Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
		•	

# Incentives to invest and to give access to new technologies

#### Duarte Brito<sup>1</sup> João Vareda<sup>2</sup> Pedro Pereira<sup>3</sup>

 $^{1}$  UNL,  $^{2}\text{AdC},\ ^{3}\text{AdC}$ 

#### "The Economics of Intellectual Property, Software and the Internet", Toulouse 2011

The opinions expressed are the sole responsibility of the authors and in no way represent the views of the PCA

< 17 >

UNL. AdC. AdC

Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

Introduction ●00	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Introduction				

Image: A matrix and a matrix

UNL. AdC. AdC

#### Presentation

1 Introduction

**2** Main Assumptions

3 Non-drastic Innovation

4 Drastic Innovation

#### 5 Conclusions

Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

Introduction ○●○	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Introduction				

## Motivation

Sectoral regulators are considering three main approaches to regulate Next Generation Access Networks:

- Continuity approach
- Equality of Access approach
- Forbearance approach

In this article, we analyze, in the context of the forbearance approach, the incentives of a vertically integrated firm:

- to invest in the new technology
- to give access to the new technology to a downstream entrant

UNL. AdC. AdC

Introduction 000	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Introduction				

# Questions

- Will the vertically integrated firm voluntarily give access to the entrant, or should open access obligations be extended to the new technology?
- 2 Given that the vertically integrated firm must have incentives to invest, is it socially preferable to have a monopoly or a duopoly in the retail market?
- In some circumstances, only the vertically integrated firm can invest, but in others, perhaps due to public policies, both firms can. Is it necessarily socially preferable to have both firms able to invest?

Image: Image:

→ Ξ →

UNL. AdC. AdC

	Main Assumptions ●000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				
Demand				

Consumers have a linear demand function for retail services:

$$y_j = z - p_j$$

Consumers pay a unit price, p<sub>j</sub>, plus a fixed fee, F<sub>j</sub>, when purchasing from firm j

Consumers do not consider the services as perfect substitutes

- Consumers are located on Hotelling's road, pay linear "transportation costs": tx
- Consumers prefer the service produced with the new technology

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

UNL. AdC. AdC

	Main Assumptions 0●00000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				

#### Demand

 Consumers select the firm that results in a higher consumer surplus, net of "transportation costs" and fixed payments



Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

UNL, AdC, AdC

	Main Assumptions 00●0000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				
Firms				

- Two firms: an incumbent, firm *i*, and an entrant, firm *e*, located on opposite ends of Hotelling line
- The incumbent is a vertically integrated firm that produces an input that (i) uses in the production of a final product and (ii) sells to an entrant



Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

UNL, AdC, AdC

∃ → ∢

	Main Assumptions	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				
<b>-</b>				
Firms				

The input can be produced using an old or a new technology

$$y_i = z - p_i \rightarrow y_i = z + v - p_i$$

- Measure of the quality improvement enabled by the new technology: \(\chi = v (2z + v)\)
  - If  $\chi$  is on (0, 6t): non-drastic innovation
  - If  $\chi$  is on  $[6t + \infty)$ : drastic innovation

Using the new technology implies making an investment I

- The entrant pays a unit price for the input
  - If the old technology is used, this access price is regulated  $(\alpha_0)$

Image: A math a math

UNL. AdC. AdC

 If the new technology is used, the incumbent makes take-it-or-leave-it offer (α<sub>n</sub>)

	Main Assumptions 0000●00	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				
Firms				

- We assume first that only the incumbent can invest in the deployment of the new technology, since the entrant has some disadvantage relative to the incumbent:
  - The entrant might not have access to financing
  - The entrant has to built the infrastructure required to support the new technology from scratch with a higher cost
  - Environmental or municipal regulation might prevent, or make too costly, the deployment by the entrant of the infrastructure required to support the new technology

UNL. AdC. AdC

Later we will allow both firms to invest in the deployment of the new technology.

	Main Assumptions 00000●0	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				

## Regulator

• The regulator chooses  $\alpha_0$  to maximize welfare, which includes:

- Consumer surplus
- Firms' aggregate profit
- Transportation costs
- Investment costs
- Access to the new technology is not regulated
  - e.g.: in US, Verizon is deploying a next generation access network, but is only obliged to offer to entrants wholesale services equivalent to what it would offer through a traditional network

(日) (同) (三) (

UNL. AdC. AdC

	Main Assumptions 000000●	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Main Assumptions				

## Timing of the game

The game unfolds as follows:

- Stage 1: The regulator sets  $\alpha_0$
- Stage 2: The incumbent makes an investment decision
- Stage 3: If investment takes place, the incumbent and the entrant negotiate over the access price to the new technology α<sub>n</sub>
- Stage 4: Observing the access prices, α<sub>0</sub> and α<sub>n</sub>, the entrant chooses which technology to use, if any
- Stage 5: The incumbent and the entrant compete on retail prices

