

Resale Price Maintenance: Economics and policy implications

Patrick Rey

(partly based on joint work with Thibaud Vergé)

JFTC - Competition Policy Research Center Tokyo, 10 May 2013



Introduction

Policy perspective

• Vertical restraints: hotly debated

... both in practice and in the economics literature

• Large divergence law / economics for price restrictions

Economics literature: vertical / horizontal interaction

- Vertical coordination
- Rivalry between vertical structures
- More recently: interlocking relationships (consumer goods)

Resale Price Maintenance

Various forms

- Imposed price
- Maximum price (price ceiling)
- Minimum price (price floor)
- Recommended, advertised prices

Specific product markets

- Drugs
- Books, newspapers

Competition Law

Price restrictions are "bad"

- In the EU for instance, RPM (price floors) is a "hardcore restriction" (one out of two)
- Non-price restrictions are more tolerated (rule of reason)

Caveats

- US policy over time
 - 1911: price floors are per se illegal (Dr Miles)
 - 1968 : price ceilings are per se illegal (*Albrecht*)
 - 1997: rule of reason for price ceilings (State Oil)
 - 2007: rule or reason for price floors as well (*Leegin*)
- France
 - Lang Act: RPM mandatory for books and press
 - Galland Act: de facto RPM for supermarkets

Economics: not so clear-cut

OECD Report on Franchising, 1994

EC Green paper on vertical restraints, 1997

Rey-Vergé in Handbook in Antitrust Economics, 2008

Intrabrand coordination (vertical relations)

• Price and non-price restraints can have similar effects

Interbrand competition (horizontal rivalry)

• Not necessarily favourable to non-price restrictions

Economics: Intrabrand competition

Double-marginalization

Spengler JPE 1950

 \rightarrow positive effect on welfare for price caps (not price floors)

Free-riding on retail services, quality certification

Telser JLE 1960, Marvel-McCafferty Rand 1984

- \rightarrow welfare effect
- ambiguous/positive

Comanor-Frech AER 1985, Caillaud-Rey 1987

- similar for price and non-price restrictions
- easier enforcement?

Economics: Intrabrand competition

Producer's opportunism (Hart-Tirole Brookings 1990)

O'Brien-Shaffer Rand 1992, Rey-Vergé Rand 2004

 \rightarrow welfare effect

- negative
- similar for price and non-price restrictions
- applies to price caps as well as price floors

Economics: Interbrand competition

Main concerns relate more to non-price restrictions

Competition-dampening: strategic delegation, not RPM

- Rey-Stiglitz *EER* 1988, *Rand* 1995 (Bonanno-Vickers *JIE* 1988)
- Gal-Or *EER* 1991
- Caillaud-Rey *EER* 1995

• Foreclosure: tying/exclusive dealing, not RPM

- Hart-Tirole *Brookings* 1990
- Ordover-Saloner-Salop *AER* 1990

 \rightarrow Welfare implication: tougher towards non-price restrictions

Economics: RPM as a facilitating practice

Downstream cartel

- Sham vertical agreements
- Relevance
 - Few cases
 - ... but RPM was per se illegal (and is still a hard-core restriction in the EU)
 - Little incentives to "denounce" such an agreement

Upstream collusion

- US Supreme Court (*GTE Sylvania* 1977, *Business Electronics* 1988)
- "vertical price arguments might assist horizontal price fixing at the manufactured level (by reducing the manufacturer's incentive to cheat on a cartel, since its retailers could not pass on lower price to consumers."
- Jullien-Rey Rand 2007
 - RPM can indeed facilitate collusion by enhancing the detection of deviations
 - RPM more effective than other vertical restraints in doing so

\rightarrow Welfare implication: caution when used in a generalized way

More recently: Interlocking relationships

Joint research with Thibaud Vergé (JIE 2010, work in progress)

Commonly observed feature

- Competing stores can carry the same competing brands
- Applies to most consumer goods

In this context, competition is "fragile"

- Retailers can act as "common agents" for competing brands
- RPM eliminates both intrabrand and interbrand competition
- Territorial restrictions would not achieve the same outcome

Interlocking relationships

Market structure

- 2 (differentiated) manufacturers A and B, constant marginal cost *c*
- 2 (differentiated) retailers 1 and 2, constant marginal cost (= 0)
- demand pattern for 4 "products" (monopoly prices p^M , profit Π^M)



Interlocking relationships

Competition game

- Upstream competition
 - manufacturers offer two-part tariffs, with or w/o RPM
 - retailers (observe all tariffs) and accept / reject
- Downstream competition: retailers set retail prices
- Note: Dobson and Waterson (IJIO 2007) on linear tariffs

Retail market power

- No retail bottleneck
 - Potential competition at each retail location: selection process (BW Rand 1985)
 - Bypass: manufacturers set-up own their own outlets or sell directly
- Retail bottlenecks: a single retailer at each retail location (confer rents)

No retail bottleneck (and no RPM)

Interbrand competition, then intrabrand competition

- Retail prices are (somewhat) competitive ($p^c < p^M$)
- Not entirely obvious, due to interlocking relationships
 - Manufacturers recover retail margins through fixed fees
 - Internalize impact of (retail) prices on
 - the entire margin on sales of own brand
 - the retail margin on sales of rival brand
 - Retail prices are driven by wholesale (marginal) prices
 - Maintaining high retail prices requires high wholesale prices
 - Positive upstream margins
 - Free-riding on rival manufacturer's upstream margin

