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| 1 | Monday, 13 February 2017 | 1 | dispensability. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (10.00 am) | 2 | So just to remind the Tribunal as briefly as I can, |
| 3 | Housekeeping | 3 | at the costs management hearing I think before the |
| 4 | THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Mr Harris. | 4 | President in I think September, it was suggested that it |
| 5 | MR HARRIS: Good morning. One or two housekeeping matters | 5 | was anticipated that Mr Bishop would be addressing that |
| 6 | if I may. Thank you ever so much for the protocol. | 6 | issue, and of course we anticipated that as part of my |
| 7 | I think that has been sent to the experts. | 7 | learned friend's pleaded case that one would normally |
| 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am sorry it was so late. | 8 | expect an economist to address and they chose not to, |
| 9 | MR HARRIS: Not at all, sir, and we will dutifully vacate | 9 | and having chosen not to at the PTR, we of course |
| 10 | the front bench after lunch. | 10 | identified that they had chosen not to and said it |
| 11 | Just whilst on the subject of experts, you invited | 11 | wouldn't be fair if they did then do so in the reply |
| 12 | me to take instructions over the weekend as regards | 12 | report and then they have chosen not to again. |
| 13 | timing. We are content with that proposal that was put | 13 | So we say: fine, no problem. But our submission, if |
| 14 | forward by the Tribunal, namely that if it is Mr Parker | 14 | you needed to pick this up, sir, you don't need to turn |
| 15 | to go first -- though I know what is said about that in | 15 | it up but just so that you know we put it in writing as |
| 16 | the protocol -- after lunch tomorrow, then he will have | 16 | well at paragraph 104.3 of our skeleton argument, our |
| 17 | come out of purdah at some point in the morning, even if | 17 | submission is that in those circumstances it wouldn't be |
| 18 | only just before lunch, and I'll have an opportunity to | 18 | fair or appropriate for Mr Bishop to be asked questions |
| 19 | consult with him then with my team. If he is first up, | 19 | about that and/or to seek develop a case that he has |
| 20 | then that should suffice. | 20 | deliberately chosen not to put forward in his written |
| 21 | Can we play by ear whether there is a need for | 21 | report. But I can't take it any further than that |
| 22 | another 15 or 20 minutes. It may not arise, | 22 | because of course ultimately it is a matter for the |
| 23 | particularly if the hot tubbing is finished well before | 23 | Tribunal. |
| 24 | lunch. | 24 | THE CHAIRMAN: No, and in a sense, there's a distinction to |
| 25 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the only thing we were conscious of was | 25 | be drawn between hot tubbing where the matter may arise |
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| 1 | that it would be, just as Mr Maclean was identifying the | 1 | and cross-examination where the matter won't arise, |
| 2 | unfairness of an extensive purdah, so it seems to us | 2 | because of course you will be in control of the |
| 3 | a little bit unfair if there was a non-extensive purdah | 3 | cross-examination of Mr Maclean's expert. |
| 4 | with one party's expert going in straight after the hot | 4 | Just to give you an indication of how we are |
| 5 | tub. | 5 | thinking, we obviously have some idea of what we want to |
| 6 | MR HARRIS: Yes. | 6 | ask the experts, and we have supplied them with an |
| 7 | THE CHAIRMAN: And so you can take it from us that if it is | 7 | indication, albeit very broad brush, in the protocol. |
| 8 | your expert going in after the hot tub, there will be | 8 | Our sense is that it would be not consistent with the |
| 9 | accommodation if you need it for however long you need | 9 | hot tubbing process to have a debate where only one |
| 10 | it within reason to take instructions. | 10 | expert participated. We certainly don't want to |
| 11 | MR HARRIS: I imagine that may not be problematic. I am | 11 | encourage the filling out for the sake of it of a gap, |
| 12 | grateful. | 12 | if that's what you call it, in Mr Maclean's expert's |
| 13 | THE CHAIRMAN: Who knows? But I think that would be the | 13 | report, but equally, if we consider a question is worth |
| 14 | fair indication to give. | 14 | asking we will want to have a debate between the two |
| 15 | MR HARRIS: Two other matters on housekeeping. | 15 | experts. |
| 16 | The first is of course the procedure is ultimately | 16 | MR HARRIS: Yes, sir, may I make just one parting remark |
| 17 | entirely up to the Tribunal but you will recall, sir, | 17 | then in response to that, which is of course that would |
| 18 | that we attempted to use that rather unhappy phrase that | 18 | have been a case, had it been chosen to be addressed, |
| 19 | counsel like to use to put a marker down at the PTR and | 19 | for my learned friend's side to advance. Because they |
| 20 | then again in our skeleton about the danger, we say | 20 | didn't, Mr Parker hasn't addressed that issue either. |
| 21 | unfairness to us, should it be the case that at any | 21 | So at the moment there is no expert evidence on the |
| 22 | point during the oral evidence Mr Bishop is allowed to | 22 | topic, so it wouldn't be as though one would be asking |
| 23 | seek to develop a case which he has deliberately not put | 23 | only one expert to opine upon that which he has |
| 24 | in either of his written reports, and the point that | 24 | addressed, whereas the other hasn't, because neither has |
| 25 | I am referring to of course is necessity and | 25 | addressed it, because it would have had to come from |
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| 1 | them for us to respond. | 1 | evening to do a better job I hope for the Tribunal. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | So we say, and as we put it in the skeleton that is | 2 | It is obviously a matter for the Tribunal but what |
| 3 | somewhere where the claimant has deliberately chosen to | 3 | we had in mind was if the Tribunal was willing to accept |
| 4 | be silent on an issue where they have the burden. As | 4 | something from us by, say, 12 o'clock on Friday, whether |
| 5 | regards expert evidence, of course I accept that | 5 | that would be convenient. It is obviously a matter for |
| 6 | Mr Springett seeks to address that as a matter of fact | 6 | the Tribunal. |
| 7 | and you have seen what we have to say about that in the | 7 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll think about that. But |
| 8 | skeleton. | 8 | Mr Harris, I take it you have nothing to add to that? |
| 9 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed. I suspect it may not arise but | 9 | MR HARRIS: No. For our part, we see the great benefit of |
| 10 | thank you for the marker. | 10 | the Tribunal having -- I hate to say this because I can |
| 11 | MR HARRIS: Then the final housekeeping point, whilst I at | 11 | just imagine what it is going to do to my Thursday |
| 12 | least am on my feet, is if I can ask with great respect, | 12 | night, but the benefit of a full day of reading on the |
| 13 | are we still on track to finish next Monday for certain? | 13 | Friday, so we venture to suggest something like |
| 14 | The reason I ask is I have been asked to take on two | 14 | 8 o'clock or 9 o'clock in the morning on Friday so the |
| 15 | commitments next Tuesday and I said: "I would rather | 15 | Tribunal has the full day. I hesitate to say that but |
| 16 | just check first if you don't mind". | 16 | there we go. |
| 17 | THE CHAIRMAN: I hope so. Because what I think we are | 17 | MR FREEMAN: Mr Harris and Mr Maclean, closings are meant to |
| 18 | envisaging is that to the extent that we are overrunning | 18 | be short, pithy summaries of your case, not another |
| 19 | within the trial it is an intra-trial overrun and it | 19 | bible, please. I am thinking of my weekend. |
| 20 | cuts into your time for the preparation of submissions, | 20 | MR HARRIS: Yes, sir. |
| 21 | rather than -- or possibly the Tribunal's time for | 21 | THE CHAIRMAN: It takes time to do things in short, though, |
| 22 | reading, we'll see, but with an end date as planned. | 22 | that is the trouble. |
| 23 | MR HARRIS: Yes, sir. | 23 | MR HARRIS: That may be the answer to the question. The |
| 24 | THE CHAIRMAN: Close of play Monday. Mr Maclean? | 24 | less time, the shorter they will be. |
| 25 | MR MACLEAN: Perhaps I am more reckless than my learned | 25 | MR FREEMAN: That is your challenge. |
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| 1 | friend. I already have a commitment for next Tuesday | 1 | THE CHAIRMAN: We will think about it and get back to you. |
| 2 | afternoon and I was proceeding upon the basis that we | 2 | MR HARRIS: So if there aren't any more preliminaries then |
| 3 | were going to finish next Monday. | 3 | I would like to resume with Mr Springett if he's able to |
| 4 | My point is this: first of all, so far as Mr Harris' | 4 | do so. |
| 5 | point on Mr Bishop's concern, I hear what he says and | 5 | MR IAN SPRINGETT (continued) |
| 6 | I suspect he is tilting at windmills but we will see | 6 | Cross-examination by MR HARRIS (continued) |
| 7 | what happens. | 7 | MR HARRIS: Mr Springett, you will recall we were talking |
| 8 | So far as my point of housekeeping, it is this: I | 8 | about matters connected with the group procurement law |
| 9 | assume the Tribunal is content with the suggestion | 9 | when we finished on Friday afternoon. Do you remember |
| 10 | I made the other day that, given Mr Bishop's | 10 | that? |
| 11 | difficulties on Wednesday morning, we won't sit on | 11 | A. We were, yes. |
| 12 | Wednesday morning but we will sit on Wednesday | 12 | Q. And I am right in saying to you, am I not, that the |
| 13 | afternoon. That is the first thing. | 13 | other sister and/or parent companies of a member of AM |
| 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that is the basis upon which we | 14 | who are supposedly bound by the group procurement law, |
| 15 | have been proceeding. | 15 | those other sister or parent companies they are not |
| 16 | MR MACLEAN: Then following on from that, I think in the | 16 | actually members of the company, are they? |
| 17 | original plan when we didn't sit at all on Wednesday and | 17 | A. Bound by the group -- as I understand it, no, they're |
| 18 | Thursday for the preparation of written closings, | 18 | not members. |
| 19 | I suspect they are due at some time on Thursday | 19 | Q. So that means they don't have any listing rights of |
| 20 | afternoon and what I was going to raise with the | 20 | their own as members, do they, these sister or parent |
| 21 | Tribunal, for the Tribunal to hopefully think about, was | 21 | companies? |
| 22 | whether, given that we are losing half a day, the | 22 | A. That's my understanding. |
| 23 | Tribunal would be prepared to accept the written | 23 | Q. They don't have a vote, do they, as members of the |
| 24 | closings at some stage on Friday rather than close of | 24 | company? |
| 25 | play on Thursday, which obviously gives us an extra | 25 | A. Only members. |
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|  | Q. That is right. And what share do they get on the | 1 | A. Again, you're putting forward a legal term to me which |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | winding up of the company, the sister and parent | 2 | I wouldn't venture to make an opinion on. |
| 3 | companies? | 3 | Q. Thank you. I am going to now ask you some questions |
| 4 | A. Only the members get that. | 4 | about a different part of the contract, what has been |
| 5 | Q. That is right. My suggestion to you, Mr Springett, is | 5 | called in the legal pleadings the "no other promotions |
| 6 | that you have no reason or justification for this group | 6 | rule". You know what I mean? |
| 7 | procurement rule, do you? | 7 | A. I do. |
| 8 | A. Yes, we do. | 8 | Q. You are restricted from promoting any other portal bar |
| 9 | Q. Perhaps you could explain what you say that reason or | 9 | OTM, correct, as a member? |
| 10 | justification is. | 10 | A. Correct. |
| 11 | A. Well, it avoids the situation where the rules and the | 11 | Q. Though, to be fair to you, you are allowed to mention |
| 12 | contracts can be gamed -- | 12 | that you are on the one other portal, correct? |
| 13 | THE CHAIRMAN: "Gamed", you said? | 13 | A. Yes, that's right. |
| 14 | A. Gamed, yes, sir. What I mean by that is that clearly | 14 | Q. I suggest to you, Mr Springett, that what you were |
| 15 | there would be ways, for example, for a member entity, | 15 | really aiming for in relation to this obligation in the |
| 16 | particularly if it was part of a group of companies, to | 16 | contract was to ensure that the members engaged in |
| 17 | evade the One Other Portal rule obligation by simply | 17 | supplementary marketing for the benefit of OTM; is that |
| 18 | channelling business via a sister company or another | 18 | right? |
| 19 | element of the group. So that's one of the purposes of | 19 | A. There are two parts to it. I don't remember the clause |
| 20 | that group rule and the procure obligation in | 20 | numbers in the contracts and they vary from contract to |
| 21 | particular. | 21 | contract, but one of the obligations, one of the |
| 22 | MR HARRIS: Now, you say, Mr Springett, in your fifth | 22 | positive obligations that members enter into is to |
| 23 | witness statement at paragraph $21-$ you don't need to | 23 | actively promote their own portal, so including our logo |
| 24 | turn it up, I am going to quote it to you -- you say, | 24 | in window displays, on marketing literature -- you know, |
| 25 | and I quote: | 25 | doing anything they can do to grow the brand |
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| 1 | "There is nothing preventing it [by which you mean | 1 | particularly in their local market, and by the same |
| 2 | GHL] from complying." | 2 | token, it doesn't make any sense to us, if they're |
| 3 | But that is not right, is it? Can you explain to me | 3 | owning a portal business, to then go around promoting |
| 4 | how GHL is supposed to procure its parent to do | 4 | somebody else's portal business. |
| 5 | something that the parent doesn't wish to do? | 5 | Q. Right. Mr Springett, I am pleased to hear you say that |
| 6 | A. I think you are taking me into matters of contract. | 6 | because you have anticipated my next question. You just |
| 7 | I say that under advice from my legal team. | 7 | said there are two parts. Now, as I understand them, |
| 8 | Q. So you can't yourself -- and that is fair enough, | 8 | the two parts are a positive obligation on the part of |
| 9 | I don't need you to tell me anything about your legal | 9 | the members to engage in marketing for OTM, and the |
| 10 | advice -- put forward a method by which a subsidiary | 10 | second part is a negative obligation on the part of |
| 11 | company can procure a parent company to do something | 11 | members not to promote somebody else; correct? |
| 12 | that the parent doesn't wish to do; is that right? | 12 | A. I think that's a reasonable summary, yes. |
| 13 | A. Well, again, I have had the procure obligation explained | 13 | Q. And that I suggest to you, that negative obligation is |
| 14 | to me right back at the beginning when the contract was | 14 | what is pernicious; it is intended to hurt the other |
| 15 | first drafted, but the --I have given you a practical | 15 | portals, isn't it? |
| 16 | example of how we see it operating. It is there to | 16 | A. It just seems to us to be common sense that if you |
| 17 | ensure that participants behave properly in relation to | 17 | create your own portal and enter it into the market, you |
| 18 | their obligations. That's all I can tell you. | 18 | would not necessarily then seek to promote the brand of |
| 19 | Q. Right. So is the answer to my question either no you | 19 | a portal you don't own. |
| 20 | can't, or you don't know whether a parent -- | 20 | Q. But you accept, I think, don't you, perhaps following on |
| 21 | A. I think it is a matter of contract primarily. | 21 | from that answer, that the other portals will therefore |
| 22 | Q. I see. And am I right in saying, therefore, that you | 22 | obviously lose some of the benefit of the free |
| 23 | also can't put forward a method by which a sister | 23 | competition that they would otherwise get from having |
| 24 | company can procure a sister company to do something | 24 | agents on that other portal, correct? |
| 25 | which the sister company doesn't want to do? | 25 | A. I'm not aware that agents are under any obligation to |
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| 1 | promote other portals. | 1 | the initial five-year contractual period. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Well, Mr Springett, can I just turn your attention, | 2 | Q. That is right. So I think the answer to the question |
| 3 | please, draw your attention to bundle $1 / 544$. The | 3 | then is "yes", Mr Springett. You think it only applies |
| 4 | document itself starts on 542. | 4 | for the start-up period of five years, this restriction, |
| 5 | A. Yes. | 5 | correct? |
| 6 | Q. In your solicitor's index this is described as | 6 | A. I don't have a strong view either way. It could |
| 7 | a questions and answers document from 4 March 2013. | 7 | continue and it would make sense to continue, as far as |
| 8 | A. Okay. | 8 | I'm concerned, as long as members own their own |
| 9 | Q. Am I right in saying that you are responsible, or | 9 | business. |
| 10 | largely responsible, for putting together this document? | 10 | Q. Well, let me just take you then to a passage in your |
| 11 | A. Yes. | 11 | fifth witness statement. You can put away whatever |
| 12 | Q. The bit I would like to draw your attention to, please, | 12 | other bundle you had open a minute ago, and if you are |
| 13 | is the top paragraph of page 544 and do you see the | 13 | handed bundle C, please, claimant's witness statements, |
| 14 | final two sentences of that top paragraph, the one | 14 | and if you turn to tab 4, to your fifth witness |
| 15 | beginning "We are asking our members"? | 15 | statement, and if you turn within that, please, to |
| 16 | A. "From the experience of Primelocation ..."? | 16 | paragraph 13.1. This is under the heading about the |
| 17 | Q. I beg your pardon. Three sentences: | 17 | rule we are talking about. |
| 18 | "We are asking our members to promote ..." | 18 | A. Mmm. |
| 19 | A. I see, yes. "... the new portal," yes. | 19 | Q. And in 13.3 do you see that you say in the second |
| 20 | Q. Yes, and then you say in the final sentence: | 20 | sentence, talking about this "no other promotions" rule: |
| 21 | "They will obviously lose some of the benefit of | 21 | "This is not least because it applies only for the |
| 22 | this free promotion from agents joining us." | 22 | start-up period of five years in order to facilitate |
| 23 | The "they" in that sentence is the other portals, | 23 | OTM's attempt to break into a market which is dominated |
| 24 | isn't it? | 24 | by two incumbents ... " |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | Do you see that? |
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| 1 | Q. So I suggest to you that it is right that one of | 1 | A. I do. |
| 2 | the aims of the rule was to take away the benefit of | 2 | Q. So your written evidence to the Tribunal is that you |
| 3 | free promotion from other portals, wasn't it? | 3 | thought it would only apply to the start-up period of |
| 4 | A. Well, it is a by-product of the rule really, isn't it? | 4 | five years because that was the break-in period, right? |
| 5 | Q. A moment ago, Mr Springett, you said there were two | 5 | A. Well, I think that's because the contracts only extend |
| 6 | sides to it. One of them was positive to help your | 6 | for that time. |
| 7 | portal, the other one was negative, and I suggest to you | 7 | Q. And the reason that you -- am I right in thinking that |
| 8 | the negative one is: cause other agents to cease | 8 | since you thought it only was in place or since your |
| 9 | supporting their competitor sites; that is right, isn't | 9 | view is that it is only in place for five years you |
| 10 | it? | 10 | thought it was only needed for five years, correct? |
| 11 | A. Well, I can only repeat, it would seem common sense to | 11 | A. Well, there's --I think my view would be that even |
| 12 | me that if you create a new business and you own it, you | 12 | beyond five years it would be a logical step for members |
| 13 | would choose to promote your own business and if you | 13 | to take, to promote the portal they owned and not |
| 14 | were doing so previously you would cease promoting other | 14 | promote ones they didn't own, and that would apply at |
| 15 | brands in the same marketplace. | 15 | any time, but I think what's in my witness statement is |
| 16 | Q. Other brands who are competitors, correct? | 16 | more to do with what agents have entered into contracts |
| 17 | A. Correct. | 17 | actually to do. |
