Reform Lodging

The Illusion of Fairness: Rate Parity Agreements and Their Detrimental Impact on the Hotel Industry

---

Table of Contents

I. Introduction & Overview
II. Economic Implications
III. Dimension of Competition
IV. Global Regulatory Actions on Rate Parity Agreements: A Closer Look
V. Conclusion

I. Introduction & Overview

In today's digital age, industries across the globe have witnessed an unprecedented rise in monopolistic practices, often cleverly concealed behind technicalities and jargon. The hotel industry, a major pillar in the service sector, hasn't been spared either. Central to this issue are rate parity agreements, often portrayed as standard business contracts but, upon closer inspection, reveal an agenda to cement market dominance and suppress competition.

Rate parity agreements stipulate that hotels must offer the same room rate across all distribution channels, whether on their proprietary website or any Online Travel Agencies (OTAs) they partner with. This seemingly innocuous requirement, though presented as a means to ensure 'fairness,' is anything but. In reality, it's a calculated move to maintain a stronghold over pricing structures and inhibit market diversity.

When the most influential OTAs command the digital marketplace, the equilibrium of power becomes distorted. These OTAs, backed by the leverage rate parity agreements provide, effectively hamstring hotel franchisors and their franchisees. By dictating pricing structures, they leave little room for these entities to adjust their rates in response to local market demands or operational costs. What's painted as a level playing field in fact becomes a breeding ground for coercive monopolistic behavior.

Franchisees, especially those operating in areas with elevated living or operational costs, find themselves in a precarious situation. Bound by the constraints of these agreements, their ability to adjust prices or offer incentives is stifled, jeopardizing their profitability and sustainability. Furthermore, this lack of pricing flexibility deprives consumers of potential discounts or special offers, leading to an environment where choice is curtailed, and genuine competitive pricing is virtually non-existent.

The European response to the challenges posed by rate parity agreements is instructive. Several European countries have identified the inherent anti-competitive nature of such clauses, leading them to declare such agreements illegal. This decisive action has initiated a recalibration of OTA contracts, fostering a more equitable competitive landscape. The US, on the other hand, stands at a crossroads. The continued enforcement of rate parity agreements has paved the way for OTA market consolidation, with major players overshadowing and outmaneuvering smaller competitors.

For genuine competition to flourish and for consumers to truly benefit from a diverse marketplace, regulatory bodies such as the FTC must intervene. There's a pressing need to evaluate rate parity agreements critically, considering their far-reaching implications for competition, consumer choice, and the health of the hotel industry.

Amidst this monopolistic environment, a deceptive illusion of choice has emerged for the unsuspecting consumer. When embarking on price shopping, a consumer is typically presented with an array of seemingly varied website options, often exceeding ten in number. On the surface, it appears as though there's a wealth of choice at their fingertips. However, the underlying reality is starkly different. Most of these diverse platforms are simply offshoots or affiliates of the two major OTAs. Despite the differing logos, website designs, and branding, the prices remain eerily consistent across the board. This carefully crafted façade misleads consumers into believing they're accessing a broad market spectrum, comparing and contrasting various deals. In truth, they are merely navigating different corridors of the same monopolistic mansion. Such practices not only erode the very concept of genuine consumer choice but also undermine trust in the digital marketplace. Consumers, believing they are making informed decisions based on wide-ranging market research, are essentially choosing between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, both under the control of the same puppeteers.

Franchisees in areas with higher living or operational costs may find it challenging to maintain profitability with these pricing restraints. Conversely, the imposition of minimum prices may inhibit franchisees from providing discounts or promotional deals to attract or retain clientele.

Over the years, OTA industry behemoths Expedia Group and Booking Holdings have consolidated the marketplace through their collective ownership of a wide swath of both large and small booking engines. Below is a list of OTAs owned by the two largest travel industry players:

OTAs and Subsidiaries Owned by Expedia Group:

1. Expedia
2. Hotels.com
3. VRBO
4. Travelocity
5. Hotwire
6. Orbitz
7. Ebookers

8. Cheaptickets
9. CarRentals.com
10. Expedia Cruises
11. WotIf
12. Trivago

OTAs and Subsidiaries Owned by Booking Holdings:

1. Booking.com
2. Priceline
3. Agoda
4. Rentalcars.com
5. Kayak
6. Opentable
7. Rocketmiles
8. Fareharbor
9. Hotelscombined
10. Cheapflights
11. Momondo

The OTAs need inventory to survive and the major hotel franchisors, instead of protecting their franchisees and wielding more brand loyalty & power, succumb to the whims of the major OTAs by providing their franchisee room inventory to all the OTA platforms. What appears on the surface as a necessary evil and additional inventory distribution strategy, is, another scheme to benefit the ***franchisor's*** bottom line. The way in which OTAs receive hotel brand inventory is by ways of coercive contracts, without franchisee involvement or say, in which franchisors receive hefty fees from the commissions that are charged to the hotel franchisees for receiving OTA traffic. What occurs here is a double dip by the franchisor, by agreeing to the "negotiated" OTA commissions and then assessing additional distribution fees. In the case of Choice Hotels, these additional distribution fees charged to the hotel franchisees by Choice, amount to upwards of 6.5% extra as a kickback to the franchisor.

II. Economic Implications

The ripple effects of rate parity agreements extend beyond the immediate hotel industry, casting shadows on the broader economic landscape. One of the most palpable consequences is the potential for price inflation. In a genuine competitive environment, businesses are constantly driven to optimize their offerings, ensuring that consumers get value for their money. However, with rate parity agreements acting as a de facto price floor, there's a suppression of this competitive spirit. Instead of prices being dictated by market dynamics such as supply, demand, operational costs, or regional economic factors, they are held hostage by these agreements. The absence of genuine price wars or aggressive competitive pricing strategies can easily lead to a scenario where consumers are faced with prices that are higher than what a truly competitive market would dictate.