No retail bottleneck

 \rightarrow for A: max $\Sigma_{j=1,2}$ $(p_{Aj} - c) D_{Aj}(p) + (p_{Bj} - w_{Bj}) D_{Bj}(p) - F_{Bj}$



Resale Price Maintenance

Retail prices are directly set by manufacturers

- Recover as before retail margins through franchise fees
 - \rightarrow internalize as before the impact of (retail) prices on
 - the entire margin on sales of own brand
 - the retail margin on sales of rival brand
- No need anymore to use wholesale prices to maintain retail prices
 - squeezing upstream margins yields monopoly outcome
 - $w_{ij} = c \rightarrow$ each manufacturer residual claimant on all margins

→ set retail prices at the monopoly level (
$$p = p^M$$
)

Resale Price Maintenance

Continuum of equilibria

- For any given wholesale prices, there exists an equilibrium
 - given p, A and 1 can share profits through either w_{A1} or F_{A1}
 - \rightarrow A and 1 are thus indifferent about w_{A1}
 - but w_{A1} affects A's dealing with 2, as well as 1's dealing with B
- Eq. wholesale and retail prices are negatively correlated
 - $W \nearrow \rightarrow p \searrow$
 - free-riding on rival's upstream margin
- Only one equilibrium robust to (even small) retail effort
 - retailers as residual claimant
 - wholesale prices at cost, retail prices at monopoly level

Retail bottlenecks

Retailers earn positive rents

$$(p_{A1} - w_{A1}) D_{A1} - F_{A1} + (p_{B1} - w_{B1}) D_{B1} - F_{B1} \ge (p_{B1} - w_{B1}) d_{B1} - F_{B1}$$

$$\rightarrow (p_{A1} - w_{A1}) D_{A1} - F_{A1} \ge (p_{B1} - w_{B1}) [d_{B1} - D_{B1}] > 0$$

$$\rightarrow \max \Sigma_{j=1,2} (p_{Aj} - c) D_{Aj} + (p_{Bj} - w_{Bj}) [D_{Bj} - d_{Bj}]$$

Retailers indifferent wrt dealing with both or only one

- manufacturers can easily deviate to exclusive dealing
- even small deviations can trigger very different market structures
- "double common" agency equilibria may no longer exist

Retail bottlenecks

RPM

- For a linear demand and a range of parameters
 - continuum of double agency equilibria
 - including monopoly pricing $(p = p^M \text{ for some } w < c)$
- As $w \nearrow$, p and retailers' profits \searrow , manufacturers' profits \nearrow
 - manufacturers prefer lowest retail prices
 - retailers prefer highest retail prices (even above p^M)

Secret contracting (work in progress)

- Restores existence of double common agency equilibria
- More competitive without RPM
- Still yields monopoly prices with RPM

Illustration: France

Empirical evidence

- France Germany: branded products in supermarkets
- Biscourp-Boutin-Vergé *EJ* forth.: market concentration and prices
- Bonnet-Dubois-Simioni Rand 2010
 - French market for bottled water
 - Structural econometric model
 - Berry-Levinson-Pakes *Econometrica* 1995
 - Berto Villas-Boas Rand 2009
 - Linear prices / two-part tariffs / RPM
 - \rightarrow best fit: two-part tariff + RPM, monopoly prices

Policy implications: key factors

Industry structure

- Type of distribution channel
 - Franchising
 - Interlocking relationships
- Scope for collusion
 - Concentration: tight oligopolies vs competitive industries
 - Market transparency

Coverage of the practice

- Bilateral contracts versus industry-wide practices
- Temporary versus permanent programs

Bibliography

Surveys

- Patrick Rey and Thibaud Vergé, "The Economics of Vertical Restraints", in *Handbook of Antitrust Economics*, Paolo Buccirossi ed., MIT Press, 2008.
- Patrick Rey and Jean Tirole (2007), "A Primer on Foreclosure," *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Vol. III, Mark Armstrong and Rob Porter eds, North Holland, 2145-2220.
- OECD, Competition policy and Vertical Restraints: Franchising Agreements, Paris, 1994.
- European Commission, *Green Paper on Vertical Restraints in EU Competition Policy*, COM(96)721, 1997.

Personal articles

- Jeanine Miklós-Thal, Patrick Rey and Thibaud Vergé (2011), "Buyer Power and Intrabrand Coordination," *The Journal of the European Economic Association*, 9(4):721–741.
- Patrick Rey and Joseph Stiglitz (1988), "Vertical Restraints and Producers Competition," *European Economic Review*, 32:561-568.
- Patrick Rey and Joseph Stiglitz (1995), "The Role of Exclusive Territories in Producer's Competition," *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 26:431-451.
- Patrick Rey and Jean Tirole (1986), "The Logic of Vertical Restraints," *American Economic Review*, 76:921-939.
- Patrick Rey and Thibaud Vergé (2004), "Bilateral Control with Vertical Contracts," *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 35:728-746.
- Patrick Rey and Thibaud Vergé (2010), "Resale Price Maintenance and Interlocking Relationships," *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 58(4):928–961.
- Patrick Rey and Michael D. Whinston (2013), "Does Retailer Power Lead to Exclusion?," *The RAND Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.