| 18 | Q. Thank you. And I suggest to you -- sorry, I am moving | 18 | Q. Perhaps I could show you a copy of a contract in |
| 19 | on now. And your view is that this obligation not to | 19 | bundle 4 where this rule arises. The Gascoigne Halman |
| 20 | promote other competing -- other sites, even the other | 20 | copy of the contract begins on page 2208 in bundle 4. |
| 21 | one that they choose, your view is that that applies | 21 | Just so you can orientate yourself, I know you are very |
| 22 | only for the start-up period of five years, right? | 22 | familiar with these documents, Mr Springett, but the OOP |
| 23 | A. Well, again, it comes back to something I said to you | 23 | rule is in clause 6, isn't it? That is on 2209. |
| 24 | yesterday, that as far as Agents' Mutual and members are | 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | concerned, everyone's focus when we started this was on | 25 | Q. And what we are referring to as the restriction on |
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| 1 | promoting other portals, that is clause 7 , isn't it? | 1 | Q. And that's a particular scheme, G5, and do you see the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | "We will promote the portal to our registered | 2 | opening date? |
| 3 | applicants ... and agree not to promote any other | 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | portal." | 4 | Q. Five years from that would take you beyond |
| 5 | A. Correct, yes. | 5 | 26 January 2020, wouldn't it? |
| 6 | Q. Can you just show me where in that clause 7 it says it | 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | is limited to five years? | 7 | Q. Can you see that the same point applies to items 8,10 , |
| 8 | A. Well, it doesn't say that but the contract is only for | 8 | 15 and 17? |
| 9 | five years. | 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Q. Right, so if you are wrong on that and the contract | 10 | Q. So those are the categories, aren't they, of additional |
| 11 | isn't limited for five years then you have gone further | 11 | membership contracts that would take a five-year |
| 12 | than you needed to, correct, with this restriction? | 12 | membership beyond 26 January 2020, aren't they? |
| 13 | A. Again, I think as I described on Friday, this would be | 13 | A. Yes, they are. |
| 14 | a matter for us as a board and with our legal advisers | 14 | Q. And you can see that at various times, I don't need to |
| 15 | to assess whether we were going to at some stage butt up | 15 | read them out, there have been various branches |
| 16 | against legal considerations in retaining these things, | 16 | contracted as at the scheme close date and various that |
| 17 | so if it turned out that it looked like we were, then we | 17 | are still contracted? |
| 18 | would release it and there would be a way to do that. | 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | Q. I see. So perhaps in either clause 6 or 7 now can you | 19 | Q. Refer both items, 5, 8, 10, 15 and 17? |
| 20 | show me where it says that the restriction, either the | 20 | A. Yes. |
| 21 | OOP restriction or the not promoting other portals | 21 | Q. And indeed, one can see the figures for oneself. |
| 22 | restriction, will remain in place until such time as | 22 | Then can I leave that tab now and move on in the |
| 23 | Agents' Mutual's board decides otherwise? | 23 | bundle to tab 28 and this time draw your attention to |
| 24 | A. It doesn't say that. | 24 | the bottom of the first page of tab 28. Mine doesn't |
| 25 | Q. No. Can you show me where in either provision it says | 25 | have a page number on it. Is yours the first page of |
|  | Page 18 |  | Page 20 |
| 1 | that it will remain in force until Agents' Mutual | 1 | a letter dated 26 January 2017? |
| 2 | achieves market power under the CMA's definition? | 2 | A. Yes, it is, yes. |
| 3 | A. It doesn't say that either. That is really a matter for | 3 | Q. And you explain via your solicitors, or more accurately |
| 4 | our board. | 4 | your solicitors explain on behalf of the company, don't |
| 5 | Q. I am right in saying that the duration of the OOP rule | 5 | they, at the bottom in (i) that some of those types of |
| 6 | extends in some cases even beyond five years from the | 6 | contract remain available even today to new members; is |
| 7 | date of launch, doesn't it? | 7 | that right? |
| 8 | A. Well, to the extent I suppose that we've entered into | 8 | A. That's correct. |
| 9 | contracts for five years since the launch date. | 9 | Q. And that over the page, there was a mistake in the |
| 10 | Q. Yes. Perhaps I can just take you to one or two of those | 10 | information memorandum which said that the five-year |
| 11 | details. | 11 | period from listing finished for membership schemes on |
| 12 | Now we are in bundle X and I am turning at first | 12 | 26 January 2020, yes? |
| 13 | into tab 25, please. When we looked at this table on | 13 | A. Yes. |
| 14 | Friday, Mr Springett, you identified that the total | 14 | Q. And in fact, then in (iv), and I won't read this out |
| 15 | numbers, the figures, certainly the bottom right-hand | 15 | because I think the particular figures might be |
| 16 | one, 6307, that wasn't confidential. | 16 | sensitive, but your solicitors are accepting that there |
| 17 | A. That's correct. | 17 | are in fact -- and then you can see the numbers of |
| 18 | Q. I can't remember now. Did you say that the other one is | 18 | arrangements that expire after 26 January 2020, yes? |
| 19 | confidential? | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | A. Yes, please. | 20 | Q. Including some in -- well, one can see the rest -- some |
| 21 | Q. Okay, so I won't read that one out. But now I am | 21 | in 2021 and some later on in 2021, right? |
| 22 | looking at a different column. Do you see on the first | 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | page of the table, reference number 5, using the | 23 | Q. Now, when you first put your mind to it -- I am finished |
| 24 | left-hand column? | 24 | with bundle X, thank you. When you first turned your |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | mind to the duration of the OOP rule -- well, let me |
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| 1 | start again. | 1 | did you come up with the duration figure? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | When you first turned your mind to putting together | 2 | A. Well, which duration figure are we talking about? |
| 3 | Project Z, am I right that you didn't hire any | 3 | Because at this point we're well pre-merger here. So |
| 4 | consultants to assist you, correct? | 4 | there are basically four significant players in the |
| 5 | A. I think I was the consultant. | 5 | market: Rightmove, the DPG brands, Primelocation and |
| 6 | Q. Yes, good answer, Mr Springett, yes. I will show you in | 6 | FindaProperty, and Zoopla as the fourth player and |
| 7 | a minute what it was you were asked to do. But you | 7 | I think we looked on Friday at a document which showed |
| 8 | didn't -- in addition to you, there were no other | 8 | I think at November 2011 that the discussion was still |
| 9 | consultants, right? | 9 | around full exclusivity for three years. So I think the |
| 10 | A. We -- I think we had some legal advice at a pretty early | 10 | five-year discussion came later, once the merger had |
| 11 | stage. | 11 | taken place and we had reviewed the whole situation and |
| 12 | Q. I am talking right at the -- let me help you. | 12 | determined that full exclusivity wasn't viable. So it |
| 13 | A. We are in 2011, I think. | 13 | certainly isn't around this time that that consideration |
| 14 | Q. Yes. Let me just show you. My suggestion to you is it | 14 | was looked at. |
| 15 | was just you with a very limited budget to undertake | 15 | Q. Thank you. Let me take you then to the document in this |
| 16 | some desk research. Does that ring a bell? | 16 | bundle at page 181 which you have looked at before. |
| 17 | A. Yes, absolutely. | 17 | This is the Project Z draft of 9 November 2011. |
| 18 | Q. So I can show you that document if I may. It is at | 18 | A. That is the one I was referring to, yes. |
| 19 | bundle $1 / 89$. This was an email that was sent to you and | 19 | Q. Yes, thank you. If you turn it up to 181, and this is |
| 20 | some of the other founding steering committee members | 20 | a document that you have said that you were responsible |
| 21 | headed "Project Z". And do you see at the top of | 21 | for authoring, do you see in the paragraph just above |
| 22 | page 89 under the heading "Resources for preliminary | 22 | the second hole punch, the one beginning "To allow it |
| 23 | investigation" -- | 23 | ..."? |
| 24 | A. Yes. | 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | Q. -- what you were asked to do? | 25 | Q. "To allow it to achieve sustainable entry ..." |
|  | Page 22 |  | Page 24 |
| 1 | A. The only thing I would observe from what you just said | 1 | And it goes on, and then at this stage, this early |
| 2 | is that I don't think the steering committee formed | 2 | version of the OOP rule, you say: |
| 3 | itself until later. | 3 | "Their listings will be committed to the preferred |
| 4 | Q. A fair point, but Mr Abrahmsohn and Mr Hodgson at least | 4 | portal on an exclusive basis for at least three years." |
| 5 | in the cc list -- | 5 | Do you see that? |
| 6 | A. Became so, yes. | 6 | A. Yes, but we ought to make clear that "OOP" means "One |
| 7 | Q. -- and Mr Flint, who sent you the email, they are all | 7 | Other Portal", whereas what's referred to in this |
| 8 | founding members of the steering committee, aren't they? | 8 | paragraph is full exclusivity. |
| 9 | A. Which was formed later was my point. | 9 | Q. No, no, with respect, Mr Springett, that is not right, |
| 10 | Q. I suggested to you that it was just yourself by way of | 10 | is it? Because look, it goes on to say: |
| 11 | desk research at this early stage because that is what | 11 | "However, given the importance to agents of listing |
| 12 | it says at the top of 89 , doesn't it? | 12 | with at least one other market leading portal an |
| 13 | A. That's correct. | 13 | exemption is being made such that agents could list |
| 14 | Q. And indeed you had a pretty limited budget. Is that | 14 | their properties priced at less than 1 million or |
| 15 | figure that is in yellow below, is that now | 15 | renting for less than $£ 500$ per week also on Rightmove |
| 16 | confidential? | 16 | over this period." |
| 17 | A. No, I'm happy for it to be -- | 17 | So it is a one other portal, isn't it? |
| 18 | Q. Because this was many, many years ago. So it was you, | 18 | A. Okay, for that segment, but I guess what I'm pointing |
| 19 | by yourself at a desk using $£ 5,000$ plus some travel | 19 | out is it isn't the version of the rule that was |
| 20 | money, correct? | 20 | eventually determined. |
| 21 | A. Correct. | 21 | Q. That is right. It is a large segment, isn't it: |
| 22 | Q. And we can see what that generated in terms of duration. | 22 | properties priced at less than $£ 1$ million or renting for |
| 23 | No, sorry, let me do that in a slightly different | 23 | less than $£ 500$ a week? That is a very large segment, |
| 24 | way. When you generated your duration figure using this | 24 | isn't it? |
| 25 | limited budget and the desk research by yourself, how | 25 | A. It is a big segment. |
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| 1 | Q. Yes, that's right. I am going to come back later on, | 1 | the launch of Agents' Mutual are totally different from |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Mr Springett, to the fact that you identify Rightmove | 2 | those that were extant when Primelocation launched, |
| 3 | here as being the one other portal on this early version | 3 | don't you? |
| 4 | of the rule, but right now I am still focused on the | 4 | A. Well, that's a third point in time, isn't it? So |
| 5 | fact that in this early version of the rule you identify | 5 | Primelocation was launched in 2001. We are here talking |
| 6 | an exclusivity period, subject to that carve-out, for | 6 | in 2011, pre the merger, at a point where Zoopla was |
| 7 | three years and not for five years. That is right, | 7 | really not on anyone's radar, and then a post-merger |
| 8 | isn't it? | 8 | situation where a reassessment was done of what was |
| 9 | A. Clearly at this point we were looking at three years, | 9 | needed and still later a detailed financial model was |
| 10 | yes. | 10 | put together. |
| 11 | Q. Can you show me the documents in which you set out your | 11 | Q. That is right, but I think you do accept, don't you, |
| 12 | analysis of why at that stage you were thinking that | 12 | that the portals market at the time of launch of |
| 13 | only three years was required? | 13 | Agents' Mutual is totally different from the portals |
| 14 | A. Well, I think at that stage I was considering history | 14 | market when Primelocation launched? |
| 15 | really, and what we'd achieved with Primelocation which | 15 | A. It's considerably more difficult, yes. |
| 16 | also had a three-year initial period written into it. | 16 | Q. You say that, Mr Springett, but actually it is much more |
| 17 | Q. That is right. So it was your past experience based on | 17 | of a mixed picture, isn't it, as regards difficulty? |
| 18 | Primelocation that was principally driving it, wasn't | 18 | A. I don't remotely agree with that. |
| 19 | it? | 19 | Q. Really? |
| 20 | A. Together with some early legal advice that we had taken | 20 | A. It was a market completely dominated by two large media |
| 21 | I think as long ago as certainly the first half of 2011. | 21 | groups. |
| 22 | Q. Please, Mr Springett, don't feel obliged to tell me | 22 | Q. You say that now, Mr Springett, but my understanding is |
| 23 | anything about your legal advice unless you want to. | 23 | that you were regarding it as a market that had moved to |
| 24 | A. I'm just saying we had some. | 24 | some extent in favour of portals compared to when |
| 25 | Q. But can you show me the spreadsheet or the data analysis | 25 | Primelocation launched. Do you accept that? |
|  | Page 26 |  | Page 28 |
| 1 | that led you at that time to think that you needed, in | 1 | A. In favour of portals? That is a different matter. That |
| 2 | order to "allow it to achieve a sustainable entry" -- | 2 | is a different question altogether. |
| 3 | and here I am quoting from your top line -- | 3 | Q. Mr Springett, can I draw your attention to, still in |
| 4 | A. Yes -- | 4 | bundle 1, we are back in a document, a Q and A that you |
| 5 | Q. -- to need only three years? What's the data or | 5 | looked at before but this time on page 542. I said to |
| 6 | spreadsheet or analysis that you conducted in order to | 6 | you a moment ago that it was a more mixed picture and |
| 7 | come up with three years at this stage? | 7 | you didn't accept that. But I am just looking at your |
| 8 | A. I think as I have just said, the origin of that was | 8 | item 3 now on page 542. |
| 9 | referring back to previous experience and it's relevant | 9 | A. Mm. |
| 10 | to say at this point that this was more an issue of what | 10 | Q. And you say in the fourth line down -- do you have the |
| 11 | would work commercially from my perspective as somebody | 11 | sentence beginning "Although"? |
| 12 | advising the company, or the putative company, at this | 12 | "Although the competitor environment is now tougher, |
| 13 | stage of what might work, and also a question of what | 13 | the situation is also eased by the fact that paying |
| 14 | the agents felt would be viable for them as businesses. | 14 | listing fees is now an established concept and agents |
| 15 | So I don't think really at this stage we were into | 15 | recognise fully the value the portals provide." |
| 16 | detailed analysis. There was no business plan. There | 16 | A. Yes. |
| 17 | were no financials drawn up at this early stage. | 17 | Q. That is right, is it not? So it is not unequivocally |
| 18 | Q. No, exactly, Mr Springett. There is no underlying data | 18 | harder to launch when Agents' Mutual launched, compared |
| 19 | or financial analysis at this stage to come up with the | 19 | to when Primelocation launched, is it, even in your own |
| 20 | three years, is there? That is right, isn't it? | 20 | words? |
| 21 | A. That's right. | 21 | A. Well, that's certainly a saving grace, but I can tell |
| 22 | Q. So it is effectively based upon your view, including | 22 | you that the market environment when I launched |
| 23 | your past experience with Primelocation, correct? | 23 | Primelocation, or when we launched Primelocation, was |
| 24 | A. That's right. | 24 | rather easier than the one that we entered into at the |
| 25 | Q. But you accept that the market circumstances relating to | 25 | beginning of 2015. |
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| 1 | Q. But not unequivocally in one direction, as you would | 1 | and it has undoubtedly grown -- I have seen statistics, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | have had us accept just a moment ago, now that you have | 2 | and I can believe them, that most searches for property |
| 3 | seen this document. That is right, isn't it? | 3 | now initiate online at the rate of about 90 per cent of |
| 4 | A. Well, to the extent that it's established that people | 4 | people, so that inevitably makes it easier in the sense |
| 5 | had to pay for the two largest portals, that's true. | 5 | that usage, in the generality, of the internet has |
| 6 | Q. Well, it is not just that, is it? Because it is also | 6 | increased amongst property sellers. |
| 7 | because "agents recognise fully the value the portals | 7 | The thing that is more difficult now is that there |
| 8 | provide"? So that had been a development in favour of | 8 | has been for a number of years established usage of |
| 9 | portal launching, hadn't it, compared to Primelocation? | 9 | a relatively small number of brands which had also |
| 10 | A. That's true. | 10 | recently become even more concentrated and so our entry |
| 11 | Q. That is right. | 11 | to the market, one of the challenges for that was to |
| 12 | MR FREEMAN: Mr Harris, could I just ask -- you can hear me, | 12 | say: well, how would it be possible to encourage -- |
| 13 | can you? | 13 | I got into trouble on Friday with "consumers", but |
| 14 | MR HARRIS: Yes, thank you. | 14 | property seekers to change their behaviour and begin to |
| 15 | MR FREEMAN: Mr Springett, when you say "more difficult", | 15 | consider a new entrant to the market? |
| 16 | your answer is all about agents but what about | 16 | MR FREEMAN: Thank you. |
| 17 | persuading viewers to look at portals because that's the | 17 | MR HARRIS: Thank you, Mr Springett. |
| 18 | key to the other side of the market? | 18 | I am going to move on a little bit now. It is |
| 19 | A. Well, yes, and I think our challenge was that we were | 19 | right, isn't it, that when you were putting together in |
| 20 | entering at a time where there were two entrenched | 20 | these early days Project Z and the formulations of the |
| 21 | portals. Consumer behaviour had been as it was in terms | 21 | OOP rule and the other restrictions, that you started |
| 22 | of the portal -- of portal usage for a number of years, | 22 | from a presumption that you wanted to obtain the |
| 23 | particularly in relation to Rightmove. | 23 | maximum degree of exclusivity protection, didn't you? |
| 24 | I'd also say, and it is a personal view, that Zoopla | 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | is primarily an amalgam of a number of relatively | 25 | Q. And indeed, in your business plan you say -- and |
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| 1 | long-established portals where again consumer usage of | 1 | I quote -- you "ideally would require its members to |
| 2 | those was pretty well established. | 2 | list their properties exclusively". Do you remember |
| 3 | So by the end of 2012 you had a situation where | 3 | that? |
| 4 | there were two portals, strong brands, big marketing | 4 | A. I do. |
| 5 | budgets, with already entrenched consumer usage of those | 5 | Q. In the event, though, you went for just one degree less |
| 6 | portals, and one of the challenges for us would be how | 6 | exclusivity, didn't you? You carved out from the |
| 7 | to come into the market and move those eyeballs, if you | 7 | exclusivity an exemption in favour of one other portal, |
| 8 | like, and part of the logic, one of the primary parts of | 8 | right? |
| 9 | the logic of the One Other Portal rule was to say: we're | 9 | A. Well, that was really one of the main, I suppose |
| 10 | not going to be able to afford the kind of marketing | 10 | negotiating points between me and the steering committee |
| 11 | budgets which would achieve that, and I'm not even sure | 11 | because I came from the point of view that I didn't |
| 12 | however much you spend you would necessarily be | 12 | think it would work at all without the agents being |
| 13 | effective in achieving that. | 13 | prepared to provide their listings and revenue on |
| 14 | But I've always believed that the properties, the | 14 | a fully exclusive basis. |