The game is solved by backward induction, starting from last stage

Image: A math a math

UNL. AdC. AdC

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation •000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Non-drastic Innovation				

## Price competition stage

In the price competition stage, five cases may occur:

- The entrant chooses not to operate. Incumbent is monopolist and uses
  - 1 the new technology
  - 2 the old technology
- 2 There is no investment and both firms face a demand given by  $y_j = z - p_j$ . The entrant has costs  $\alpha_0$
- **3** There is investment and both firms use the new technology. Both firms face a demand given by  $y_j = (z + v) - p_j$ . The entrant has costs  $\alpha_n$
- 4 There is investment but the entrant does not use the new technology. The incumbent's demand is  $y_i = (z + v) p_i$  while the entrant's demand is  $y_e = z p_e$ . The entrant has costs  $\alpha_0$

UNL. AdC. AdC

Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

	Main Assumptions	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation	Policy Implications
	0000000	0●00000000	00	000
Non-drastic Innovatio	on			

# Technology choice stage

Entrant's technology choice if there is investment:



	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 00●0000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Non-drastic Innovatio	on			

## Access price offer stage

In equilibrium, the incumbent offers:

$$\alpha_n^*(\alpha_o;\chi) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\alpha_o^2 + \chi} & \text{for } \alpha_o \text{ on } [0,\sqrt{6t-\chi}) \\ \left[\sqrt{6t},+\infty\right) & \text{for } \alpha_o \text{ on } \left[\sqrt{6t-\chi},+\infty\right) \end{cases}$$

- If α<sub>o</sub> is low, the incumbent cannot drive the entrant out of the market since it can always use the regulated old technology
- If the incumbent "gives" access to the new technology, it benefits from a higher access price
- Otherwise, it benefits from selling the product that is more valued by consumers. But... the previous effect dominates

		Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation	
		000000000		
Non-drastic Innovation				

#### Investment stage

• Denote by  $\Delta \Pi_i(\alpha_o) := \pi_i^{d_n} \left( \alpha_n^*(\alpha_o; \chi) \right) - \pi_i^{d_o}(\alpha_o)$ . The incumbent:



Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

UNL, AdC, AdC

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Non-drastic Innovatio	n			

## Regulation stage

Welfare function (when using the same technology)



Increasing the access price has the following effects:

- It increases transportation costs (-)
- It reduces consumption for the consumers served by the entrant (-)
- It makes some consumers shift from the entrant, where they face a higher marginal price, to the incumbent (+) = > < ≡ >

Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

UNL, AdC, AdC

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications	
Non-drastic Innovation					

## Regulation stage

In equilibrium, the regulator sets:

$$\alpha_o = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } \chi \text{ on } \begin{bmatrix} 0, \frac{6}{5}t \\ 0 & \sqrt{6t - \chi}, +\infty \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \chi \text{ on } \begin{bmatrix} \frac{6}{5}t \\ \frac{6}{5}t, 6t \end{bmatrix}$$

- for low values of  $\chi$ , and therefore for low values of  $\alpha_n^*(\cdot)$ , the regulator sets  $\alpha_o = 0$ , which leads to a duopoly,
- for high values of χ, and therefore for high values of α<sup>\*</sup><sub>n</sub>(·), the regulator sets an α<sub>o</sub> on [√6t χ, +∞), which leads to a monopoly with the new technology
- it is never optimal for the regulator to induce no-investment, and thereby a duopoly with the old technology

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications
Non-drastic Innovation				

# Summing up...

- If χ is on (0, <sup>6</sup>/<sub>5</sub>t): (i) the regulator sets α<sub>o</sub> = 0, (ii) the incumbent invests, (iii) the incumbent offers α<sup>\*</sup><sub>n</sub> = √χ, (iv) the entrant uses the new technology
- If  $\chi$  is on  $\left[\frac{6}{5}t, 6t\right)$ : (i) the regulator sets  $\alpha_o$  on  $\left[\sqrt{6t-\chi}, +\infty\right)$ , (ii) the incumbent invests, (iii) the incumbent offers  $\alpha_n^*$  on  $\left[\sqrt{6t}, +\infty\right)$ , (iv) the entrant exits the industry

<ロ> <四> <四> <日> <日> <日</p>

UNL. AdC, AdC

Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications	
Non-drastic Innovation					

#### Two firms can deploy the new technology

Assume that the entrant and the incumbent have the same investment cost. In equilibrium:



Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

		Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation	
		0000000000		
Non-drastic Innovation				

