



Competition

S-38.041 Networking Business




Generic Business Strategies

		Competitive advantage	
		Lower cost	Differentiation
Competitive scope	Broad target	<i>Cost leadership</i>	<i>Differentiation leadership</i>
	Narrow target	<i>Cost focus</i>	<i>Differentiation focus</i>

- Cost leadership may lead to a beneficial circle: high market share \Rightarrow supply-side economy of scale \Rightarrow volume purchase discounts \Rightarrow sustainable cost leadership
- Differentiation leadership may enable higher prices \Rightarrow higher profits \Rightarrow more R&D \Rightarrow more differentiation \Rightarrow sustainable brand leadership



Competition and service life cycle



- Regulator can intervene when sufficient market data exists
- Dominant design and market shares are often established before regulatory intervention \Rightarrow early competition is often guided by the non-optimal legacy regulation (e.g. VoIP)



Competition and Network Effect

- *Network effect* may remain as a *network externality*, and lead to *market failure*, if it cannot be *internalized* by the players (ref. congestion)
- Network effect is *direct* when it is generated through a direct physical effect of the number of purchasers on the quality of the product (e.g. Internet subscription)
- Network effect is *indirect* when complementary goods become more plentiful and lower in price as the number of users of the good increases (e.g. PCs get cheaper when more Internet subscriptions are sold)
- Network is *literal* when it is physical and can be legally owned by somebody (e.g. Internet router network)
- Network is *virtual* when it is metaphorical and human-oriented (e.g. speakers of English language)

Source: Liebowitz, Margolis, 1994



Competition and Network Effect


		Physicality	
		<i>Literal</i>	<i>Virtual</i>
Distance	<i>Indirect</i>	GSM handsets	Experts for Nokia handset UI
	<i>Direct</i>	SMS messaging service	Finnish speaking SMS users

- Network effect is strongest when *direct* and *literal* (e.g. SMS service)
 - ⇒ End-to-end interoperability more important than differentiation
 - ⇒ Scale economy drives ⇒ players become big
 - ⇒ Competition oligopolistic ⇒ regulator likely to intervene
- Network effect is weaker when *indirect* (e.g. handsets or digital content)
 - ⇒ Only partial interoperability required (client-server)
 - ⇒ Differentiation can bring advantages ⇒ fragmentation
 - ⇒ Social surplus can be maximized despite fragmentation
 - ⇒ Regulator less likely to intervene



Game Theory

Two-Player Nash Equilibrium: Examples in Mobile Industry



In game theory, the so-called Nash Equilibrium happens when no player can achieve a higher benefit by choosing another strategy.

Two-player games (P1 and P2) can be visualized using state diagrams showing the benefits per state per player, and the arrows for describing direction of state changes.

The first mover advantage (benefit a) when deciding about the launch of a new service (wait-and-watch vs. launch) encourages the first player to launch which then forces the second player to follow. The only Nash equilibrium is Launch-Launch. Examples in mobile include MMS and handset subsidy.

The impact of positive network effect in technology choice decisions punishes the players (P1 and P2) if they choose different technologies (Tech 1 and Tech 2) and forces them to align. The related Nash Equilibriums are those with a single technology.

How do the examples change if benefit values are modified? What about expanding one-shot games to repeating games?



Game Theory

Models for a small number of players


- Bertrand model for one-step competition (ref. MOB game)
 - **price** as a strategic variable (prices posted at the same time)
 - quantities selected by customers preferring cheaper
 - minimum of all the firms' prices determines market price
- Cournot model for one-step competition
 - **quantity** as a strategic variable (quantities posted at the same time)
 - market price depends on and adjusts for the market quantity
 - all quantity sold at the same price
- Stackelberg model two-step competition
 - players post quantity/price one after another
 - leadership

Modeling remains simplistic from the practical telecom viewpoint!



Market Entry Strategies

Incumbent's desire for risk control



- Incumbent has more to lose \Rightarrow often takes limited risks only
- New product category and new customer segment involve risks
- “One risk at a time” helps managing risks
- Sometimes competitive time pressure forces taking both risks at the same time

Source: Teece, 2001 (modified)



Market Entry Strategies

Innovator's need for complementary assets

		Complementary asset	
		Freely available	Hard to get
Protection of IPR	Strong	IPR owner exploits	Joint exploitation
	Weak	Innovation of little value	Compl. asset owner exploits

Dominant design exists (with an arrow pointing to the 'Hard to get' column)

- Complementary assets turn an innovation into commercial success (e.g. browser war between Netscape and Microsoft)
- Innovator should as early as possible
 - identify the required complementary assets (e.g. sales channel, technology)
 - identify toughest competition: imitators vs. complementary asset owners
 - define strategy with respect to complementary assets
 - in case of “too heavy” innovation ⇒ sell IPR immediately