| 15 | listings themselves, are the thing that draws the | 15 | There was an extended standoff period actually |
| 16 | consumer and therefore the strategy has been to, if you | 16 | during 2011 running into 2012 where I was saying: "We |
| 17 | like, have some movement, some switching of the agents | 17 | cannot move forwards or certainly you won't be moving |
| 18 | and the property listings between the three portals as | 18 | forward with me involved unless we can get to a sensible |
| 19 | now list in the market. | 19 | outcome around that question." And in the end the |
| 20 | MR FREEMAN: From your point of view as a new start-up | 20 | compromise position was one other portal. |
| 21 | portal, does the increased willingness and preference of | 21 | But all the time during that period, bear in mind, |
| 22 | house-hunters, lease-hunters, to use online portals as | 22 | I think round about late 2011 the intention to merge |
| 23 | a means of finding listed properties, does that make | 23 | between DPG and Zoopla had been announced, and then |
| 24 | your task of entry easier or more difficult? | 24 | around April 2012 I think it was given the go ahead and |
| 25 | A. I think the fact that there is strong usage of portals, | 25 | that I think led to a bit of a meeting of minds where |
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| 1 | the agents felt: well, we've got to do something and | 1 | Rightmove? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | don't believe it is feasible to do full exclusivity but | 2 | A. Yes, I wouldn't dispute that at that time Rightmove was the gorilla in the room. There was really no possibility that people would choose to leave Rightmove, and particularly for property valued below the |
| 3 | we would enter into a one other portal rule arrangement. | 3 |  |
| 4 | Q. I suggest to you, Mr Springett, that in your own mind | 4 |  |
| 5 | the thinking about what that one other portal would be | 5 |  |
| 6 | was always clear; you always thought the one other | 6 | £1 million threshold, because Rightmove is the |
| 7 | portal would be Rightmove, didn't you? | 7 | mainstream brand. |
| 8 | A. Well, this is -- in fact, I should have raised this on | 8 | Q. In fact at this stage I am right in saying, aren't I, |
| 9 | Friday afternoon when we were looking at | 9 | that you took the view that it was inconceivable that |
| 10 | the November 2011 document. | 10 | the majority of agents would come off Rightmove, didn't |
| 11 | Q. Do you want the page, Mr Springett? It is page 181 of | 11 | you? |
| 12 | bundle 1. | 12 | A. Well, certainly in the circumstances that pertained at |
| 13 | A. It is not particularly necessary. It is just really -- | 13 | that time, that's right, but what I'd also say about |
| 14 | I wanted to give just a flavour for what my personal | 14 | this is that the primary problem was then and remains |
| 15 | position was at that time and also how the agents were | 15 | Rightmove and it's just turned out that Zoopla is not |
| 16 | feeling about this because if what you are suggesting, | 16 | the solution. |
| 17 | if your case is that a plot to defeat and do down Zoopla | 17 | Q. In fact, my suggestion to you is that this idea |
| 18 | emerged in the course of 2011, I was semi-retired at | 18 | persisted well into the following year. If you turn in |
| 19 | that point. I had been asked to help with this project | 19 | the same bundle to a document that begins on 369, this |
| 20 | and I was helping on a consultancy basis, albeit | 20 | is dated 23 September 2012. So we are just under a year |
| 21 | by November I wasn't being paid anything for the | 21 | later now compared to that Project Z letter. We looked |
| 22 | privilege. I was simply giving my view as to what the | 22 | at this before because it was the one I took you to |
| 23 | group would need to do and it was certainly not agreed | 23 | right at the outset about the management deal and your |
| 24 | at that stage that I would even write a business plan, | 24 | cut of the management pot. |
| 25 | let alone become CEO. | 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | Page 34 | Page 36 |  |
| 1 | As far as the agents were concerned, this was | 1 | Q. But if you turn over the page to 371 under item 5, |
| 2 | a four-brand market. The gorilla in the room by some | 2 | "Control on capital payments" I suggest to you at this |
| 3 | margin at that point was Rightmove and the agents were | 3 | stage you were making various scenarios about growth |
| 4 | also concerned at the behaviour of DPG having determined | 4 | rates but that you can see scenario B on the previous |
| 5 | to manage FindaProperty and Primelocation together. And | 5 | page, it is an increase of the annual growth rate to |
| 6 | so actually the problem has always been Rightmove, and | 6 | a thousand offices a year rather than 500 a year. But |
| 7 | the secondary problem was the emergence of DPG as a kind | 7 | what is telling in my suggestion to you is the next |
| 8 | of package of brands that they had to use. And Zoopla | 8 | bullet point. What you were aiming for at that stage |
| 9 | was not really on their radar. I don't think even that | 9 | was ownership of the number 2 portal in a market with |
| 10 | all of the steering group member firms were using Zoopla | 10 | only two credible participants, and the only two |
| 11 | at that point. So the idea that we cooked up a plot to | 11 | credible participants simply must have been OTM and |
| 12 | do it down is fanciful. | 12 | Rightmove, mustn't they? |
| 13 | Q. I suggest to you, Mr Springett, that it was always in | 13 | A. Well, we are now looking at September 2012, so the |
| 14 | your mind right from the very beginning, precisely | 14 | merger has taken place and I don't think we were clear |
| 15 | because it was the gorilla in the room, that all the | 15 | by then, but it didn't matter because I think our mantra |
| 16 | agents when they had to choose a one other portal would | 16 | has been really that it's a market where there might end |
| 17 | choose Rightmove and that's why you identified it by | 17 | up only being one participant or there might end up |
| 18 | name on page 181. That is right, isn't it? | 18 | being two participants. In either case, the agents had |
| 19 | A. Let me go to 181. Would you kindly point me at where it | 19 | better end up owning one of them because otherwise the |
| 20 | says "Rightmove"? I'm sorry. | 20 | consequences for them and their industry are very |
| 21 | Q. Yes, it is the paragraph we were looking at with the | 21 | severe. |
| 22 | three years, just above the second hole punch. In the | 22 | Q. Jumping a little bit in time, so please bear with me, |
| 23 | final line you actually identify what the other portal | 23 | Mr Springett, but if we go in the same bundle, earlier |
| 24 | would be, albeit on this earlier version of the One | 24 | to page 207 we see the next iteration of the Project Z |
| 25 | Other Portal rule, don't you, you identify it as | 25 | document. The one we looked at a moment ago was |
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| 1 | early November and this one beginning on page 207 is | 1 | A. Yes, they are. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | late November. | 2 | Q. And I think I am right in saying that your comments are |
| 3 | A. Yes. | 3 | in the boxes on the right-hand side? |
| 4 | Q. Do you see that in fact the formulation of the draft OOP | 4 | A. That's right. |
| 5 | rule has changed in the course of November? If you turn | 5 | Q. So if we turn over the page then to 192, the column for |
| 6 | now to page 215 you can see that in the same paragraph, | 6 | Mr Abrahmsohn, he comments for some reason in capital |
| 7 | the one beginning "To allow it", you can see that the | 7 | letters in the left-hand column and picking it up in the |
| 8 | listing period is still three years, that is four lines | 8 | second sentence he says: |
| 9 | down, but the final sentence that we were just | 9 | "We understandably don't want to get it wrong and |
| 10 | concentrating on, that has now been changed: | 10 | can't change strategy midway, i.e. for the exclusivity |
| 11 | "However ..." | 11 | to be limited to Rightmove." |
| 12 | You can see for itself. | 12 | Do you see that? |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | A. Yes, I do. |
| 14 | Q. It goes on, and then instead of saying one other portal | 14 | Q. Then in fact your comment on this point is: |
| 15 | for certain properties and naming Rightmove, it's | 15 | "For discussion at the next meeting. I suspect we |
| 16 | changed to "one other portal of their choosing" and then | 16 | might run into collective boycott territory if we were |
| 17 | you introduce the phrase: "the choice of portal must | 17 | more specific." |
| 18 | apply across all offices of that firm"? | 18 | So you did have that expressly in mind, didn't you, |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | that naming Rightmove might lead directly to a charge of |
| 20 | Q. And then you say what the effects will be. | 20 | collective boycott? |
| 21 | I suggest to you, Mr Springett, that what you and | 21 | A. I didn't have a concern about it. I mean, clearly the |
| 22 | your at this stage steering committee members wanted to | 22 | steering committee, quite rightly, is raising lots of |
| 23 | do was take out the word, the identified other portal, | 23 | questions and I'm answering them at the time. But we |
| 24 | Rightmove, because you were worried that would give rise | 24 | didn't crystallise what we were going to do until much, |
| 25 | to an obvious charge of a collective boycott of Zoopla, | 25 | much later in the process and, as I say, at this stage |
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| 1 | weren't you? | 1 | I don't think I'd agreed to be part of the management of |
| 2 | A. I don't think any of that was in our mind at the time. | 2 | this. I think I was still advising on what one would do |
| 3 | The focus at this stage was what was going to work | 3 | in order to make an entry to the market. |
| 4 | commercially, and it was a matter that came up much | 4 | Q. Just reading from the transcript, Mr Springett, you said |
| 5 | later when we took formal legal advice that we needed to | 5 | a moment ago when I put to you this passage about your |
| 6 | then cut our cloth accordingly. | 6 | words "collective boycott", you said: |
| 7 | Again, I remind you that at this stage no financial | 7 | "I didn't have a concern about it." |
| 8 | modelling had been done at all. So this was really | 8 | Is that because you are not concerned about |
| 9 | still part of working out between us what would work, | 9 | collective boycott territory? |
| 10 | and me saying: "To enter this market you're going to | 10 | A. Of course not. At the point that we took formal legal |
| 11 | need the maximum exclusivity and unique content that can | 11 | advice we were clearly alerted to the issues around |
| 12 | be delivered," and agents saying, "We can't live with | 12 | that. |
| 13 | that". | 13 | Q. You go on to say: |
| 14 | Q. Mr Springett, I suggest to you that answer is just flat | 14 | "If, as seems likely, the larger firms will choose |
| 15 | wrong when you say you didn't have the worry about | 15 | Rightmove and many think it performs better ..." |
| 16 | a collective boycott in mind at that time. Would you | 16 | That is a bad understatement, isn't it, |
| 17 | like to change that answer? | 17 | Mr Springett? It is not just that it seemed likely at |
| 18 | A. Well, I can -- I didn't have the worry about it. | 18 | that stage. It was, to use your words from the |
| 19 | Q. I see. Can we turn in bundle 1 then to page 191. You | 19 | Project Z draft, "inconceivable" that the majority of |
| 20 | see this is comments following the 23 November meeting | 20 | firms would choose to drop Rightmove, wasn't it? |
| 21 | on the latest draft paper and financial projections? | 21 | A. Again, we are still in pre-merger time here, so the |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | market -- if I go back to 2011, the market was |
| 23 | Q. On the left-hand side are entries recording statements | 23 | Rightmove, the gorilla, and then three smaller brands, |
| 24 | from some of the founder committee steering members, | 24 | Primelocation, FindaProperty and Zoopla, and if |
| 25 | aren't there? | 25 | I remember rightly, the OFT made that very plain, the |
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| 1 | OFT report. | 1 | if I delivered it to Savills on 7 February 2012. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. So I think the answer is yes, then, it was inconceivable | 2 | I think the origin of the slides pre-dates that, but |
| 3 | in your view at the time that the majority of firms | 3 | 7 February. |
| 4 | would not drop Rightmove, yes? | 4 | Q. Thank you, yes. You can see, can't you, that the |
| 5 | A. Inconceivable -- I think it was inconceivable that they | 5 | company, or the would-be company's strategy as described |
| 6 | would drop Rightmove. | 6 | by you at that time is set out on the slide on page 288, |
| 7 | Q. Yes, inconceivable that they would drop Rightmove, which | 7 | isn't it? |
| 8 | is what you say in the Project Z draft that I just | 8 | "Strategy: a direct replacement Primelocation TDPG." |
| 9 | showed you? | 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | A. And that was my judgment in 2011. | 10 | Q. So it is specifically targeting a named other portal |
| 11 | Q. In fact, you have never been surprised that over | 11 | competitor in the market, isn't it? |
| 12 | 90 per cent of estate agents in the market chose the | 12 | A. I mean, I guess at that point in the proceedings we |
| 13 | dominant market leader, have you? | 13 | thought that would be the outcome. |
| 14 | A. I was surprised. I think I have told you that our view | 14 | Q. No, Mr Springett, with respect, it says that is the |
| 15 | of this moved considerably during the course of 2013 | 15 | would-be company's strategy, doesn't it? |
| 16 | when I went beyond London and the Southeast because up | 16 | A. Okay, but if you take the view that it is unlikely that |
| 17 | until that point the experience of particularly the | 17 | people will leave the market leader at that point, then |
| 18 | steering group members was that for them Primelocation | 18 | if you are going to have one other portal the corollary |
| 19 | in particular was a very important brand. I think, | 19 | of that in those circumstances would be that TDPG would |
| 20 | again I refer to the OFT report, that makes clear that | 20 | be the loser. |
| 21 | actually in London at the time Primelocation and | 21 | Q. Exactly, Mr Springett. I couldn't have put it better |
| 22 | FindaProperty was stronger in combination than Rightmove | 22 | myself. Thank you. |
| 23 | was in that part of the world. The merger changed | 23 | Then I am now looking at -- I am going to take this |
| 24 | everything and if you look at the things that were being | 24 | quickly, Mr Springett, but do you see over the page, so |
| 25 | said and the statistics being quoted at the time, early | 25 | the second page of the Savills' slide so we are now |
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| 1 | 2013, and beyond that into 2014, the impression | 1 | earlier in that document at 296. |
| 2 | absolutely was that Zoopla by virtue of the merger had | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | caught up with Rightmove. | 3 | Q. Can you see this was the income and cost projection for |
| 4 | Q. I suggest to you, Mr Springett, that your express | 4 | the proposed company at that stage, yes? |
| 5 | strategy on the part of the would-be company at that | 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | time was directly to replace what was still then | 6 | Q. And at the top line it was intended to be an incremental |
| 7 | Primelocation and TDPG, wasn't it? | 7 | growth of 500 offices a year? |
| 8 | A. Well, I mean, it is a moving feast with respect. You | 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: I think we need to be careful here because it |
| 9 | need to direct me to a point in time and I'll tell you | 9 | is not yellow but it says "Entire spreadsheet |
| 10 | what I think I felt at the time. | 10 | confidential", Mr Harris. |
| 11 | Q. These are, as I understand it, they are your words. We | 11 | MR HARRIS: Are these historic figures still confidential, |
| 12 | are back in tab 1 -- | 12 | Mr Springett? |
| 13 | A. You need to be clear at what time I am speaking. | 13 | A. I'm happy for them to be discussed. |
| 14 | Q. Yes, let's go to a particular document and ascertain the | 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. |
| 15 | date. So I am in bundle 1 at page 288, which | 15 | MR HARRIS: Thank you. Thank you, sir, because mine isn't |
| 16 | I understand to be a document of 7 February 2012, so | 16 | yellow either so I had overlooked that so I am grateful |
| 17 | just a couple of months after the Project Z documents, | 17 | to you. |
| 18 | still whilst Primelocation and TDPG are separate, yes? | 18 | So you were going to have 500 offices sign up in the |
| 19 | A. This is like a presentation document? | 19 | pre-launch year, yes, and then 500 a year going forward |
| 20 | Q. This is how I understand it to be. | 20 | each year? |
| 21 | A. I am just making sure I have got the right document. | 21 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 22 | Page 270? | 22 | Q. And then can you see if you go down the page below the |
| 23 | Q. 288 is the one I want to look at but I think the | 23 | box the surplus deficits before tax and depreciation and |
| 24 | document begins on 271. | 24 | then the cumulative, on this plan with 500 offices a |
| 25 | A. Yes, so this is a presentation that was -- it looks as | 25 | year, including only 500 at the date of launch, you were |
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| 1 | going to break even, weren't you, after just one and | 1 | Q. I don't need to read out the figures but if you turn to page 657 , I am right in saying, aren't I, that the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | a bit years of trading, because you're negative in year | 2 |  |
| 3 | 2 on surplus deficit but in year 3 you have become quite | 3 | original plan was to raise a certain amount of |
| 4 | significantly positive, so somewhere between year 2 and | 4 | pre-launch finance? The two bullet points. Do you see |
| 5 | year 3 you have broken even, correct, on this plan? | 5 | that? There was one that was loan capital with a figure |
| 6 | A. On this plan, yes. | 6 | next to it and the next figure was some monthly |
| 7 | Q. And then it goes into significant further surpluses | 7 | subscriptions per office and it comes to a total? |
| 8 | every year after a little over a year's worth of | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | trading, yes? | 9 | Q. So the pre-launch finance on this plan was the first |
| 10 | A. Yes, but it -- | 10 | figure identified plus the second figure? |
| 11 | THE CHAIRMAN: So cumulatively you break even in the course | 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | of year 6? | 12 | Q. Members of the Tribunal, you may recall some similarity |
| 13 | MR HARRIS: I think, Mr Springett, what the Chairman is | 13 | with the figures which I asked you to identify in the |
| 14 | saying is if you look at the cumulative figure it will | 14 | previous document I think on Friday. |
| 15 | have broken even between some time after four years of | 15 | I am right in saying, aren't I, that the plan at |
| 16 | trading and into the fifth year of trading, yes? | 16 | this stage was for the business to generate monthly |
| 17 | A. I see that. This is by no means the plan we | 17 | surpluses as soon as it goes live? You can see that |
| 18 | implemented, however, because this would have been | 18 | beneath the second bullet point, the third line down. |
| 19 | targeted at a much more limited market, so we would have | 19 | A. Mmm. (The witness nodded). |
| 20 | been going -- under this plan we would have been | 20 | Q. Do you see that, the third line down: |
| 21 | charging, as it says on 293, an average listing fee of | 21 | "This is to ensure there is a solid core franchise |
| 22 | $£ 400$ per month. What we actually have with the model | 22 | ..." |
| 23 | that we have adopted is 244 , and the funding model was | 23 | A. Sorry, you have lost me slightly here. |
| 24 | different and so really this would have been much more | 24 | Q. The second bullet point. |
| 25 | of a niche, upmarket sort of website, which is something | 25 | A. Yes, pre-launch monthly subscriptions? |
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| 1 | that we moved away from, particularly post the approval | 1 | Q. Yes, beneath that there is a paragraph beginning: |
| 2 | of the merger which came I think later. | 2 | "The firms comprising ..." |
| 3 | Q. I see. So you considered another alternative entry, did | 3 | So the points, Mr Springett, are these. This was |
| 4 | you, of a niche and upmarket website that only required | 4 | a plan based upon generating a certain amount of |
| 5 | 500 per launch and would start to break even after | 5 | pre-launch finance in the amounts that I have shown you? |
