Entry in Parcel Markets: Applying Fudenberg and Tirole's Taxonomy

Felix Gottschalk*, Eva Zuberbühler**, and Michael Funk**

Paper prepared for the 31st CPDE | May 26, 2023 | Gdańsk, Poland

Presented here are the views of the authors and not necessarily the views of Swiss Post or Swiss Economics

*Swiss Post



Julius Caesar -



20

Let me have men about me that are fat, Sleek-headed-men, and such as sleep o'nights; Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look; he thinks too much; such men are dangerous.

Shakespeare (1599) -

The fat-cat effect, the puppy-dog ploy, and the lean and hungry look <u>D</u> Fudenberg, <u>J</u> Tirole - The American Economic Review, 1984 - JSTOR The idea that strategic considerations may provide firms an incentive to" overinvest" in'capital" to deter the entry or expansion of rivals is by now well understood. However, in some ... ☆ Speichern 奶 Zitieren Zitiert von: 1552 Ähnliche Artikel Alle 7 Versionen

Despite increasing competition many industry professionals believe their USP to maintain or gain volumes in growing parcel market

Question: Compared to the B2C e-commerce delivery market in my country, in the next five years volumes for my post will grow...



Majority of industry professionals expect their USP to either gain (52%) or maintain (29%) market share Question: In the next five years competition in my domestic B2C e-commerce delivery market will...

Increase strongly
Decrease moderately
Decrease moderately
35%
37%
18%
6%
PC (2022)
92% of industry professionals expect that **competition** in their domestic parcel market will **increase** in the next five years

No contradiction

competition includes contestability, i.e., the threat of market entry

- What strategies should a postal USP follow when facing entry?
- What role does the USO play?

Literature on entry deterrence in postal markets often builds on renowed theories in industrial organization



Vast literature on entry in postal markets, for instance,

- Crew and Kleindorfer (2007).
 Approaches to the USO under Entry.
- Jaag (2011). Entry Deterrence and the Calculation of the Net Cost of Universal Service Obligations.
- Valletti et al. (2002). Universal
 Service and Entry: The Role of
 Uniform Pricing and Coverage
 Constraints.

We study whether the USO supports or confines a USP's strategies when facing entry by applying Fudenberg and Tirole's (1984) taxonomy to parcel markets.

Timing

1st stage
 Incumbent decides
 on investing in
 strategies to deter
 or accomodate entry

2nd stage
 product market
 competition takes
 place

Optimality of USP's strategy depends on

Type of product market competition

- Strategic substitutes: best response is to take contrary decision than opponent (e.g., Cournot quantity competition)
- Strategic complements: best response is to take same decision than opponent (e.g., Betrand price competition)

Effect of investments on entrant's profit

- Decreasing (strategy makes incumbent **«tough»)**
- Increasing (incument looks **«soft»)**

Fudenberg and Tirole (1984) show that intimidating the entrant is not always the optimal strategy for the incumbent

	Deterrence (ex ante entry)	Accommodation (ex post entry)
Strategic substitutes (quantity competition)	 Incumbent's best strategy is to look intimidating: Top dog: Overinvest in «tough» strategies that emphasize dominant market position (e.g., sorting capacity that lowers marginal cost) 	
Strategic complements (price competition)	 Lean and hungry: Underinvest in «soft» strategies to signal efficiency and agility (e.g., vehicle fleet powered by hydrogen) 	 Look inoffensive to avoid price war: Puppy dog: Underinvest in tough strategies Fat cat: Overinvest in soft strategies

Applying the taxonomy to parcel markets shows that the USO is ambigous for the incumbent's strategy

	Deterrence (ex ante entry)	Accommodation (ex post entry)
Rural parcel markets (high fixed cost \rightarrow capacity commitment credible \rightarrow compete in quantity)	 Top dog («tough»): USO (geograp overinvest and maintain capacity Lean and hungry («soft»): Politica underinvestment in, e.g., environme 	whical coverage) stipulates USP to
Urban parcel markets (low fixed cost \rightarrow capacity commitment not discouraging \rightarrow price competition)	USO (geographical coverage, uniform price) prevents USP from being an aggressive price competitor → USP cannot deter entry	 USO already mitigates price competition, but: puppy dog might be possible (when regulated prices can be adjusted upwards) investment to become fat cat is ambiguous (soft strategy credible, but still profitable?)

Conclusion

- Old model provides insights to USP's strategic issues in the markets of the future
- Shed light on role of USO on the feasability of strategies in submarkets
- Raises questions on regulation of parcel markets (and does not answer them)
- USO as an strategic advantage (but not necessarily profitable) in rural areas, but limits strategic options in cities
- May observe «puppy-dog» or «fat cat» -USPs in cities (accomodation-case)
- For more precise recommendation derived from model, we **need more precise assumptions** and callibrations (left to future research)

References

- IPC (2022). Global Postal Industry Report (GPIR) 2022.
- Crew, M.A. and P.R. Kleindorfer (2007). Approaches to the USO under Entry. In: M.A. Crew and P.R.
 Kleindorfer (eds), Liberalization of the Postal and Delivery Sector, Edward Elgar.
- Fudenberg, D. and J. Tirole (1984). The fat-cat effect, the puppy-dog play, and the lean and hungry look. The American Economic Review, 74(2).
 - Similar, however, independendly: Bulow, J.I., J.D. Geanakoplos, and P.D. Klemperer (1985).
 Multimarket oligopoly: Strategic substitutes and complements. Journal of Political economy, 93(3).
- Jaag (2011). Entry Deterrence and the Calculation of the Net Cost of Universal Service Obligations" (2011). Review of Network Economics, 10(1).
- Shakespeare, W. (1599). The Tragedy of Julius Caesar.
- Valletti, T. M., S. Hoernig, and P. P. Barros (2002). Universal Service and Entry: The Role of Uniform Pricing and Coverage Constraints. Journal of Regulatory Economics, 21(2).