Parallelly, there's the looming specter of economic concentration. By fortifying the dominant position of a few major OTAs, rate parity agreements essentially lay down a red carpet for these entities to monopolize the marketplace. In such a landscape, smaller players, who might bring in fresh perspectives, novel business models, or innovative solutions, find it increasingly challenging to carve a niche or even survive. Economic concentration, historically, has been a precursor to reduced market dynamism. When a handful of players hold a disproportionate share of the market, the urgency to innovate diminishes. After all, with limited competition, there's less incentive to constantly evolve or improve. This stasis can lead to market stagnation, reducing the diversity of offerings for consumers and potentially slowing down the advent of groundbreaking innovations or strategies.

III. Dimension of Competition should be Multiple.

True competition in the hotel industry must span two crucial dimensions: intra-hotel pricing and inter-platform dynamics. First, while hotels themselves should have the flexibility to offer varied pricing across platforms, the current rate parity structure ensures a uniformity that does not serve the end consumer. Such a model overlooks the myriad factors that could drive a hotel to adjust its prices: localized events, off-peak promotions, or even efforts to differentiate themselves from neighboring establishments.

Yet, even more critically, the platform landscape itself demands vigorous competition. It's a common scenario: a traveler, zeroing in on a specific destination or area, finds their options constrained to a particular hotel or two that best suits their needs. In such cases, the differentiating factor should ideally be the platform offering the most competitive rates, encouraging OTAs to vie for consumer attention and loyalty. By stifling this inter-platform competition, rate parity agreements not only erode the incentive for OTAs to be aggressive in their pricing strategies but also rob consumers of the chance to benefit from such rivalry. In essence, when travel is inherently destination-centric, the competition should be as much about the platform's ability to offer the best deals as it is about the hotel's services and rates.

IV. Global Regulatory Actions on Rate Parity Agreements: A Closer Look

The prevalence of rate parity agreements within the hotel industry has not gone unnoticed by regulatory bodies across the world. Concerned about the potential anti-competitive and monopolistic implications of such agreements, several nations have taken steps to regulate or even prohibit these practices. Below are various regulatory actions undertaken globally on the issue of rate parity agreements.

1. **European Union**

In 2015, the European Commission launched a competition sector inquiry into e-commerce, which included an examination of rate parity clauses in hotel bookings. Following the investigation, several member states, including France, Italy, and Belgium, moved against these clauses, deeming them as restrictive.

2. **France**

The "Macron Law" of 2015 prohibited rate parity clauses in contracts between hotels and OTAs. This bold move allows French hotels to offer lower rates on their own websites than those provided on OTAs.

3. **Germany**

Germany's Bundeskartellamt, the country's national competition regulator, banned Booking.com from enforcing rate parity agreements in 2015. This decision followed a similar ban on HRS, another prominent OTA, a year prior.

4. **Austria**

In 2016, Austria's Federal Competition Authority declared rate parity clauses as anti-competitive, effectively making them illegal. The regulatory body emphasized the importance of fostering genuine competition and innovation within the hotel industry.

5. **Italy**

The Italian Competition Authority, in agreement with the European Commission's stance, reached an accord with Booking.com in 2015. The OTA agreed to abandon its rate parity agreements in the country.

6. **Sweden**

Sweden's competition authority undertook an in-depth analysis of rate parity agreements, especially focusing on Booking.com's practices. In 2015, the OTA committed to amending its rate parity terms in Sweden, following a similar change in its practices in France and Italy.

7. **Australia**

The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) scrutinized the rate parity practices of major OTAs. Though a complete ban was not implemented, considerable pressure from the ACCC led to OTAs such as Expedia and Booking.com voluntarily agreeing to allow hotels to offer lower rates on other OTA platforms and offline channels.

8. **Japan**

In a significant move in 2019, Japan's Fair Trade Commission (JFTC) raided the offices of major OTAs including Expedia, Booking.com Japan, and Rakuten. This was on suspicions that these OTAs enforced rate parity clauses in their contracts with hoteliers. This raid followed a similar investigation into Amazon’s e-book pricing parity practices, signaling Japan's intention to clamp down on such anti-competitive clauses.

V. Conclusion

In conclusion, the global trajectory indicates a growing discomfort with rate parity agreements. Regulators worldwide are increasingly recognizing the potential harms of such agreements on competition, innovation, and consumer choice. While the regulatory response varies, from outright bans to negotiated amendments, the message is clear: a fairer, more competitive landscape is the need of the hour in the hotel industry.

Rate parity agreements, far from being benign business contracts, serve as tools to fortify monopolistic behavior. They curb competition, limit choice, and have the potential to reshape industries to serve the interests of a few dominant players. Regulatory bodies must recognize this looming threat and act decisively to ensure that industries remain competitive, diverse, and, above all, fair. FTC must ACT on this very consumer centric issue, whether it's the hotel industry grappling with the stranglehold of dominant OTAs or independent sellers navigating the vast marketplace of Amazon, there's a pressing need for updated regulatory frameworks that prioritize genuine competition, market diversity, and long-term consumer welfare, and hotel owners and consumers are awaiting action.

About Reform Lodging: *Reform Lodging is a nonprofit hospitality industry think tank and owner advocacy organization fueled by the youthful exuberance of millennial hoteliers, backed by the wisdom of industry luminaries. The organization was founded in April 2020 by Rich Gandhi, Sagar Shah, and Dharam Goragandhi and has over 1,700 members from across the United States and overseas. Reform Lodging's website is www.reformlodging.org*