| 6 | a year and a bit of trading; is that right? | 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | A. Well, that was what was under consideration at this | 7 | Q. And with 1,000 offices at launch date, right? |
| 8 | point. A lot of things were moving at this stage. The | 8 | A. That's right. |
| 9 | market had consolidated pretty rapidly and so we were | 9 | Q. And the idea was that, generating that amount from those |
| 10 | kind of changing to keep up in a way. | 10 | thousand offices, the business would generate monthly |
| 11 | Q. Mr Springett, I suggest to you that the -- if we now | 11 | surpluses as soon as it goes live, correct? |
| 12 | look at the business plan which is to be found in | 12 | A. Yes, that's right. |
| 13 | bundle $2 / 657$. If you want to see the first page it is | 13 | Q. And indeed that it would build up healthy cash balances |
| 14 | at 644. | 14 | on that plan, correct? |
| 15 | A. Okay. | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | Q. I am turning now into some of the annexes at the back of | 16 | Q. And if you want to see those they are over two more |
| 17 | the business plan, so if you keep going until you get to | 17 | pages at 661. So you can see in the table, again |
| 18 | page 657. | 18 | I don't need to particularly read out any figures, but |
| 19 | A. "Market entry strategy"? | 19 | again you can see that the plan has evolved by this |
| 20 | Q. Yes, that's right. It is possible that this is | 20 | stage, hasn't it? So this is 1,000 offices on entry, |
| 21 | a separate document but it comes at the same time as the | 21 | 500 per annum, yes -- |
| 22 | business plan. If you want to see the front page it is | 22 | A. Mmm. |
| 23 | 645. It is entitled "Executive summary". | 23 | Q. -- additional branches and you can see that there is |
| 24 | A. Yes, this looks like the business plan that was approved | 24 | a minor loss, a relatively small loss after just the |
| 25 | and from which all of the other documents now flow. | 25 | first year of trading, so that's year 2, isn't it? |
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|  | plan as identified in these documents was to build up | 1 | But the thrust of that was altogether about being in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | these healthy cash balances whilst OTM builds up into | 2 | a position to spend more on marketing and that's pretty |
| 3 | the true alternative they need, and indeed to put | 3 | much what we've done. |
| 4 | together a substantial war chest that you could use to | 4 | So this hasn't been driven to generate cash |
| 5 | take on Rightmove; that is right, is it not, within the | 5 | surpluses. What it -- when I have referred to "war |
| 6 | five years? | 6 | chest", I don't remember this email particularly, but |
| 7 | A. What would you be describing as a substantial war chest? | 7 | I would have been thinking about the amount we would |
| 8 | Q. These are your words, Mr Springett. If we turn in | 8 | have available to run the business in a way that would |
| 9 | bundle 3 to 1429, this is an email that you wrote | 9 | challenge the incumbents. |
| 10 | in August 2013 to somebody enquiring about the would-be | 10 | Q. Thank you, but the fact is, Mr Springett, isn't it, that |
| 11 | business? | 11 | your restrictions, including the OOP, remain in place |
| 12 | A. Yes. | 12 | for the whole of the five-year trading period but you |
| 13 | Q. A Mr Henderson at Acorn Properties. In the second | 13 | were expressly aiming to be the number 2 player as |
| 14 | paragraph down, second substantive paragraph down, you | 14 | quickly as possible and preferably within the first two |
| 15 | say: | 15 | to three years of trading, weren't you? |
| 16 | "The one thousand office figure is a threshold | 16 | A. And I think I took some time on Friday to explain our |
| 17 | rather than a target. We are hoping that more agents | 17 | view and that of our advisers and our board around that, |
| 18 | will sign up. At that level we would represent | 18 | which is that that's something that we -- in relation to |
| 19 | a formidable portal force preparing to enter the market | 19 | the commercial and the legal imperatives we keep under |
| 20 | as we would have a very substantial war chest and an | 20 | review, so, you know, I -- |
| 21 | extremely strong committed income from the outset." | 21 | Q. So I think the answer is "yes" then? |
| 22 | So that is what you were hoping to achieve, wasn't | 22 | A. Well, we kicked off with a five-year view if that's what |
| 23 | it: healthy cash balances which gave rise to a very | 23 | you want to -- |
| 24 | substantial war chest well within the five-year trading | 24 | Q. But my point, Mr Springett, is it was expressly the view |
| 25 | period? That's right, isn't it? | 25 | of you and the board that notwithstanding that your |
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| 1 | A. Where is the "well within the five-year trading period"? | 1 | restrictions are in place for five years you wanted to |
| 2 | Q. You can see that from your table, Mr Springett, on | 2 | be the number 2 player as quickly as possible and within |
| 3 | document 2 at page 661. | 3 | two to three years, correct? |
| 4 | A. Again it might help the Tribunal if I explain the | 4 | A. Well, I don't think at the point we set out we remotely |
| 5 | principle on which this was put together. What I was | 5 | had that ambition. I think our view changed at the end |
| 6 | asked to do by the steering committee was create | 6 | of 2013 when we realised that instead of getting to the |
| 7 | a portal platform at the minimum cost really. They | 7 | threshold of 1,000 branches, we'd got to 1,800 and so we |
| 8 | asked me to put something together which would allow an | 8 | recalibrated the plan early 2014 to a much more |
| 9 | entry to the market to be made, a credible entry for the | 9 | ambitious scale. |
| 10 | lowest possible cost, consistent with it being scalable, | 10 | Q. Absolutely, Mr Springett, and that is when you |
| 11 | and what we were trying to do was have a business plan | 11 | presumably reduced the duration of the OOP rule; is that |
| 12 | which said: if this number of people buy into it then we | 12 | right? |
| 13 | can get it there and have it available. And having got | 13 | A. No. |
| 14 | it there and having the scope then to present the | 14 | Q. No, you didn't, did you? |
| 15 | proposition, we hoped that others would come on board; | 15 | A. Because a plan is just a plan, isn't it? We need to |
| 16 | there would be a snowball effect, other agents would see | 16 | respond to actual circumstances. |
| 17 | it was a good idea and support it and it would continue | 17 | Q. Thank you. |
| 18 | to grow. | 18 | A. We see what happens and we determine whether we have |
| 19 | So the business plan that was structured and | 19 | a commercial reason to change or a legal imperative to |
| 20 | crystallised in March 2013 was a base plan to allow that | 20 | change. |
| 21 | to happen and even within the information memorandum at | 21 | Q. If anyone wants it, the reference to where you say that |
| 22 | the time I built in scenarios which said: if actually we | 22 | "The company strategy is to get Agents' Mutual to be the |
| 23 | recruit more people by the time of launch and if our | 23 | number 2 player as quickly as possible within the first |
| 24 | recruitment thereafter is at I think a thousand offices | 24 | two to three years and then we will work to become equal |
| 25 | per month, then that would change how the thing looked. | 25 | to Rightmove" is bundle 9/5035 in the board meeting |
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| 1 | notes of 10 February 2014. | 1 | subheading "Member recruitment", as I understood it you |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. That's consistent entirely with what I've just said. | 2 | say: |
| 3 | Q. Yes, it is, thank you, Mr Springett. | 3 | "This means we are over 60 per cent of our way to |
| 4 | I think I am right in saying that your own case was | 4 | our next major milestone with the achievement of 4,000 |
| 5 | that your venture really became completely unstoppable | 5 | supporting agent offices, a point at which the venture |
| 6 | when you had signed up only 4,000 agent branches, right? | 6 | really does become unstoppable." |
| 7 | A. Again, I suspect you're paraphrasing, aren't you? | 7 | Correct? |
| 8 | Q. Well, I mean, is that your view or not? | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | A. No, it isn't. | 9 | Q. But in fact you had 4,600 agent branches on launch date, |
| 10 | Q. It isn't your view. | 10 | didn't you, a little over that? |
| 11 | A. The $\mathbf{4 , 0 0 0}$ level, if it is the $\mathbf{4 , 0 0 0}$ you are referring | 11 | A. Well, I think you are interpreting "unstoppable" in one |
| 12 | to, was the point at which we felt we -- it was almost | 12 | way and the way I interpret it is in the way I described |
| 13 | like a point of no return for us, that if we could get | 13 | earlier, that it becomes -- we are past the point of no |
| 14 | to that level of support, and bear in mind 4,000 offices | 14 | return, we commit to the launch. I think up until the |
| 15 | was a combination of those contracted and those offices | 15 | point where we had reached 4,000 supporting agents as |
| 16 | which were covered by a letter of intent to contract, we | 16 | a total we weren't completely sure that we would |
| 17 | felt once we'd reached that level then we could confirm | 17 | necessarily launch. |
| 18 | that the project actually was going to launch, which we | 18 | Q. In fact, having got far, far more agent branches than |
| 19 | hadn't done until that point in time. I mean, we didn't | 19 | you had anticipated and far more than the thousand that |
| 20 | have a brand name even until July 2014. I don't think | 20 | in your original base case plan you said would allow you |
| 21 | we told anybody about it until August. We reached the | 21 | to achieve sustainable entry, what you do with the extra |
| 22 | 4,000 level of total support in, I believe it | 22 | money that's generated is devote it almost entirely to |
| 23 | was October and announced it, and some time after that | 23 | marketing, don't you? |
| 24 | we began approaching agents who had given letters of | 24 | A. Not -- some of it went into staffing large organisation |
| 25 | intent to say: will you now sign a contract? | 25 | but I agree that we wanted to have the maximum impact |
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| 1 | Now, all of that in parallel with developing the | 1 | with marketing. |
| 2 | portal, planning for the launch marketing which had to | 2 | Q. That is right, because to use your words from a moment |
| 3 | be paid for a couple of months in advance, so there was | 3 | ago, and here I do paraphrase but they are on the |
| 4 | a sort of a point in time where we had to say: yes, this | 4 | transcript, you wanted to grow more swiftly. That is |
| 5 | is a definite go and we are going to implement it and | 5 | right, isn't it? |
| 6 | implement it in the timetable that we committed to, | 6 | A. I think there was -- we saw an opportunity to grow more |
| 7 | which was January 2015. | 7 | rapidly, certainly. |
| 8 | Q. Thank you. And I think you said that I was paraphrasing | 8 | Q. Yes, thank you. Members of the Tribunal and |
| 9 | and you didn't agree with me but as I understand it, | 9 | Mr Springett, again I won't read them out but I think |
| 10 | those were your words if you turn to bundle 5 at 2897 -- | 10 | you still have bundle 10/5639 and 5640 open and we can |
| 11 | A. I'm not sure I said I didn't agree with you, did I? | 11 | see what that progression in marketing spend in fact was |
| 12 | I said I thought you were paraphrasing. | 12 | when you got far more offices than you had originally |
| 13 | Q. Bundle $5 / 2897$, please, a document we haven't been to | 13 | planned for, correct? |
| 14 | before. | 14 | A. Sorry, do you have the page number? H1? |
| 15 | A. May I get rid of some of these bundles? | 15 | Q. No, H10. |
| 16 | Q. Yes, if you could perhaps just keep number 10 around. | 16 | A. Sorry, what was the page number, please? |
| 17 | A. I will. | 17 | Q. It was 5639. |
| 18 | Q. But by all means discard some of the others, thank you. | 18 | A. Thank you. Yes, we did spend just about 12 million in |
| 19 | This is an email that I understand you to have | 19 | the first years. |
| 20 | written to either people who had signed contracts or | 20 | Q. I don't know, is that not confidential? |
| 21 | perhaps LOIs. So it is written to you from you, and was | 21 | A. I'm happy for it to be ... |
| 22 | it sent out to -- | 22 | Q. Thank you. So instead of the original plan, which would |
| 23 | A. I am just trying to work out who this would have gone | 23 | have planned to use sustainable entry, and I am quoting |
| 24 | to. It certainly would have gone to members, I think. | 24 | from your Project Z document, which was 1,000 offices |
| 25 | Q. What you said under the second hole punch under the | 25 | allowing you to spend -- are none of those figures |
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| 1 | confidential? | 1 | Q. So am I right in saying then that just like when you |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. I think it's fine. | 2 | originally thought it might be three years you didn't |
| 3 | Q. So it was 3.27 but in fact you launched with 4,600 and | 3 | employ external analysts or consultants or economists, |
| 4 | you spent 12 million? | 4 | you didn't do that when it moved from three years to |
| 5 | A. Yes. | 5 | five years, did you? |
| 6 | Q. That's right, isn't it? And on my suggestion to you | 6 | A. That was my assessment. I had been engaged as |
| 7 | that's meant that you have already become unstoppable, | 7 | a consultant in the first place having had something to |
| 8 | but instead of dialling back on any of the restrictions | 8 | do with the industry over the years. |
| 9 | in your contract, for example reducing the duration of | 9 | Q. So there is no document, is there, that says, for |
| 10 | the OOP rule, you just spend all of the money you | 10 | instance, "Well, if we sign up 1,000 agents at launch we |
| 11 | generate, or nearly all of it, on marketing, don't you? | 11 | will need five years but if we sign up 2,000 agents at |
| 12 | A. Completely, absolutely, and where we've ended up | 12 | launch we will only need four years but if we sign up |
| 13 | relative to the other two portals indicates that we are | 13 | 3,000 agents at launch we will only need three years" |
| 14 | going to have to keep doing that. | 14 | and setting out the financials and the economics for any |
| 15 | MR HARRIS: Thank you. | 15 | of those? There is no such document, is there? |
| 16 | Sir, that may be a convenient moment. I am on track | 16 | A. No, there is no such document but equally that would be |
| 17 | to finish as mandated at 12.30 and it may be | 17 | a very simplistic way of going about it because |
| 18 | a convenient moment to have five minutes. | 18 | competitor response would form part of the assessment, |
| 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Harris. Just to let those | 19 | for example, and -- |
| 20 | behind you know, I hope we have emailed out for the | 20 | Q. You say that, Mr Springett, but in your original |
| 21 | experts, Mr Parker and Mr Bishop, to look at | 21 | business plan based upon the 1,000 offices plus 500 per |
| 22 | a spreadsheet which draws together the materials very | 22 | year my understanding is that your plan was that that |
| 23 | helpfully provided by them to us in a single place. So | 23 | would be successful irrespective of competitor action; |
| 24 | I hope they have that. We probably won't come to that | 24 | isn't that right? |
| 25 | today but we may come to it tomorrow morning in the hot | 25 | A. Well, that's relative to -- am I right in thinking that |
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| 1 | tubbing. Five minutes. | 1 | is a fully exclusive situation? |
| 2 | MR HARRIS: Thank you. | 2 | Q. No, by this stage you had moved the OOP rule into its |
| 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. | 3 | current guise. Would you like to see where you did say |
| 4 | (11.30 AM) | 4 | that? |
| 5 | (A short break) | 5 | A. Yes, please. |
| 6 | (11.35 AM) | 6 | Q. It is in bundle 2/664. We looked at part of this. This |
| 7 | MR HARRIS: Mr Springett, we are nearing the end of this | 7 | is part of the 2013 business plan that was signed off by |
| 8 | journey you will be very pleased to hear. So we looked | 8 | the board. If you see in the top left-hand box at page |
| 9 | earlier, didn't we, about how in an earlier iteration of | 9 | 664 we are in the 1,000 office scenario? |
| 10 | the OOP rule the duration was limited to three years, | 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | and we know of course that in its final form it had | 11 | Q. And then you see five entries down there is risk |
| 12 | increased in duration to five years, yes? | 12 | mitigation. The risk is said to be: |
| 13 | A. That's right. | 13 | "The company's market entry may be disrupted or its |
| 14 | Q. Can you show me the data or analysis that led you to | 14 | impact reduced by competitor action." |
| 15 | form the view with the board members that in fact five | 15 | You said that you wrote this and in the "Mitigation" |
| 16 | years was necessary, not three years? | 16 | column it says: |
| 17 | A. That was really our view based on the business plan and | 17 | "The directors believe that the market entry |
| 18 | the fact that it would take us that length of time to | 18 | strategy set out in the plan will be effective |
| 19 | develop into a situation where we were sufficiently | 19 | irrespective of competitor action." |
| 20 | strong to stand on our own two feet. We also formed | 20 | A. Yes, I think -- what's the date of this document? |
| 21 | that view under legal advice as to what would be | 21 | Q. I think this is the business plan March 2013, the one |
| 22 | appropriate, our legal team reviewed the business plan | 22 | you said got signed off by the board. The front page is |
| 23 | and that was the conclusion that was reached. | 23 | on 664. |
| 24 | I won't pretend that I wasn't keen to have it for as | 24 | A. Well, I suppose to the extent that if we get the first |
| 25 | long as I could have it. | 25 | 1,000 offices then we would be able to make the portal |
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| 1 | live in the market, I guess is what $I^{\prime} \mathrm{m}$ saying. | 1 | analysis or frankly even your list of all the offices |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Mr Springett, I suggest to you that you could have | 2 | that would have signed up to Agents' Mutual without the |
| 3 | launched Agents' Mutual on to the market by signing up | 3 | OOP rule in place? |
| 4 | a core group of agents who supported Agents' Mutual, | 4 | A. That's a judgment we made and even if they had, even if |
| 5 | perhaps because it was a mutual and/or because it was | 5 | we had had thousands and thousands of offices, if we'd |
| 6 | paying healthy interest payments but who did not want to | 6 | just had a subset of the same stock that was on Zoopla |
| 7 | be bound by the OOP rule. That is right, isn't it? You | 7 | and Rightmove we would not have got traction with the |
| 8 | could have launched by signing up those people? | 8 | public. |
| 9 | A. Sorry, those people who didn't want to be bound by the | 9 | Q. So it is a judgment you made but you don't crunch the |
| 10 | OOP rule? | 10 | numbers or analyse them or set them out in any form at |
| 11 | Q. That's right, but nevertheless were attracted to | 11 | this time, do you? |
| 12 | Agents' Mutual. | 12 | A. Well, because our view, our consideration, was as |
| 13 | A. Well, we didn't think that that would get any traction | 13 | I referred earlier this morning: could we attract |
| 14 | with audiences. | 14 | property seekers to the portal if all we had was |
| 15 | Q. That is because you didn't investigate it with the big | 15 | a subset of what both of the existing portals had? And |
| 16 | three, Countrywide, Connells or LSL, did you? | 16 | we didn't think we could. |
| 17 | A. Well, our view at the time that we came into the market, | 17 | So to some degree, you know, having Countrywide and |
| 18 | which is now April/May 2013, at least in terms of | 18 | LSL and Connells on board in those circumstances we |
| 19 | exposing the proposition, was that their interests were | 19 | still didn't believe would do the job, and that's clear |
| 20 | not aligned with what we were trying to do. In fact, | 20 | actually from my notes of the four-way meeting |
| 21 | they were the opposite. They had every reason to want | 21 | in January 16. |
| 22 | the status quo to continue. | 22 | Q. So the answer to the question is: "No, we didn't set out |
| 23 | Q. But you didn't investigate it with them at the time, did | 23 | in spreadsheets or a list of numbers of all of the other |
| 24 | you? | 24 | offices that would have been prepared to sign without |
| 25 | A. We didn't discuss it with them at the time and had they | 25 | the OOP rule," but then you go on to give a reason why. |
