this programming to customers in your area. These are fees that the local management team has made a business decision to not incur and to not pass along those costs to all of our customers.
Estimates - $\lambda_r$

In Philadelphia and San Diego areas, ask what is the lowest $\lambda_r$ that would induce the integrated RSN to withhold from satellite?

- In Philadelphia and San Diego areas, ask what is the lowest $\lambda_r$ that would induce the integrated RSN to withhold from satellite?
Close Loophole in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Share</th>
<th>Surplus ($/month/capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exc.</td>
<td>w/o exc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4SD</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Pop. 1052705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Forcing RSN onto satellite predicted to increase consumer surplus by 1-4%.
Remove Program Access Rules

- Predict exclusion by Comcast in Bay Area, Chicago, Pacific Northwest
- Possibly in New England and Sacramento
- Not in DC
### Removing Program Access Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exclusion?</th>
<th>Market Share</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\lambda_r = .79$</td>
<td>w/o exc.</td>
<td>exc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSN Bay Area</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Int. Cable: 0.615</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite: 0.211</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. 5676023</td>
<td>Consumer: -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSN CA</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Int. Cable: 0.605</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite: 0.212</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. 4623318</td>
<td>Consumer: -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSN Chicago</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Int. Cable: 0.597</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite: 0.209</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. 5041614</td>
<td>Consumer: -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSN Mid-Atl.</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Int. Cable: 0.662</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite: 0.165</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. 4423934</td>
<td>Consumer: -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSN NE</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Int. Cable: 0.646</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite: 0.116</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. 4734329</td>
<td>Consumer: -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSN NW</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Int. Cable: 0.598</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite: 0.254</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop. 3275967</td>
<td>Consumer: -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Allowing exclusion would lead to 1-4% decreases in consumer surplus in markets where we predict exclusion.
Removing Program Access Rules

• Decision to exclude driven by two factors in our model:

1. Coverage of integrated cable firm
2. Mark-ups of satellite and integrated cable firms

• For DC, Cox operates a large cable system in Northern Virginia. Comcast excluding satellite generates returns to Cox that Comcast only partially shares.
Comcast – Time Warner Cable Integration

• Comcast and Time Warner Cable both have footprints in two major RSN markets: NYC and Houston.

• We can use our estimates to predict exclusion behavior in each of these markets.

• We transfer control of FSN Houston to Comcast-TWC in 2007.
Comcast – Time Warner Cable Integration

Comcast-TWC RSNs and Exclusion

Three Party Surplus

\[ \lambda_r \]

Houston

NYC

[Graph showing the relationship between \( \lambda_r \) and Three Party Surplus for Houston and NYC.]
To do list and Caveats

• Re-equilibration of $\tau$ and prices following exclusion.

• Relaxing assumption that $\lambda_r = 0$ under Program Access Rules.

• ...

• Extend to more years
• Partial ownership shares
• Deal with team blackout territories that cut through DMA’s.
Conclusion

• Framework for vertical merger analysis allowing for

• Efficiencies
• Foreclosure
• Partial coordination by upstream and downstream units within integrated firm.

• Find regulatory policy prevents exclusion in several important markets.
• Comcast-TWC doesn’t raise obvious issues in RSN market
Increase $\mu$

Decrease distance decay

No carriage

Carriage by integrated only

Carriage by both