Source: Teece, 2001 (modified)



Market Entry Strategies

Example: Virtual Mobile Network Operators

	Price	Focus	Differentiate	Reselling	Clustering
Source of roaming contacts	Local MNO	Local MNO	Local MNO	Self	Foreign MNO
Source of service platforms	Local MNO	Local MNO	Self	Self	Foreign MNO
Importance of content partners	Low	Low	High	Low	High
Importance of new services	Low	Medium	High	Medium	High
Importance of own brand	Medium	High	High	Low	High
Feasible number of subscribers	High	Low	Low/medium	High	Medium
Feasible ARPU	Low	High	High	Low	Medium
Typical initial target segment	Students	Minorities	Early adopters	Other MVNO	Business users

Source: Kiiski/Hämäläinen, 2004



Customer Lock-In (1/2)

Concepts

- *Lock-in* of a customer to a service provider is proportional to the inter-provider *switching cost* (direct and indirect cost)
- Service provider may inflate the real switching cost with additional anti-competitive margins
- Examples of switching cost are the cost and pain of changing a phone number, email account, or web site address
- In practice, perfect competition conditions may not be achieved because of customer lock-in
- Regulator keeps reducing the switching cost to promote competition and to cut prices (e.g. number portability)
- Effects of lock-in can be quantified by observing that service providers can obtain profits per customer equal to the switching cost!



Customer Lock-In (2/2)

Quantification

- Let service providers (i and j) have a monthly charge of p and a monthly variable cost of c per customer. In a competitive market and in the absence of switching cost the price would simply be $p=c$
- Now, at equilibrium, let it cost customers s to switch providers, let providers offer one-time discount d to attract new customers, and let r be the monthly interest rate

(1) $p_i + p/r = p_j - d_j + s + p_j/r$, price for staying equals that of switching

(2) $(p_j - c) - d_j + (p_j - c)/r = 0$, present value of profits equals zero

$\Rightarrow (p_i - c) + (p_i - c)/r = s$

present value of a customer equals her switching cost

or, $p_i = c + rs/(1+r)$


price equals marginal cost plus mark-up on switching cost

Source: Courcoubetis et al. 2003



Porter's 5 Forces

GPRS in Finland: Big picture





Porter's 5 Forces

GPRS in Finland: Barriers of entry (e.g. Tele2)

Key factors

1. Government policy (e.g. number and conditions of licenses)
2. Capital requirements (e.g. cost of radio coverage)
3. Economies of scale (e.g. cost of service platform)
4. Switching cost of customers (reduced by number portability)
5. Access to distribution channels (operator-specific retail)
6. Product differentiation (only for new value-added services)
7. Cost disadvantages independent of scales
 - favorable locations (BTS towers)
 - learning curve (competent staff)
 - (proprietary)
 - (favorable access to raw materials)
 - (government subsidies)



Porter's 5 Forces

GPRS in Finland: Rivalry among existing operators

Key factors

1. Capacity augmented in large increments
2. High exit barriers
3. Numerous or equally balanced competitors
4. Slow industry growth
5. High fixed or storage costs
6. Lack of differentiation or switching costs
7. Diverse competitors
8. High strategic states



Porter's 5 Forces

GPRS in Finland: Bargaining power of buyers (e.g. large firms)

Key factors

1. Products are standard or undifferentiated
2. Buyer faces few switching costs (e.g. coupling between Intranet and GPRS)
3. Buyer has full information
4. Buyer purchases large volumes relative to the seller's sales
5. Buyer purchases are a significant portion of the buyer's total costs
6. Product is unimportant to the quality of the buyers' products or services



Porter's 5 Forces


GPRS in Finland: Bargaining power of suppliers

Key factors

1. Few suppliers (e.g. infra suppliers)
2. Not obliged to contend with other substituted products
3. Industry is not an important customer of the supplier group
4. Suppliers product is an important input to the buyers business
5. The supplier groups products are differentiated or it has built up switching costs
6. The supplier group poses a credible threat of forward integration



The Value Net



Source: Nalebuff and Brandenburger, 1997



Competitors & Complementors

A player is your **complementor** if customers value your product more when they have the other player's product than when they have your product alone.

A player is your **competitor** if customers value your product less when they have the other player's product than when they have your product alone.



Complementors & Competitors: The Supply Side

A player is your **complementor** if it's **more** attractive for a supplier to provide resources to you when it's also supplying the other player than when it's supplying you alone

A player is your **competitor** if it's **less** attractive for a supplier to provide resources to you when it's also supplying the other player than when it's supplying you alone



Value Net of Mobile Operator