|  | Page 66 |  | Page 68 |
| 1 | shown any interest they could have contacted us, of | 1 | That is right, isn't it? |
| 2 | course. | 2 | A. That's what I just said. |
| 3 | Q. Right. | 3 | Q. Yes, thank you. In fact, I suggest to you that you |
| 4 | A. They were aware of it. | 4 | performed simply no analysis of how many agent branches |
| 5 | Q. And you didn't investigate it with Hunters, Miss Frew's | 5 | there would have been out there who would have been |
| 6 | organisation, did you? | 6 | prepared to sign up without the OOP rule, did you? |
| 7 | A. Yes, we did. We talked to --I had a meeting with the | 7 | A. No. |
| 8 | then managing director of Hunters in May 2013 I believe. | 8 | Q. I suggest to you in addition that it's not necessary to |
| 9 | Q. It is right, is it not, that the big three estate agents | 9 | restrict agents to list with only two portals. There |
| 10 | would have given you over 2,200 agent branches, wouldn't | 10 | are lots of examples, aren't there, of multi-listing on |
| 11 | they, if they had signed up? | 11 | more than two portals, correct? |
| 12 | A. I think at that time. | 12 | A. I'm not aware of many, certainly not since the merger. |
| 13 | Q. And that was well over your base case plan for launching | 13 | Q. Well, Mr Symons, even he said, he's one of your |
| 14 | with 1,000 offices, wasn't it? | 14 | witnesses, he said that at times his organisation signed |
| 15 | A. That is true but I had not the slightest hope that they | 15 | up for listing on more than two portals, didn't he? |
| 16 | would do that and sign up for one other portal. | 16 | A. He did say that. |
| 17 | Q. And you didn't investigate with my own client, Gascoigne | 17 | Q. And another one of your witnesses, Mr Wyatt, he also |
| 18 | Halman, did you, whether they would have signed up even | 18 | said the same, didn't he? |
| 19 | without the OOP rule? | 19 | A. He did. |
| 20 | A. That's true. | 20 | Q. All of the big three said that, didn't they, in the |
| 21 | Q. And it wasn't challenged that Mr Forrest says in his | 21 | meeting, they would be prepared to sign up with you |
| 22 | paragraph 48 that Gascoigne Halman would have become | 22 | without the OOP rule even though they wanted to retain |
| 23 | a member of AM even without the OOP rule in place? | 23 | Rightmove and Zoopla, yes? |
| 24 | A. Well, that's his view. | 24 | A. They said that. |
| 25 | Q. Can you show me the document, your spreadsheet or your | 25 | Q. Hunters, Miss Frew, said the same thing, didn't she? |
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| 1 | A. She did. | 1 | there. I travelled far and wide, as you noted, round |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Mr James in his witness statement, he wasn't challenged | 2 | the country, exposing the proposition and that was to |
| 3 | when he said he would have been prepared to sign up with | 3 | some extent our market research phase. |
| 4 | more than two? That's right, isn't it? | 4 | Q. Exactly. And that is as far as it went. Can you show |
| 5 | A. One of the things that Mr Symons said, though, I think | 5 | me the list of agents who said to you during any one of |
| 6 | it's fair to bring in, and Mr Wyatt indeed as well, is | 6 | these presentations or what you distilled at the end of |
| 7 | that they didn't focus on those portals and many of them | 7 | them, who said "I can afford, I'm prepared to pay; |
| 8 | disappeared. They didn't have to leave them. They were | 8 | I can't afford, I'm not prepared to pay"? Where is that |
| 9 | just no longer there. | 9 | list? |
| 10 | Q. That is right, but he said he would be prepared to sign | 10 | A. That discussion took place earlier in 2011 when |
| 11 | up to more than two, didn't he, Mr James, in the right | 11 | I actually was paid to do some work, which was meetings |
| 12 | circumstances? | 12 | with I think 15 to 20 agents to gauge their view on what |
| 13 | A. I don't remember what Mr James said. | 13 | was going on in the market. |
| 14 | Q. Well, gentlemen, members of the Tribunal, it is the | 14 | Q. I see. So your view on who could afford to pay on more |
| 15 | final paragraph of Mr James' statement and it wasn't | 15 | than two was based on taking soundings from 15 or 20 |
| 16 | challenged. | 16 | agents, was it? |
| 17 | Even some of your own founder members are | 17 | A. That was the initial grouping, yes. |
| 18 | historically big multi-listers, aren't they? | 18 | Q. That was what it was based on? I just want to be |
| 19 | A. Circumstances change over time but I think I've made | 19 | completely clear about this. |
| 20 | very clear that my view is that the only two post-merger | 20 | A. What's "this"? |
| 21 | that have mattered to anyone and made any material | 21 | Q. When you say that agents couldn't afford to pay -- |
| 22 | difference to competition are Rightmove and Zoopla. | 22 | A. Yes, my initial view was based on those and then as we |
| 23 | Q. The fact is, Mr Springett, that even your own founder | 23 | expanded and presented the proposition I gathered more |
| 24 | members, some of the important ones, historically have | 24 | input on that. |
| 25 | been big multi-listers, haven't they? | 25 | Q. That is right, and you never created a list, did you, |
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| 1 | A. I think historically is right. | 1 | of: this agent, this agent, this agent and this agent, |
| 2 | Q. Let me show you a document to make that point good. It | 2 | they say they can't afford; this agent, this agent and |
| 3 | is bundle $1 / 105$. I appreciate this is not your document | 3 | this agent they say they can afford? You didn't do that |
| 4 | and I also appreciate it is 2011 but it seems to be, | 4 | ever? |
| 5 | doesn't it, internal communications within Savills about | 5 | A. I didn't remotely think it was a practical thing to do. |
| 6 | the number of different portals that they are on at that | 6 | Q. And in fact you still have absolutely no data that you |
| 7 | date in time? | 7 | are able to present to this Tribunal, have you, as to |
| 8 | A. Yes. | 8 | how many agents can afford to pay on more than two |
| 9 | Q. By my reckoning, even if you count all of the DPG ones | 9 | portals and who can't afford to pay on more than two |
| 10 | as one, that's five different portals that they are on | 10 | portals, have you? |
| 11 | at this time? | 11 | A. No. |
| 12 | A. That's true, but obviously since that time there has | 12 | Q. It is right, isn't it, that Zoopla launched without any |
| 13 | been further consolidation so that Zoopla and DPG have | 13 | form of exclusivity rule? That is right? |
| 14 | subsequently merged which reduces it again by one. | 14 | A. I believe so. |
| 15 | Q. In your witness statement, Mr Springett, you say that | 15 | Q. And they did so in the face of a dominant Rightmove, |
| 16 | another reason for the OOP rule is that you had been | 16 | yes? |
| 17 | informed by agents that some couldn't afford to pay for | 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | more than two portals, yes? | 18 | Q. So why don't you mention that in your witness statement |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | when you are going through the other people who have |
| 20 | Q. That is right, but you didn't perform any analysis | 20 | entered and how they've entered? |
| 21 | whatsoever, did you, about how many agents there are out | 21 | A. I don't know. I didn't include it. I'm not sure it was |
| 22 | there who could afford and who could not afford to pay | 22 | relevant. |
| 23 | for more than two, right? | 23 | Q. I suggest to you another less restrictive way of |
| 24 | A. What we -- effectively what we took during 2013 was | 24 | entering the market would have been to sign up some core |
| 25 | a survey, if you like. We put the proposition out | 25 | anchor tenants. |
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| 1 | A. But before we leave Zoopla, actually, let's be realistic | 1 | Q. That is right, but they would have been -- they were in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | about this. They entered the market, they ran for | 2 | favour of three strong portals competing and they could |
| 3 | a year, they got almost nowhere in terms of traffic and | 3 | have provided you with easily enough anchor tenants to |
| 4 | then they embarked on a private equity backed | 4 | get the venture up and off the ground, couldn't they? |
| 5 | consolidation of the market through acquisition. | 5 | A. I don't accept that. In fact, I say in my note of the |
| 6 | Q. When did they introduce their exclusivity requirement? | 6 | meeting that even with them on board, without the One |
| 7 | A. They didn't do that. | 7 | Other Portal rule we would remain a distant third in the |
| 8 | Q. No, they didn't, did they? | 8 | market. |
| 9 | A. But by the time they had completed that, and let's take | 9 | Q. But the truth is, Mr Springett, you personally had set |
| 10 | 2011 as an example, they had round about 10,000 paying | 10 | ideas, didn't you, about what the big three would and |
| 11 | customers of which around 8,000 were estate agent | 11 | wouldn't do right from the beginning? |
| 12 | branches and it was at that point that they were saying | 12 | A. We discussed it. We made an assessment. I think what's |
| 13 | that there was a risk that they might have to exit the | 13 | happened subsequently is an illustration that we were |
| 14 | market unless the merger was allowed. | 14 | right. |
| 15 | Q. I suggest to you, Mr Springett, that another less | 15 | Q. You made an assessment based upon your preconceptions |
| 16 | restrictive alternative would have been for you to enter | 16 | and without investigating it, didn't you? |
| 17 | the market by signing up a group of anchor tenants; that | 17 | A. No. |
| 18 | is right, isn't it? | 18 | Q. Perhaps I could just draw your attention then to |
| 19 | A. All our members are anchor tenants. | 19 | bundle $1 / 191$. We looked at this before. |
| 20 | Q. You could have signed up a group of anchor tenants to | 20 | A. This is 2011 now. |
| 21 | get you over the 1,000 agent branches model that you in | 21 | Q. That's right, 2011. We have seen this before but now |
| 22 | your business plan describe as allowing you to achieve | 22 | I am on the first page of the document, so |
| 23 | sustainable entry, couldn't you? | 23 | Mr Michael Hodgson's comments. Do you see there is |
| 24 | A. I don't know what you mean by that because that's what | 24 | a square icon, the first square icon on the page: |
| 25 | we did to get the venture off the ground. | 25 | "Are we sure that all three main groups, LSL, |
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| 1 | Q. You could have signed up a group of 1,000 people who | Connells and Countrywide, are all committed in some way |  |
| 2 | would have been prepared to sign but without the OOP | 2 | to Rightmove or DPG/Zoopla?" |
| 3 | rule and make them your anchor tenants? | 3 | That is his question, and your response is: |
| 4 | A. No, actually I don't think that's true. You heard | 4 | "I have no reliable information on this, either in |
| 5 | Mr Symons say that they had seen lots of these purported | 5 | relation to Zoopla now or post-merger. We should |
| 6 | market entrants come and go and what attracted him to | 6 | discuss whether to ask and who should ask". |
| 7 | this proposition was precisely the One Other Portal rule | 7 | But you didn't, did you? |
| 8 | because he felt it gave the proposition a chance. | 8 | A. Well, because events were -- our information base |
| 9 | Q. We saw in the note of the four-party meeting, didn't we, | 9 | improved, shall we say, because we became aware that |
| 10 | Mr Springett, that both Miss Platt on behalf of | 10 | a strategic partnership had been formed between those |
| 11 | Countrywide and Mr Livesey on behalf of Connells, were | 11 | three corporates and Zoopla and we were also aware that |
| 12 | actively in favour of a market in which there would be | 12 | they had long-term contracts with Rightmove in place. |
| 13 | three strong portals competing; that is right, isn't it? | 13 | Q. You never approached a single one of these people -- |
| 14 | A. I think they were in favour of us dropping our One Other | 14 | A. It was published information. |
| 15 | Portal rule. | 15 | Q. Mr Springett, you never approached a single one of those |
| 16 | Q. Well, Mr Livesey -- they are your notes of the meeting, | 16 | big three which Mr Hodgson is suggesting, "Are we sure |
| 17 | aren't they? | 17 | they're committed?" You never approached a single one |
| 18 | A. Yes. | 18 | of them prior to September 2015, eight months after |
| 19 | Q. And they do say, and I quote, as regards Mr Livesey, his | 19 | launch, did you? |
| 20 | favoured position "would be three strong portals | 20 | A. Because there was published information as early as 2011 |
| 21 | competing". So that is what he said, isn't it? | 21 | to say where they were committed. |
| 22 | A. That is what they both said. | 22 | Q. So the answer is: "Yes, we didn't approach them"? |
| 23 | Q. That's right. | 23 | A. Yes, we didn't approach them directly, no. |
| 24 | A. But I think their motive was to draw us towards | 24 | Q. Another less restrictive alternative that could have got |
| 25 | releasing our One Other Portal rule. | 25 | you into the market is you could have had just some |
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| 1 | founder members giving you exclusivity, couldn't you, | 1 | a preferred status? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | rather than every member giving you a form of | 2 | A. Yes, in return for the large chunk of money that the |
| 3 | exclusivity, yes? | 3 | selling shareholders received. |
| 4 | A. I saw that in Mr Livesey's witness statement. So what | 4 | Q. I suggest to you you could have signed up all the agents |
| 5 | he's suggesting there is that our 240 branches of our | 5 | in areas where Zoopla was already weak or of little |
| 6 | six founder members should commit themselves to use only | 6 | presence and then you wouldn't have needed the OOP rule |
| 7 | one other portal and everybody else be allowed not to do | 7 | at all, would you? |
| 8 | that. | 8 | A. I'm not sure that would again address the requirement to |
| 9 | Q. You -- | 9 | attract property seekers. |
| 10 | A. That is the suggestion, right? | 10 | Q. Mr Forrest explains, doesn't he, very clearly, and none |
| 11 | Q. You have some major listed companies, haven't you, as | 11 | of this was challenged, that in his area it was frankly |
| 12 | founder members? | 12 | no big deal to drop Zoopla because he didn't think it |
| 13 | A. We have one listed company I think. | 13 | was very good and therefore his organisation would have |
| 14 | Q. Some of them have got tens of millions of turnover, yes? | 14 | signed up completely irrespective of the OOP rule. That |
| 15 | A. Globally, not necessarily in their residential UK | 15 | is right, isn't it? |
| 16 | business. | 16 | A. That is why the local market --. |
| 17 | Q. So yes is the answer; is that right? | 17 | Q. So you could have gone round by way of entry to find all |
| 18 | A. Well, the question was: have we got public limited | 18 | those other local markets where Zoopla was weak or of |
| 19 | companies, and we have one. | 19 | little presence and you wouldn't have needed the OOP |
| 20 | Q. You have founder members who have, some of them have | 20 | rule at all would you? |
| 21 | tens of millions of pounds of turnover, don't they? | 21 | A. No, because it still doesn't address how to attract the |
| 22 | A. Savills is a big company, Knight Frank is a global | 22 | consumer audience with a differentiated property stock. |
| 23 | enterprise, yes. | 23 | Q. I will come on to the uniqueness in a moment. That's |
| 24 | Q. That is right. Sorry, may I just check something, | 24 | what you are talking about? |
| 25 | Mr Springett. (Pause) | 25 | A. Yes, it is. |
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| 1 | But it is right, isn't it, that Rightmove entered | 1 | Q. I will come on to that in a minute. Where did you |
| 2 | the market, didn't it, by just obtaining a degree of | 2 | analyse these other options that I have been putting to |
| 3 | exclusivity from its founder members and not from its | 3 | you about preferred spending or signing up in areas |
| 4 | other members, yes? | 4 | where Zoopla was weaker or of little presence or founder |
| 5 | A. Well, let's remember that they entered in 2,000 and | 5 | member exclusivity? Where are the documents that |
| 6 | let's remember also that their founder members had 2,000 | 6 | analyse those at the time you are putting together these |
| 7 | branches between them. | 7 | business plans? |
| 8 | Q. So the answer is again yes, isn't it? | 8 | A. There don't need to be documents for those things. |
| 9 | A. Yes. | 9 | A lot of this was discussed within the steering |
| 10 | Q. Thank you. I suggest to you you also could have entered | 10 | committee and then with the benefit of the various |
| 11 | in a less restrictive manner by having an obligation to | 11 | inputs that we had from the work I had done, our |
| 12 | prefer the OTM portal, such that, for instance, they | 12 | knowledge of the market, our observation of what was |
| 13 | spend -- the members spend as much on OTM as they spend | 13 | going on, published reports, OFT being an example of one |
| 14 | with other portals, yes? | 14 | of those, and so there were lots of inputs to that idea. |
| 15 | A. That wouldn't have addressed the point about the | 15 | Q. I suggest to you there is another one, Mr Springett, |
| 16 | requirement to attract the consumer, or let's get away | 16 | there is a long list of these that I have already been |
| 17 | from that, property seeker side of the network. | 17 | through, but another one is that you could have entered |
| 18 | Q. Primelocation had such a preferred status for its | 18 | the market by what Mr Livesey referred to as |
| 19 | members, didn't it, at a later stage in its existence? | 19 | "penetration pricing", yes? |
| 20 | A. That was one of the terms of the sale and purchase | 20 | A. Well, I understand what he means by that. I don't see |
| 21 | agreement. | 21 | how that -- where the money would have come from to |
| 22 | Q. I suggest to you -- | 22 | allow us to run the business and market it by entering |
| 23 | A. It was in the context of the sale to The Daily Mail | 23 | with penetration pricing. |
| 24 | Group. | 24 | Q. Primelocation entered with penetration pricing, didn't |
| 25 | Q. But factually it is right, isn't it, they had | 25 | it? |
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| 1 | A. By accident, yes. | 1 | shows any of those things? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. And indeed the penetration pricing was just for a matter | 2 | A. It really wouldn't have done the job because our perspective was, and it was borne out in practice when we came to talk to a wide range of agents, is what they |
| 3 | of months, wasn't it? It is almost the definition of | 3 |  |
| 4 | penetration pricing, correct? | 4 |  |
| 5 | A. I think there has been some rewriting of history gone | 5 | did not want was to replicate eventually what was |
| 6 | on, not just for Primelocation but particularly for | 6 | already in the market whereby the profit motive of |
| 7 | Rightmove because I think both of those portals entered | 7 | shareholders was the thing that drove these businesses, |
| 8 | the market with a business model that turned out not to | 8 | and the results are there for everybody to see. They |
| 9 | be a business model that would work and, therefore, at | 9 | wanted a portal which was capable of becoming a market |
| 10 | the appropriate time had to go to their shareholders and | 10 | leader but did so at a price to them which bore some |
| 11 | say, "Would you be prepared to pay-to-list?" So the | 11 | relationship to the costs of running these things. |
| 12 | idea that that was a carefully crafted strategy from the | 12 | Q. But I am right in saying, aren't I, Mr Springett, that |
| 13 | outset is not true. | 13 | you have now, much much later than launch started to |
| 14 | Q. But the effect, whether deliberate or otherwise, was | 14 | offer to would be new members or indeed non-members very |
| 15 | that Primelocation entered with penetration pricing by | 15 | low rates and short term deals, haven't you? |
| 16 | which I mean low or zero rates for the initial months. | 16 | A. We absolutely have done that, yes. We have had to do |
| 17 | That is right, isn't it? | 17 | that because of the kind of pricing approach that Zoopla |
| 18 | A. Okay, if that's how you want to characterise it but | 18 | has adopted. |
| 19 | again that was the year 2001. | 19 | Q. Mr Springett, just on this particular topic, can I draw |
| 20 | Q. So the answer is yes, but that was in 2001; is that | 20 | your attention to a document in bundle 13. It is to be |
| 21 | correct? | 21 | found in some board minutes, the first page of which is |
| 22 | A. I am saying it wouldn't have been a viable strategy now. | 22 | at 7437. If you want to see the first page it is 7437. |