#### Two firms can deploy the new technology

#### Equilibria of the game:

			x	
		$\left(0, \frac{6}{5}t\right)$	$\left[\frac{6}{5}t,\frac{18}{5}t\right)$	$\left[\frac{18}{5}t, 6t\right)$
	$\left[0, \Delta \Pi_{\sigma \mid I}(0)\right)$	any α <sub>o</sub> doth invest W <sup>dn</sup> ( <b>0</b> )		
I	$\left[ \Delta \Pi_{e I}(0), \pi_{i}^{d_{\mathcal{R}}}\left(0\right) \right)$	$\begin{split} \alpha_{o} &= 0 \text{ or on } (\alpha_{o}^{**}, +\infty) \\ i \text{ or } e \text{ invest} \\ W^{d_{n}}(\alpha_{n}^{*}(0)) \end{split}$	$lpha_o = lpha_o^{**}$ i or e invest $W^{d_n}(lpha_o^*(lpha_o^{**}))$ o	or $W^{d_n}(\alpha_n^*(0))$
	$\left[\pi_{i}^{d_{n}}\left(0\right),\frac{1}{2}\chi\right)$	$\alpha_o = 0$ i or e invests $W^{d_n}(\alpha_n^*(0))$	$\alpha_o$ on $\left[\sqrt{6t-\chi},+\infty\right)$ i or e invests $W^{m_n}$ or $W^{d_n}(\alpha_n^*(0))$	

Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

Incentives to invest and to give access to new technologies

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000●	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications	
Non-drastic Innovation					

#### Two firms can deploy the new technology

Comparing the welfare levels of the case where both the incumbent and the entrant can invest and where only the incumbent can invest:



Duarte Brito, João Vareda, Pedro Pereira

Incentives to invest and to give access to new technologies

UNL, AdC, AdC

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation ●0	Policy Implications
Drastic Innovation				

## Equilibrium of the whole game

- Assume that only the incumbent can invest. In equilibrium:
  - (i) the regulator sets any  $\alpha_o$  on  $[0, +\infty)$ , (ii) the incumbent invests and offers  $\alpha_n^*(\cdot)$  on  $\left[\sqrt{6t}, +\infty\right)$ , and (iii) the entrant exits the industry.
- Assume that both the incumbent and the entrant can invest. In equilibrium:
  - If *I* is on [0, ΔΠ<sub>e|I</sub>(0)): (i) the regulator sets any α<sub>o</sub>, and (ii) both firms invest.
  - If *I* is on [ΔΠ<sub>e|I</sub>(0), ½χ): (i) the regulator sets any α<sub>o</sub>, (ii) one of the firms invests and offers α<sub>n</sub><sup>\*</sup>(·) on [√6t, +∞), and (iii) the rival exits the industry.

< ロ > < 回 > < 回 > <</p>

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation ⊙●	Policy Implications
Drastic Innovation				

## Welfare comparison

- If *I* is on [0, <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>t), then, when both firms can invest in the new technology, compared with the case where only the incumbent can invest, welfare increases.
- If *I* is on  $\left[\frac{1}{4}t, \Delta \Pi_{e|I}(0)\right)$ , then, when both firms can invest in the new technology, compared with the case where only the incumbent can invest, welfare decreases.
- If *I* is on [ΔΠ<sub>e|I</sub>(0), ½χ), then, when both firms can invest in new technology, compared with the case where only the incumbent can invest, expected welfare is the same.

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications ●00
Policy Implications				

# **Policy Implications**

- If the innovation is *non-drastic*, the concern that the industry might be monopolized is not justified
- If the quality improvement enabled by the new technology is non-drastic and low, a duopoly with the new technology is socially optimal, whereas if the quality improvement enabled by the new technology is non-drastic but high, a monopoly with the new technology is socially optimal
- When the innovation is *non-drastic*, the possibility of both firms investing, instead of just the vertically integrated firm, may or may not increase welfare, if the investment cost is low, and at best leaves welfare unchanged, if the investment cost is high

< ロ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation 000000000	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications ○●○
Policy Implications				

# Policy Implications

- In some circumstances, the entrant's disadvantage regarding the investment cost can be overcome by public policies (e.g. the entrant can be given access to credit)
- Implementing such policies poses at least two types of practical problems:
  - sectoral regulators typically do not have the instruments required
  - these policies could be perceived as state aid, which is restricted in some jurisdictions
- Furthermore, if the innovation is *non-drastic*, the case for such public policies is not very strong, since the concern that the industry might be monopolized is not justified.

Image: A math a math

	Main Assumptions 0000000	Non-drastic Innovation	Drastic Innovation 00	Policy Implications 00●
Policy Implications				

# **Policy Implications**

- If the innovation is *drastic*, the concern that the industry might be monopolized by the vertically integrated firm is justified
- Two types of policies could be used to remedy this situation:
  - the regulator could promote investment by the entrant.
    However, the possibility of both firms investing solves the monopolization problem, but only if the investment cost is low
  - open access obligations could be extended to the new technology. However, unless the regulator can commit to a regulatory policy, open access obligations can reduce, or even eliminate, the vertically integrated firm's incentives to invest

• • • • • • • • • • • • •