| 23 | Q. Yes, but Mr Springett, I am just anxious -- so that we | 23 | Board minutes, 9 November 2015. My copy is in yellow. |
| 24 | are on the facts. | 24 | The paragraph to which I would like to draw your |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | attention is on 7439 under the heading "Business |
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| 1 | Q. The answer is yes, isn't it? | 1 | update". |
| 2 | A. What's the question again? | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | Q. The question is Primelocation did enter with what is | 3 | Q. Do you see the one beginning "Trials of discounted fee |
| 4 | effectively penetration pricing when it entered the | 4 | offers"? |
| 5 | market, didn't it? | 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | A. To the extent that it wasn't charging agents, yes. | 6 | Q. That is not confidential, is it? These are out there in |
| 7 | Q. Thank you. And that only lasted for a period of a few | 7 | the market, right? |
| 8 | months, didn't it? | 8 | A. Yes, that's okay. |
| 9 | A. That's right. | 9 | Q. Then can you just read the paragraph at the top of the |
| 10 | Q. And in fact, you have -- | 10 | next page to yourself in the first instance. "There was |
| 11 | A. Until we ran out of money. | 11 | general approval", that one. (Pause) |
| 12 | Q. No, because the whole point of penetration pricing, | 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Mr Springett, is it doesn't last very long and then you | 13 | Q. Is any of that confidential? |
| 14 | start to charge so you don't run out of money. That is | 14 | A. I think I'm happy for it to be covered. |
| 15 | right, is it not? | 15 | Q. I am just interested in that one because we agreed on |
| 16 | A. That is true but in entering this market you would have | 16 | the facts that you have engaged in these discounted fee |
| 17 | needed a very, very substantial amount of funding in | 17 | offers much more recently, but even in those cases it |
| 18 | order to deploy that strategy and it might still not | 18 | seems from these minutes that the strategy was to lock |
| 19 | have worked because of the reasons I was just describing | 19 | out competitors, wasn't it? |
| 20 | about the need to attract property seekers. | 20 | A. Well, to the extent that we were approaching people who |
| 21 | Q. You are welcome to point me anywhere in this | 21 | were only on one portal and the reason we found that |
| 22 | 10,000 pages, Mr Springett, to where you approached the | 22 | they were only on one portal is that they couldn't |
| 23 | seed corn funders or the investment capitalists or the | 23 | afford to be on two portals, certainly not at full |
| 24 | venture capitalists for this other source of income in | 24 | rates, we saw that as a way of increasing listings by |
| 25 | launching AM. Can you point me to me paragraph that | 25 | offering those people a low incremental price and |
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| 1 | clearly with the One Other Portal rule in place as long | 1 | Yes? But I would like to show you another document. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | as they were in contract with both those portals that | 2 | You know you are on very vulnerable territory here, |
| 3 | would have that effect. | 3 | don't you, Mr Springett, if you look at bundle 15/8274. |
| 4 | Q. That is right. Indeed, that effect, which I suggest to | 4 | Picking up the chain, as one does later in the bundle, |
| 5 | you is clearly anti-competitive is the company strategy, | 5 | it is the next page, 8275. You see there is a "Hi Ian" |
| 6 | isn't it? | 6 | from Vicky. "Please see below a press release about |
| 7 | A. No, it's not the company strategy. | 7 | Northern Ireland." That is on 11 March 2016. |
| 8 | Q. It says here there was general approval for the strategy | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | and then it goes on to say lock out competitors? | 9 | Q. Then going earlier in the bundle, so the previous page, |
| 10 | A. Yes, but you are saying that is the objective and the | 10 | you write back at the bottom of the page: |
| 11 | objective of this is simply to build our membership. | 11 | "Hi Vicky, what do you mean by the difference in the |
| 12 | Q. What does strategy mean if it doesn't mean objective? | 12 | rule?" |
| 13 | A. It means how you go about achieving your objective. | 13 | A. Yes, I see that. |
| 14 | Q. Exactly, thank you. I suggest to you that you wouldn't | 14 | Q. So she in the draft press release had talked about |
| 15 | have needed your restrictions in place or you wouldn't | 15 | a different rule in Northern Ireland? |
| 16 | have needed them for as long if you had obtained | 16 | A. Yes. |
| 17 | additional revenue from what you called additional | 17 | Q. She sends you the draft press release, correct? |
| 18 | products being sold to OTM members. That is right, | 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | isn't it? | 19 | Q. And you write back saying: |
| 20 | A. That would be true of any sorts of revenue. If we had | 20 | "What do you mean by the difference in the rule?" |
| 21 | more revenue we would grow faster -- if we grew the | 21 | And she writes back to you saying: |
| 22 | business quicker we would grow faster et cetera. | 22 | "Where Northern Ireland agents don't select to |
| 23 | Q. So it is true then. So your point being, and I think we | 23 | choose Property Pal as their one other portal ..." |
| 24 | are agreed on this, that if you had grown faster you | 24 | Helen writes to you, I beg your pardon: |
| 25 | wouldn't have needed the restriction in place for so | 25 | "... don't select to choose Property Pal as their |
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| 1 | long, right? | 1 | one other portal for all their properties but instead |
| 2 | A. Yes, that's self-evident. | 2 | choose one other portal for each individual property." |
| 3 | Q. Thank you. So it follows as well then that if you had | 3 | Just bear with me, Mr Springett. That is one of the |
| 4 | grown faster by getting in listing fees from online | 4 | differences in Northern Ireland, isn't it, you can |
| 5 | agents and from new home developers, again, you wouldn't | 5 | choose by property as opposed to -- |
| 6 | have needed your restrictions in place for so long, | 6 | A. I think we did go over that. |
| 7 | would you? | 7 | Q. Can I just ask you a question first. Yes? |
| 8 | A. I made the point to you yesterday that our proposition | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | is geared to full service agents so it would not have | 9 | Q. So that is one of the differences? |
| 10 | been as attractive in the market to those sorts of | 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | customers if we had, for example, taken new homes | 11 | Q. And the other difference is that this less restrictive |
| 12 | developers as a customer who are in the end vendors | 12 | rule applies for the first 12 months, doesn't it? |
| 13 | directly listing on some portals. So it doesn't follow | 13 | A. That's right. |
| 14 | just by admitting those categories would necessarily | 14 | Q. And I think at the top of the page, recognising that |
| 15 | have helped us build the business. In fact, we believed | 15 | this causes you a considerable difficulty you say: |
| 16 | that our approach has been very appealing to that | 16 | "Ah yes, that will be handy in court! Ha ha." |
| 17 | category of potential customer. | 17 | That is because, Mr Springett, you know perfectly |
| 18 | Q. I suggest to you that yet another less restrictive | 18 | well that that shows a less restrictive entry method for |
| 19 | alternative for entering the market is that which you | 19 | one part of this relevant market, doesn't it? |
| 20 | use in Northern Ireland. That is right, isn't it? | 20 | A. Let's go through this in series. So I get an email from |
| 21 | A. And I've agreed with you about that previously I think. | 21 | our PR manager that says "Here's the proposed release," |
| 22 | Q. That is right. In fact, we looked at the documents | 22 | and she says something about the difference in the rule. |
| 23 | where you agreed with me in which you had written that: | 23 | My purpose, I remember this, in writing back with the |
| 24 | "The operation of the OOP rule in Northern Ireland | 24 | question was not that I didn't know the answer, but to |
| 25 | makes us slightly out on a limb." | 25 | make sure she did. Mrs Whiteley was quicker to the |
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| 1 | punch and gave me the answer that we both already knew | 1 | it? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | and obviously I made a flippant remark in response. | 2 | A. And I think our view has been we assess each one we are asked to assess by our members on a case-by-case basis |
| 3 | Q. It is much more telling than that, isn't it, | 3 |  |
| 4 | Mr Springett, your remark at the top of the page? | 4 | and we determine accordingly at that point. So what we |
| 5 | A. Well, it remains to be seen. | 5 | are looking for, for example, is the market coverage, |
| 6 | Q. Yes. You have claimed as part of your case, you and the | 6 | ownership is a big factor, whether they have links, as |
| 7 | company, that there wasn't a competitive market at the | 7 | very many of them do, to one or other of the duopoly |
| 8 | time that OTM entered, right? | 8 | portals, in other words, content is shared or fed. So |
| 9 | A. I think that competition was extremely limited. There | 9 | it is things like that. |
| 10 | was no switching. In their published documents both of | 10 | Q. Thank you, I have made my suggestion to you and you have |
| 11 | the major portals say that they suffer very little | 11 | given your answer. |
| 12 | attrition and that they both have a very high proportion | 12 | I am going to move on to a point I said I would come |
| 13 | of the market listing with them. So that says to me | 13 | back to a few moments ago, the unique contents point, |
| 14 | there is very little competition in that market and | 14 | Mr Springett. |
| 15 | I observe what's going on at grass roots level when | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | talking with agents, so you can connect the market | 16 | Q. My suggestion to you is that under the OOP rule in fact |
| 17 | structure with what the customers are feeling as well. | 17 | you don't have any unique content on your website, do |
| 18 | Q. But you recognise, don't you, Mr Springett, that there | 18 | you? |
| 19 | are plenty of competing portals out there in the market | 19 | A. Well, I don't think we claim to have any unique content. |
| 20 | including at the time that you launched, don't you? | 20 | The objective here was to reach a position where no one |
| 21 | A. There are a variety of competing portals but none that | 21 | portal has complete coverage, so you can now find the |
| 22 | bear on the serious competitive dynamics and it is quite | 22 | entire market on either Rightmove and Zoopla, Rightmove |
| 23 | a fluid market so things can change. There has been, | 23 | and OnTheMarket, Zoopla and OnTheMarket. And therefore |
| 24 | particularly in the case of Zoopla, a build of their | 24 | that changes the situation from what it was before our |
| 25 | business via acquisition. There are lots of links | 25 | entry and it disrupts the position where otherwise the |
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| 1 | between portals as well which sometimes aren't | 1 | consumers had got used to simply finding all the stock |
| 2 | immediately obvious that you have to look for. | 2 | on either Rightmove or Zoopla. |
| 3 | Q. But one reason -- sorry. | 3 | Q. In fact, even your own steering committee founder |
| 4 | A. I'm just describing a little bit about the network of | 4 | members take the view that under the One Other Portal |
| 5 | other smaller portals. | 5 | rule there will be no unique content on OTM, don't they? |
| 6 | Q. But one reason that we know that there are these other | 6 | A. Well, and I take that view because we've never said |
| 7 | competing portals out there is because you have a long | 7 | unique content. What we've said is, I think it is |
| 8 | list, haven't you, as a company of what you call "other | 8 | referred to here and there, is a unique collection of |
| 9 | competing portals", right? | 9 | properties. Although I should make clear that's not |
| 10 | A. Well, it has accumulated over time. That's certainly | 10 | what we say in our marketing material, that is |
| 11 | true. | 11 | effectively an internal term for discussion, but what it |
| 12 | Q. That is right. Members of the Tribunal, you don't need | 12 | means is a differentiated property stock. And I've |
| 13 | to turn it up but we handed in a list and it is right, | 13 | explained to you what the objective was: to move the |
| 14 | isn't it, that there is a long list of other competing | 14 | market away from the situation where any new entrant |
| 15 | portals from time to time and they are other portals | 15 | would only ever have a subset of what one or other of |
| 16 | competing with your portal, aren't they? | 16 | the big portals had. |
| 17 | A. They are. | 17 | Q. Thank you. I will just show you -- actually, I will |
| 18 | Q. I suggest to you that you've distorted that competition, | 18 | just move on to the next document. |
| 19 | haven't you, because only one of those other ones can | 19 | As you know, I put this to you many times and you |
| 20 | ever be chosen by a member of OTM? That is right, isn't | 20 | defended yourself as you do, but my suggestion to you |
| 21 | it? | 21 | all along has been that the strategy was to get rid of |
| 22 | A. Yes, if it's deemed to be a competing portal only one of | 22 | Zoopla altogether but in those circumstances there would |
| 23 | them can be included. | 23 | be absolutely no unique collection on OTM, would there, |
| 24 | Q. And therefore that disables the other ones from being | 24 | if Zoopla is knocked out of the market? |
| 25 | chosen and therefore from competing with you, doesn't | 25 | A. Well, it wasn't our objective. |
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| 1 | Q. But it is right, isn't it, that if I am right and that | 1 | just as well in a way that they absolutely can't do at |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | was your objective and/or that's what you effectively | 2 | the moment. |
| 3 | achieved, then you won't even have a unique collection | 3 | Q. Thank you. Nearly there, Mr Springett. I am just going |
| 4 | because all the properties on your side, they'll all be | 4 | to put forward to you a series of fairly short points |
| 5 | on Rightmove, won't they? | 5 | and then we will be done. |
| 6 | A. Well, until such time as there was some genuine | 6 | The example of supposed entry into the property |
| 7 | switching and rivalry in which case not all agents would | 7 | market of Tescos, that is not a portal trying to enter |
| 8 | be on Rightmove and not all agents would be on | 8 | at all, was it, that was an estate agent? |
| 9 | OnTheMarket and therefore there would be a difference | 9 | A. I can tell you a bit about that because I was managing |
| 10 | and there should be if the market was functionable. | 10 | director -- sorry, chief executive of Primelocation at |
| 11 | Q. I have suggested to you in the past that various groups | 11 | the time that that happened and at that point we were |
| 12 | of agents, not just Mr Livesey but the group in west | 12 | managed independently from FindaProperty but Tesco |
| 13 | Wales and others, thought that your strategy was to | 13 | approached The Daily Mail Group because they were |
| 14 | knock out Zoopla. On this specific issue about if you | 14 | considering setting up a portal and what they wanted was |
| 15 | knock out Zoopla does it destroy the supposed uniqueness | 15 | for us to provide the initial content for that portal |
| 16 | of the collection can I take you to a document you have | 16 | and normally that was the kind of thing that I would |
| 17 | not seen in bundle $2 / 1034$. This is an email to you from | 17 | have kicked into touch in seconds but because I was then |
| 18 | Mr Cornish, again, the Acorn Limited gentleman, | 18 | part of the group and the group had broader advertising |
| 19 | 14 June 2013, yes? Do you see that he has had a meeting | 19 | relationships with Tesco we put some thought and effort |
| 20 | with you yesterday? | 20 | into it. I can remember that we were talking about |
| 21 | A. Yes. | 21 | branding Primelocation content as Tesco Finest and |
| 22 | Q. Various things have come up. Look at the final | 22 | FindaProperty's content as the mainstream brand. |
| 23 | paragraph please: | 23 | Luckily, from a commercial point of view, that |
| 24 | "We would also welcome the chance to discuss with | 24 | didn't go anywhere but there is no doubt in my mind that |
| 25 | the steering group how they see the scenario play out | 25 | it was a portal that was being developed. |
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| 1 | where everybody jumps ship from Zoopla but stays on | 1 | Q. Thank you. The suggestion in your witness statement |
| 2 | Rightmove." | 2 | about Google being another example, that was a very |
| 3 | He seems to have formed the impression as well as | 3 | half-hearted effort on their part to try to enter the |
| 4 | Mr Livesey and the group of west Wales that the view of | 4 | market, wasn't it? |
| 5 | the steering committee is to have everybody jump ship | 5 | A. Well, it wasn't felt at the time that they were to be |
| 6 | from Zoopla, doesn't he? | 6 | messed with. That's for sure. |
| 7 | A. That is exactly what it doesn't say, isn't it? He | 7 | Q. Mr Springett these are your words again. |
| 8 | wouldn't be saying it in that way if that's what I'd | 8 | A. They are also, with respect, Mr Chesterman's words in |
| 9 | proposed. | 9 | his 2014 report to analysts which was put to Mr Notley |
| 10 | Q. But it is interesting that what he points out, the | 10 | the other day. |
| 11 | proposition I was just putting to you, wasn't it, that | 11 | Q. Do you accept from me, Mr Springett, that you wrote on |
| 12 | if this was to be the case then the edge of the new site | 12 | 21 January 2013: |
| 13 | being the only place to view all available property will | 13 | "Google tried to enter the market but it seemed |
| 14 | be lost. That is because all of it will be on | 14 | a half-hearted effort and they withdrew soon |
| 15 | Rightmove, won't it? | 15 | afterwards"? |
| 16 | A. But that's not our strategy. We are talking here about | 16 | A. I agree they could have given it a lot more force than |
| 17 | a market entry strategy. We started with seed corn | 17 | they did but that doesn't mean it wasn't credible, shall |
| 18 | funding and one person in 2013 with a view to trying to | 18 | I say. |
| 19 | build something that would add some competition to the | 19 | Q. Another example you put forward in your witness |
| 20 | market and ultimately challenge the dominant market | 20 | statement is Property Live but actually that shut down |
| 21 | leader which turns over 200 million a year, so there's | 21 | in collaboration and by agreement with Agents' Mutual, |
| 22 | a bit of a way to go before we can provide what we are | 22 | didn't it? |
| 23 | setting out to, but if we do provide that, the whole | 23 | A. No, it didn't. |
| 24 | basis of it is that people then have a choice and they | 24 | Q. Perhaps we can therefore look as probably the final |
| 25 | can migrate from Rightmove and have something that works | 25 | document, bundle 4/1816. Do you see this is an email |
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|  | from you to Mr Hayward of the NAEA in October 2013? |
| ---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Yes. |
| 2 | Q. And towards the bottom he says: |
| 4 | "I am happy with the memorandum of understanding. |
| 5 | We can confirm that we will exclusively support AM." |
| 6 | Then in summary: |
| 7 | "If your board are happy with our release we can |
| 8 | move immediately. Property Live will be shut down." |
| 9 | On the previous two pages there is a written |
| 10 | memorandum of understanding between the group that ran |
| 11 | Property Live and Agents' Mutual Limited setting out an <br> 12 |
| 13 | agreed strategy for the withdrawal of Property Live from |
| 14 | A. No, the decision to shut Property Live had been taken by |
| 15 | the National Association in January and you will have |
| 16 | heard Mr Wyatt saying he was disappointed about that and |
| 17 | there was a rear guard action from the members of the |
| 18 | NAEA to consider whether there was some other commercial |
| 19 | basis on which it could be continued and I believe there |
| 20 | was some research work done around that. |
| 21 | They had come to the conclusion that they were going |
| 22 | to shut it anyway and it was wholly their decision but |
| 23 | we took the opportunity to say to them, "We would very |
| 24 | much like to work with you and have your endorsement" |
| 25 | bearing in mind our constitution and our objectives and |
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that's the basis on which we reached an agreement, but it was wholly their decision to close it down.
Q. Then the last point, Mr Springett, is you suggested in your evidence that there had been a diversion of funds away from the marketing in order to pay for this litigation?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you show me a single document, anywhere in all of these documents that bears out that suggestion?
A. Well, I suppose we could go through the management accounts and I could highlight indications that it's happened but what I can tell you, and I refer back to what I said earlier this morning, that we're a business that is spending every single spare penny on marketing and so any reduction in our available funds means a reduction in the marketing budget.
Q. I suggest to you there is not a single document anywhere including in the management accounts that bears it out. We have hunted high and low.

## A. I'm happy to agree with you.

Q. In fact, at an earlier stage of the litigation when we were pressing for security for costs the generation of funds for that was by deferment by the company of repayment of loans, wasn't it?
A. No, it wasn't.

```
Q. That's the point I'll end on there because that is to be
    found in Miss Farrell's first witness statement, your
    instructing solicitor, in bundle X, tab 39, please, and
    internal page 341. Do you have paragraph 8.5,
    Mr Springett?
A. Mmm.
Q. This was a witness statement put in by your instructing
    solicitor on instructions from you. You can see there
    it says in the top line:
    " ...been informed by Mr Springett that ..."
    A. Okay.
    Q. And then at 8.5 do you see it talks about deferment of
        loans --
    A. Yes.
    Q. -- from your members.
    A. And I think because we had to put that sum of money into
        deposit it has left us short of cash. The board members
        have done what is described there but it has still
        caused us to adjust downwards our marketing budget
        because clearly we can't spend money we don't have.
    Q. But you could and you have deferred loans in the past
        when cash has been short, haven't you?
    A. Yes.
    MR HARRIS: Thank you, I have no further questions.
        Thank you for bearing with me, Mr Springett.
```
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    THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Harris. Mr Maclean.
        Re-examination by MR MACLEAN
    MR MACLEAN: Mr Springett, I have three topics I want to
        discuss with you. Can you be handed, please, the
        transcripts bundle which is called daily transcripts on
        the spine. However, it doesn't have a letter. Would
        you turn to Day 5, please, Mr Springett. It should be
        at tab 5, Day 5, 9 February. You see there are four
        pages to each page. Do you see that, Mr Springett?
    A. Yes.
Q. If you turn, please, to the page which includes pages
121 to 124 of the transcript. That is what I want to
get to. It is internal page 31 if you use the numbers
at the bottom right-hand corner. Just cast your eye
over page 123 of the transcript. Do you see Mr Harris
said to you: "Keep number 3 to hand." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. "Now we're going to look at H16. Please open that to
the email you wrote on 2 May 2016 which begins at $8719 . "$
A. Yes.
Q. So let's just take that for a moment. H16/6719. Keep
the transcript open, Mr Springett. Right at the
beginning of the bundle, the second page there is an
email from Mr Milsom to you. Do you see that? "Thanks,
I am yes -- sorry."
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| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | to be at 136. Just look at page 136 through to 143. We |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. That is what Mr Harris was showing you, okay. Let's go | 2 | have those here but we haven't got those in H10, do you |
| 3 | back to the transcript. Do you see at line 14, | 3 | follow? |
| 4 | page 1223: | 4 | A. I'm with you, yes, so the attachments that went with the |
| 5 | "Does that put that into context for you that's what | 5 | letter. |
| 6 | was going on? | 6 | Q. But the letter itself -- there is only one letter? |
| 7 | "Answer: I agree, but having some more demonstrable | 7 | A. Is the same letter. |
| 8 | compliances. | 8 | Q. So we can see -- let us put X5 away again. |
| 9 | Then Mr Harris suggested that the point in relation | 9 | A. Right. |
| 10 | to his last question is over the page at 8721 . So just | 10 | Q. The third document you referred to in your answer to |
| 11 | go there with me, please. Do you see decision 2? | 11 | Mr Harris is something you say, "I believe |
| 12 | Mr Harris read that out, and then he says: | 12 | is April 2016". So would you then take bundle H15 and |
| 13 | "In your words you say here, you say in 2016, so | 13 | turn to page 8525. Would you tell me first of all, do |
| 14 | some two years later..." | 14 | you recognise this letter and secondly, if you do, what |
| 15 | And then he quotes another chunk. Then the | 15 | is it? |
| 16 | suggestion to you was: | 16 | A. This is --I think this was not a letter directed |
| 17 | "That's completely inconsistent with the evidence | 17 | specifically to Agents' Mutual or OnTheMarket. This is |
| 18 | that you have just given, that you already knew about it | 18 | an open letter which was transmitted in a variety of |
| 19 | and you had already had advice to say that wasn't | 19 | ways, aimed at estate agents and we are mentioned at the |
| 20 | proper, isn't it?" | 20 | bottom of the first page. |
| 21 | Just read your answer, Mr Springett. | 21 | Q. Let me just take it in stages. Would you then go over |
| 22 | "To answer this question I would like to refer to | 22 | the page. We see that this letter is dated 21 April. |
| 23 | some documents, firstly being a letter we received from | 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | the CMA on 27 March 2015." | 24 | Q. Would you then go to page 8528 in that same bundle. |
| 25 | Could you take bundle H10, please, and turn to 5393. | 25 | A. Yes. |
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| 1 | We did in the end, through Mr Harris's gritted teeth | 1 | Q. Here is one of these emails from Agents' Mutual to Ian. |
| 2 | I think, later in your cross-examination look at this | 2 | Do you see Mr Harris gave you an example of this this |
| 3 | document. H10/5393. That is the CMA letter | 3 | morning? |
| 4 | of March 2015, isn't it? | 4 | A. Yes, and that is -- |
| 5 | A. Yes, it is. | 5 | Q. What's that? |
| 6 | Q. We are going to come back to that in a minute. Then you | 6 | A. I am copied on any email that goes to our membership, so |
| 7 | say: | 7 | this is just my version of what all members would have |
| 8 | "Second, my response to the CMA to that letter." | 8 | received. |
| 9 | A. Yes. | 9 | Q. What is it? |
| 10 | Q. And then the letter that's referred to in these emails | 10 | A. I'm sorry. It is a response by us to the open letter |
| 11 | April 2016. | 11 | from the CMA which, as with the first one, generated an |
| 12 | Taking it in stages we have the CMA's letter at | 12 | enormous amount of negative propaganda from our |
| 13 | 5393, yes? | 13 | opponents and it is there to clarify our position. |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | Q. If you go back then to the transcript where we started |
| 15 | Q. If you then turn to 5507 in that same bundle H10, tell | 15 | if you still have that at page 124 you said: |
| 16 | me what that is, please, Mr Springett? | 16 | "To answer this question you would like to refer to |
| 17 | A. That's my letter which was prepared under advice from | 17 | three documents." |
| 18 | our legal team replying to Mr Kirk Patrick of the CMA. | 18 | That is the first CMA letter? |
| 19 | Q. So that's the letter you refer to as "my response", | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | right? | 20 | Q. Your response to the CMA letter and then the April 2016 |
| 21 | A. Yes. | 21 | communication which, as you say, is not to you at all |
| 22 | Q. If you take bundle X and keep that all open I am afraid, | 22 | but is an open letter from the CMA? |
| 23 | bundle X , tab 5 this appears to be the same letter as | 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | the one we have just looked at in H10 you see beginning | 24 | Q. You said you didn't have those and Mr Harris said, well, |
| 25 | at page 130 and the difference between the two appears | 25 | essentially that was too bad, and you said: |
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| 1 | "It would assist me to answer if I could refer to | 1 | taken by the incumbent portals to try to, in my words, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the documents." | 2 | derail our entry into the market. |
| 3 | And then over the page you said: | 3 | Q. Just pausing there, Mr Springett, if you turn on in the |
| 4 | "I won't be able to give you the whole truth in that | 4 | bundle then to the -- I think we established that your |
| 5 | case" and Mr Harris had to move on? | 5 | letter back to the CMA starts at 5507? |
| 6 | A. Yes. | 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | Q. So Mr Springett, you now have those documents. You have | 7 | Q. And you just used the expression" derailed". Go to |
| 8 | the CMA one from 2015, you have your response and you | 8 | 5511, do you see halfway down that page? |
| 9 | have the later CMA communication. So what is the whole | 9 | A. That is the list I was talking about. Yes, that's it. |
| 10 | truth then, Mr Springett? | 10 | Q. Was there any response from the CMA to this letter? |
| 11 | A. All right, so let me tell you what my recollection of | 11 | A. I don't believe we got a response to this letter. |
| 12 | the whole truth is and then I can spend more time | 12 | I think we offered at any point to go and see them but |
| 13 | looking for the precise elements, but if $I$ go to the -- | 13 | they didn't respond, no. |
| 14 | could you remind me where the first letter is in the | 14 | Q. Right. I am sorry, I took you out of your course |
| 15 | bundle? | 15 | I think. |
| 16 | Q. The first one is in bundle H10/5393. | 16 | A. No, and I don't know whether this is the version |
| 17 | A. Yes, and bearing in mind that what we are contemplating | 17 | actually that we are looking at at 5512 that has the |
| 18 | here is our communication with member agents and | 18 | relevant attachments, I don't think it is actually. |
| 19 | prospective member agents. If I look at the first | 19 | Q. No, it is in bundle X . |
| 20 | letter and internal page 3, 5395 in the bundle, that | 20 | A. I think that is not the point that I am primarily |
| 21 | page starts with a paragraph entitled "The suspected | 21 | addressing though. |
| 22 | agreements or concerted practices. An estate agent | 22 | If we go now to H15/8525 which is the April 2016 |
| 23 | should act independently ..." | 23 | letter, my recollection is that the CMA in this letter |
| 24 | The CMA understands that one of the requirements of | 24 | expanded the concern it had beyond the choice of which |
| 25 | membership is that in order to list properties on its | 25 | other portal to the joining of Agents' Mutual in some |
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| 1 | portal agents may list on a maximum of one other portal | 1 | form of collective manner. |
| 2 | and if Agents' Mutual's members, or I guess prospective | 2 | And so as I have said numerous times, our legal |
| 3 | members, were to meet and agree collectively either (a) | 3 | advice from the outset has been that agents have to take |
| 4 | to list only OnTheMarket or (b) to list on the same | 4 | their own individual decision but this was an occasion |
| 5 | portal in addition to OnTheMarket, the CMA would regard | 5 | where what the CMA were saying publicly expanded on its |
| 6 | this probably or possibly as constituting a breach of | 6 | letter of March 2015 by including in its potential |
| 7 | the law. | 7 | concerns some kind of collective decision to join the |
| 8 | And they also refer to other concerns, and as we are | 8 | OnTheMarket portal. I think that's laid out in the |
| 9 | on the subject of the plus one rule we visited this | 9 | second paragraph. |
| 10 | paragraph the other day. Their view on all of this | 10 | So what I was saying is that when we were |
| 11 | might change if we established a position of market | 11 | considering how to respond to that I wanted to review |
| 12 | power. | 12 | that, as I did in fact with our legal advisers, before |
| 13 | So immediately we received this letter and apart | 13 | we rushed to put out any immediate changes to our |
| 14 | from taking legal advice we made some additions to our | 14 | material and in particular, one of my concerns was that |
| 15 | information memorandum at the appropriate place where we | 15 | there is a significant difference between having |
| 16 | talk about strategy to reflect precisely the second | 16 | a meeting of estate agents at which we make our |
| 17 | paragraph under the heading "The suspected agreements or | 17 | proposals and invite them to join us and a meeting at |
| 18 | concerted practices" to warn agents that they should not | 18 | which they collectively decide to join. And what |
| 19 | agree amongst each other in the manner that is pointed | 19 | I didn't want was to put out a form of words which could |
| 20 | out there. We took the opportunity to then confirm our | 20 | be used to put people off doing the first of those two |
| 21 | understanding and we wrote to the CMA on 9 April and we | 21 | things in the spirit of putting them off doing the |
| 22 | took the opportunity to try and say a bit more about | 22 | second of those things. |
| 23 | what our intentions were. | 23 | So we paused for thought. We took legal advice and |
| 24 | I notice toward the end of that letter we also put | 24 | that's the context for the email. |
| 25 | down a little list of all the actions that were being | 25 | Q. Thank you. The second point I want to address is in the |
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|  |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 | same transcript. |
| 2 | MR FREEMAN: Just before you do, Mr Maclean, the open letter |
| 3 | is an open letter to estate agents. |
| 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | MR FREEMAN: It was not addressed to you. |
| 6 | A. No, it wasn't. |
| 7 | MR FREEMAN: It was copied to you. |
| 8 | A. That's correct. In fact, I don't recall whether it was |
| 9 | even copied to us but we certainly received a copy of it |
| 10 | and there was, as there had been the first time round, |
| 11 | a significant propaganda effort against us as a result |
| 12 | of that. But we have always wanted to make sure that we |
| 13 | didn't step out of line with anything that the CMA was |
| 14 | saying and therefore it was our intention to update if |
| 15 | we needed to our sales and marketing material. |
| 16 | MR FREEMAN: Whereas the 2015 letter to you included the |
| 17 | CMA's concern that Agents' Mutual might be encouraging |
| 18 | agents to do this or that. |
| 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | MR FREEMAN: The 2016 letter is sent openly to estate agents |
| 21 | and doesn't appear to include the concern about |
| 22 | Agents' Mutual encouraging; am I right? |
| 23 | A. No, that is right. But I should explain that the |
| 24 | 27 March 2015 letter was sent as an advisory letter to |
| 25 | us but my recollection is that the National Association |
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of Estate Agents and the Association of Residential Letting Agents were asked to promulgate a version of that letter, it wasn't the precise letter but certainly a version of the message to all of its members. So that 27 March letter in its advisory form was private to us but there was another version of it which was sent far and wide.
MR FREEMAN: Thank you.
MR MACLEAN: I am very grateful to Mr Freeman.
Can I just ask you, Mr Springett, to turn in bundle
16 if you still have that, one of the ones we looked at.
A. Do I need to keep the other ones?
Q. You are going to need H5 in a minute.
A. Right.
Q. But you can put everything else away I think. Would you turn to page 9141, please, in H16. Do you recognise this email, Mr Springett?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. It refers to a meeting between your client, ie Agents' Mutual and the CMA on 11 May 2015. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall there being a meeting on 11 May 2015?
A. Yes, I attended it.
Q. Was it on 11 May 2015?
A. I beg your pardon, it was absolutely 2016 because it followed the April 16 letter, so that is an error in the ...
Q. You told me earlier when I asked you was there a response to the 2015 letter, your answer was no?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So this appears to be referring -- assuming the date is wrong as you have just suggested -- to a meeting that took place in the wake of the April 2016 letter that we just looked at?
A. Yes, in the course of obtaining legal advice following not receipt as an addressee but certainly a receipt of a copy of the letter. As I say, we met with our advisers and we determined that we should once again seek a meeting with the CMA to try and clarify our strategy and objectives and to hear what they had to say about it.
Q. We can see from that email what they say. Is that where matters rest or is there some further follow up that you are aware of?
A. I'm not aware of any further communication, no.
Q. Right. Let me then turn to something else. In the same transcript as we started on, Day 5, would you turn to the page which gives you pages 173 to 176 of the transcript.
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## A. I have that.

Q. Look at the bottom of $174, \mathrm{Mr}$ Springett, please. Mr Harris is asking you about the west Wales group. Do you see that at line 5 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And he reads out a Dear Nigel email. Then look at your answer:
"Well the particular context ..."
Just read that to yourself, would you. Just read that to "It says exactly that" at the top of the next column. (Pause)
A. Thank you, yes.
Q. In the middle of that answer you refer to:
"We were keen and we did actually at some point in 2014 and it's in the bundle somewhere get their permission to issue a statement."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you take bundle H 5 and would you turn first of all to page 2541. Would you look at the top of the page first of all. There is an email 27 March 2014, "Dear all" from you. Do you see that?
A. Yes. I am just trying to see who that's to.
Q. It is to all the people at the bottom of 2540 .
A. Our board members.
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Q. Is it? It's to --
A. Oh, I'm sorry, to --
Q. I am not sure. I think you are replying to all the people that Mr Jones's email was sent?
A. No, I don't think that's right. I think what I've done is forwarded that email from Mr Jones to my board members.
Q. I see.
A. And with the suggestion that they might give me consent to issue a communication effectively to say that they are all in a position to meet their obligations under the contracts that they by then had signed.
Q. We can all read page 2540 but there are emails successively from Mr Abrahmsohn from Mr Flint and from Mr Jarman. We see that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if you turn on in the same bundle to 2549 , the same day, that was all very early in the morning, Mr Jarman, Mr Bartlett gets out of bed a bit later. Mr Bartlett, he's another board member?
A. He is, yes.
Q. And then at 2550 there is an email from you:
"Please find below a draft text".
And then there is a draft text at 2551 ?
A. Yes.
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> Q. And if we go to 2562 . When you referred in your answer to there being in the bundle somewhere getting permission to issue a statement. Would you look at 2562 and tell me if at all that relates to the answer you gave Mr Harris?
> A. Yes, that is the email that we were given consent by our board member firms to issue and it was -- well, as you can see, it was in response to activity in the market by our competitors to try to I think unsettle other members and prospective members and to try to tell them that it would be impossible for our board firms on launch date to list with OnTheMarket on a one other portal basis because they had signed intra contracts which would contradict --
> Q. Thank you. The final point, Mr Springett, which I hope I can do in the four minutes I have left. At page 86 of today's transcript in answer to a question from Mr Harris you referred to the published documents from Rightmove and Zoopla in the context of switching. Do you remember?
> A. Yes, I do, yes.
> Q. Would you take, please, bundle E1 and would you turn in it to page 123 . Just help me, Mr Springett, what is this? Do you recognise this document?
> A. I do.

| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | A. Yes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Have a look at the last sentence beginning "The group's | 2 | Q. We see the revenue and the audience and value which is |
| 3 | agent churn..." | 3 | percentage of leads? |
| 4 | A. "The group's agent churn. The number of estate agents | 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | and letting agents who do not renew their membership as | 5 | Q. You may have heard me put this document to some of the |
| 6 | a percentage of total agents who are members has | 6 | witnesses but in very broad terms the first two pie |
| 7 | historically been low and usually linked to the natural | 7 | charts are roughly 2 to 1 in terms of ratios and the |
| 8 | churn in the estate agency market of branch openings and | 8 | third one is 1 to 1 . |
| 9 | closings". | 9 | My question is, to what would you attribute the |
| 10 | Q. Is that something you had in mind in answer to | 10 | difference in the ratios in the third pie chart, namely |
| 11 | Mr Harris? | 11 | 1 to 1 compared to the ratio in the first two pie charts |
| 12 | A. Yes, it is. | 12 | which is in broad terms 2 to 1 ? |
| 13 | Q. Then finally, page 201 do you see "Current trading and | 13 | A. It is a wholly different methodology for generating |
| 14 | future prospects"? | 14 | leads within a rather different definition between the |
| 15 | A. Yes. | 15 | two portals and so I think Zoopla during this period was |
| 16 | Q. Do you see the sentence: | 16 | set up to generate more measurable activity and I am |
| 17 | "The group's strong operating momentum has | 17 | thinking emails and measurable phone calls than |
| 18 | continued." | 18 | Rightmove would have been. |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | MR MACLEAN: Thank you very much, Mr Springett. Those are |
| 20 | Q. Is that a phenomenon you would recognise or not? | 20 | all my questions in re-examination. Does the Tribunal |
| 21 | A. In relation to Zoopla? | 21 | have any questions? |
| 22 | Q. Yes. | 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: No, we have no questions. Thank you very |
| 23 | A. Absolutely I would. Since this time their claims of | 23 | much, Mr Springett. You are released. |
| 24 | their brand awareness have become more bullish. They | 24 | A. Thank you. |
| 25 | now say they have greater brand awareness than Rightmove | 25 | (The witness withdrew) |
|  | Page 118 |  | Page 120 |
| 1 | does. I think their visit numbers have increased. | 1 | MR MACLEAN: I am sorry, I trespassed for four minutes. We |
| 2 | I think their ARPA has increased, and I am going from | 2 | have to do a little reorganisation. Where would you |
| 3 | memory, relating to their 2016 full year performance but | 3 | like Mr Harris and I to be this afternoon? I ask this |
| 4 | I think on all of those metrics that has increased. | 4 | with a little trepidation. |
| 5 | Q. Finally, Mr Springett, in an earlier answer on Day 6 you | 5 | THE CHAIRMAN: Can I answer in the negative. Not in that |
| 6 | referred at page 35 to the Zoopla IPO prospectus but you | 6 | row. We don't envisage that you will play a role in the |
| 7 | went on to say you were referring to Zoopla being "neck | 7 | hot tubbing. The reason for that is should you wish to |
| 8 | and neck in terms of coverage by agents, very close on | 8 | retraverse any matter that we traverse with the experts |
| 9 | brand awareness and I think ahead on lead generation." | 9 | you will be entirely free to do so in cross-examination |
| 10 | The final document I want to show you is back in | 10 | and that is a gloss I think on the normal rules of hot |
| 11 | bundle H2, if the Tribunal will just bear with me. | 11 | tubbing. But I don't know if there is room in the row |
| 12 | Would you turn to page 688. It is not your document, | 12 | immediately behind. |
| 13 | Mr Springett, it is Zoopla's document but are you | 13 | MR MACLEAN: If they squeeze up. |
| 14 | familiar with this document from Mr Chesterman | 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: That would probably be satisfactory. But if |
| 15 | in March 2013? | 15 | you could make efforts to move your materials to one |
| 16 | A. I am, yes. | 16 | side that would be very helpful. |
| 17 | Q. In the context of your reference in your answer to | 17 | MR MACLEAN: Very good. |
| 18 | Mr Harris about lead generation, would you turn to | 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: As I think we said in the protocol the |
| 19 | page 685. You should be looking at three pie charts? | 19 | experts really only need their reports and the annexures |
| 20 | A. Yes. | 20 | to those reports to hand plus the data they circulated |
| 21 | Q. If I have understood this, which I almost certainly have | 21 | in the joint statements to us. We will start at |
| 22 | not, the first one deals with revenue. Do you see that? | 22 | 2 o'clock with the hot tubs, so the taps can start |
| 23 | A. Yes. | 23 | running now. We will end not later than 4.20 today and |
| 24 | Q. Split between Rightmove and ZPG. So this is | 24 | that's because we have another event, nothing to do with |
| 25 | post-merger, right? | 25 | this case but we will be having others, perhaps not in |
|  | Page 119 |  | Page 121 |


|  | this court but in court 1, I am not sure about the |
| ---: | :---: |
| 1 | logistics, but Mr Holmes will be making an appearance |
| 2 | there. |
| 4 | MR MACLEAN: He may or may not have changed by that time. I |
| 5 | hope not. |
| 6 | THE CHAIRMAN: Tradition is not. |
| 7 | MR MACLEAN: I know, I told him that. |
| 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: As you or so Mr Harris knows it is the |
| 9 | tradition to have a cup of tea after this matter. I am |
| 10 | quite sure Mr Holmes will have other matters to talk |
| 11 | about beyond this case, but if any other of either |
| 12 | counsel team wish to attend then you will be more than |
| 13 | welcome. |
| 14 | MR HARRIS: That is very kind, sir. |
| 15 | MR MACLEAN: Very good. |
| 16 | MR HARRIS: Is the intention that prior to the hot tubbing |
| 17 | we introduce the witnesses and take them to their report |
| 18 | and verify their signatures? |
| 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think that will be necessary. |
| 20 | I anticipate that you will do that when they each give |
| 21 | evidence-in-chief and we will simply take their reports |
| 22 | de bene esse pending that moment in time. |
| 23 | MR HARRIS: The only reason I raise it is Mr Parker has some |
| 24 | minor typo type clarifications in his report. I had |
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I am in your hands as to quite how -- none of them are --
THE CHAIRMAN: I understand. No, we'll deal with those matters when each expert is giving his evidence-in-chief and obviously we won't be reading anything into the fact that they haven't been corrected earlier than that. That is one of those things.
In that case we'll rise until 2 o'clock.
$(1.07 \mathrm{pm})$
(Luncheon Adjournment)
( 2.00 pm )
THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, gentlemen. You have no doubt
been apprised of the process that we are going to go
through this afternoon and tomorrow morning.
Essentially it is a collaborative process where we, the
Tribunal, engage in a form of conversation with you and between yourselves with a view to educating the Tribunal as to the issues in play. So what will happen is that I, in conjunction with my colleagues, will lead the discussion. We'll try and get you to talk both to us and amongst yourselves.
In short order, you will be sworn in but before you
are I just want to make clear a couple of points.
First of all, the more straightforward and
layman-like you can make your answers to our questions,
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I am quite sure, for my part at least, the more that will be appreciated. It may be that you have to descend into jargon but the chances are, if you do, we will have to ask for elucidation.

The second point is that you are obviously giving opinion evidence as expert economists. To a greater or lesser extent you may have familiarity with the factual situation. You may have heard the facts which have been given by the various witnesses. It would be extremely helpful in your answers if you could make clear when you are relying upon particular facts to support the opinion that you are giving.

I don't anticipate that we will require you, because it will take too long, to track down specific factual points in the materials we have had. To the extent that a point becomes contentious or difficult or unclear, we may need to request the assistance of your legal teams to track down whether a particular fact does or does not pertain. But for the present I am really just interested in ensuring that where your opinion depends on a particular fact we identify what that fact is. You will both appreciate obviously that neither of you are giving evidence of facts and all you can do is indicate the facts that matter to your opinions.

The final point: although ordinarily the claimant's
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expert, Mr Bishop, would go first, we will reverse the order, at least for swearing and for the initial questions, simply because the burden, as has been demonstrated by the fact that openings were in this order, it will be Mr Parker to go first followed by Mr Bishop.

Do you two gentlemen have any questions of me before we swear you in?
MR PARKER: No, sir. MR BISHOP: No.
THE CHAIRMAN: Then perhaps we will proceed to swear you in.
MR SIMON BISHOP (sworn)
MR DAVID PARKER (affirmed)
Questions by the Tribunal
THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could begin with the nature of the market in which portals operate. It is common ground that it is a two-sided market but I wonder, Mr Parker, if you could start by defining what you see as the two sides in that market.
MR PARKER: Sir, I think within the portals market the two sides are estate agents on the one hand and the house-hunters/vendors on the other. So the job of the portal is to put estate agents and the property that they are seeking to sell in line with the buyers, and particularly vendors of those properties, which is what

|  | Mr Bishop calls "the property seeker" and what I call |
| ---: | :---: |
| 1 | the "house-hunter/vendor". So I think for me those are |
| 2 | the two sides. There are essentially estate agents and |
| 3 | then there are house-hunter/vendors. |
| 5 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Bishop? |
| 6 | MR BISHOP: I would agree with Mr Parker. |
| 7 | MR FREEMAN: Which side of the market have you got vendors |
| 8 | in? |
| 9 | MR BISHOP: I have estate agents on one side and vendors are |
| 10 | consumers of the estate agent services, so it is |
| 11 | property seekers on one side and I have vendors as |
| 12 | a consumer of the estate agent. |
| 13 | MR FREEMAN: Vendors provide the properties which give rise |
| 14 | to the listings which fulfil that side of the market, |
| 15 | don't they? |
| 16 | MR BISHOP: They do, but it is also true that vendors can |
| 17 | also be on the side that Mr Parker suggested, because |
| 18 | they are also searching on the website, so they're kind |
| 19 | of, if you like, on both sides. |
| 20 | MR FREEMAN: Okay, not with a view to a purchase though? |
| 21 | MR BISHOP: No. |
| 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: So what we have, if I can paraphrase, is |
| 23 | a slightly longer chain in terms of the parties on the |
| 24 | estate agent side and the estate agent is directly |
| 25 | involved with the portal but acting for and on behalf of |
|  |  |
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the vendors who instruct the estate agent and you loop that as one side, and then on the other side you have the house purchasers who are directly using the portal to obtain information about properties they are interested in?
MR PARKER: Yes, and perhaps to expand slightly, I think an individual estate agent you could think of a bit like a portal, they are trying to put house vendors and house purchasers together.
MR FREEMAN: They are a bricks and mortar portal.
MR PARKER: They are a bricks and mortar portal in a specific geographic area. So I think I am entirely in agreement with Mr Bishop that vendors come up a couple of times here. They come up as customers of the estate agent and that side of the little mini portal that is the estate agent, but they also come up when looking for property because in many cases house-hunters who are searching on the property portal will themselves at some point need to become vendors in order to become a house purchaser and so they may be looking at property portals on a regular basis as a house-hunter or property seeker and it is only maybe a bit later in their journey, if you like, that they then become a vendor from the kind of perspective of the property portal.
THE CHAIRMAN: I see. I think what you are saying, and
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Mr Bishop do shout if my summary doesn't accord with your view, is that in the ordinary course the ultimate consumer will be both a vendor and a purchaser, the most transactions involve my selling a property and also then buying, whether it's an upsize, a downsize or simply a move, and the exception is perhaps the case where I am only selling or only buying, if such cases exist, but I think what you are saying, Mr Parker, is that in general a property vendor is also a property purchaser.
MR PARKER: Yes, that is right.
MR BISHOP: I agree.
THE CHAIRMAN: Nothing to add?
MR BISHOP: No.
THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we have heard a little bit about the geographic limits of markets and I think it was common ground before the factual evidence was given that so far as the first side of the market was concerned, the market was the UK-wide market and I am just wondering if we think specifically about the evidence we heard regarding Northern Ireland, whether you, gentlemen, would want to change your views about that.

Let's again start with Mr Parker.
MR PARKER: Sir, from a property portal perspective, I think
for the purposes of carrying out the analysis it was a good starting point to look at the UK as a whole
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because a lot of the data, the relevant portals operate across the UK as a whole or at least across GB as a whole and the data that you have available relates to GB or the UK as a whole as it may be.

I can see that from the very recent discussions around Northern Ireland that the conditions of competition do look somewhat different there. There seem to be some different players, some local players there. I think for the purposes of analysis it is not clear to me that it would make a big difference between saying there is a market in GB and a market in Northern Ireland if you look at those separately, or there's a UK market but there are some differences in the competitive conditions in different regions and we have picked those up in the competitive effects stage, if you like.

So from an economist's perspective, this may not be quite what you are looking for, but from an economist's perspective the marketing side I think doesn't really add a huge amount to the debate but I can see that from the conditions of competition it does seem to be somewhat different in Northern Ireland. So one could potentially split that off.
THE CHAIRMAN: Before you go on to the other side, Mr Bishop, do you want to comment on that? MR BISHOP: I agree with Mr Parker.
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| 1 | THE CHAIRMAN: So far as estate agents are concerned, and | 1 | not tied so much to a specific geographic location and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | I appreciate that is in terms of our enquiry a slightly | 2 | they can do more kind of national-type advertising and |
| 3 | less important area but just to get your evidence on | 3 | they can advertise on property portals, amongst other |
| 4 | this, I think you are agreed that their markets are much | 4 | places, and potentially they could have on-the-ground |
| 5 | more geographically constrained; the bricks and mortar | 5 | people who are doing valuations and so on, they could |
| 6 | stage at least is looking to a particular locality. | 6 | sign up a network of people, maybe in the future that |
| 7 | MR PARKER: Yes, I think that's right. For a bricks and | 7 | might change the relevant definition of the local estate |
| 8 | mortar estate agent I think we haven't come to a view as | 8 | agency market from a geographical perspective, but we |
| 9 | to exactly the ambit of those local markets and how they | 9 | would still have the -- at least for now, house-hunters |
| 10 | are defined everywhere, but I think it seems | 10 | probably are still looking in specific local areas. The |
| 11 | a reasonable assumption that given the nature of an | 11 | full service of the bricks and mortar estate agents are |
| 12 | estate agency business, and my personal experience that | 12 | still present in different local areas. |
| 13 | they tend to focus on a specific area and focus on | 13 | Since, if you wanted to go into more of the sort of |
| 14 | properties in that area, that it would make sense to | 14 | competition economics jargon of this, a hypothetical |
| 15 | think of local estate agency markets and there being | 15 | monopolist of all of the full service estate agents in |
| 16 | a whole number of local estate agency markets across the | 16 | a local area I think would still have enough of the |
| 17 | UK although I am not sure what the number is. | 17 | presence of the potential offerings at the moment so as |
| 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: Again, Mr Bishop, before I follow with | 18 | to mean I wouldn't seek to depart from a local set of |
| 19 | a supplemental, you have nothing to add? | 19 | local markets -- even though online estate agents are |
| 20 | MR BISHOP: No, I agree. | 20 | now coming in, I don't think they're important enough at |
| 21 | MR LANDERS: Could I just ask, we heard about the emergence | 21 | this stage to change if you like from a local geographic |
| 22 | of the corporate estate agents, the three big ones. | 22 | market definition but that could come in the future. |
| 23 | Does that in your opinion change what you have just said | 23 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Bishop? |
| 24 | in any way? | 24 | MR BISHOP: I think if you want to move to Cornwall you need |
| 25 | MR PARKER: Not from my perspective. I think it is -- as | 25 | to buy a property located in Cornwall, and I think the |
|  | Page 130 |  | Page 132 |
| 1 | I understand it, the corporates have a set of different | 1 | fact that an online estate agent is offering properties |
| 2 | chains of local estate agents across the country but | 2 | for sale in Cornwall and in Hampshire or Sunderland, |
| 3 | I wouldn't say that that widens the definition of the | 3 | that just says it is active in three separate markets in |
| 4 | relevant market. It is that there are some estate | 4 | the same way that a corporate might be active in more |
| 5 | agency businesses that have chosen to locate in many | 5 | than one local market. |
| 6 | different parts of the country, sometimes with different | 6 | MR FREEMAN: So it doesn't change the geographic market |
| 7 | branding, different franchise names, and so on. I don't | 7 | location but it is another source of competition? |
| 8 | think that makes a difference for market definition. It | 8 | MR BISHOP: It is another source of competition but I would |
| 9 | is a business strategy. That's all. | 9 | still consider the competition in the estate agent |
| 10 | MR BISHOP: Again, I agree. | 10 | market still to be local. |
| 11 | THE CHAIRMAN: Following up on that, we have heard about corporates but we have also heard about, and I think it is an inaccurate label I'm using, but online estate | 11 | THE CHAIRMAN: I think I am detecting a difference. I am |
| 12 |  | 12 | not sure it matters but I would quite like to nail it if |
| 13 |  | 13 | there is. You are suggesting, Mr Bishop, that even if |
| 14 | agents, but let's treat that as a business model that is | 14 | there was a dramatic change in the market split away |
| 15 | less focused on local branches, much more based on an | 15 | from bricks and mortar towards what I am terming |
| 16 | internet or online offering but I am not excluding from | 16 | "online", let us suppose, plucking these figures from |
| 17 | my definition feet on the ground, simply in a more | 17 | the air, at the moment it is 90 per cent bricks and |
| 18 | dynamic way. | 18 | mortar and 10 per cent online, let us suppose one |
| 19 | As regards that sort of estate agent -- I'll use | 19 | inverted those percentages and it was 90 per cent online |
| 20 | a shorthand, "online estate agent" -- can I ask the same | 20 | and 10 per cent bricks and mortar, I think your answer |
| 21 | question as Mr Landers asked about corporates? | 21 | would still be that the geographic market was a local |
| 22 | MR PARKER: So I think my view, and I haven't particularly | 22 | one. Whereas I think, but Mr Parker do come back on |
| 23 | explored this in my report, I think my view would be at | 23 | this, you might suggest that the market was perhaps less |
| 24 | the moment online estate agents are a small but growing | 24 | geographic or a bigger geographic market. |
| 25 | part of the market. They tend to have, because they are | 25 | MR PARKER: I think that could be the case, particularly if |
|  | Page 131 | Page 133 |  |



| 1 | series from 2011 onwards. But that is showing you that | 1 | change the fact that there is a market definition for |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | there has been a considerable increase in the proportion | 2 | property portals alone and that's essentially the view |
| 3 | or the number of visitors to online property portals, at | 3 | that the OFT came to as well. |
| 4 | least over the last five years, and if you look at the | 4 | THE CHAIRMAN: It may be that Mr Freeman wants to come back |
| 5 | OFT decision and so on that has been going on for more | 5 | on that but before he does, if he does, Mr Bishop, do |
| 6 | years back in the past. We don't have the data here, | 6 | you have any comments or indeed any questions that you |
| 7 | but I think that's correct. | 7 | would like to ask Mr Parker about that? |
| 8 | And I think it explains, if you like, what we see in | 8 | MR BISHOP: I think -- no, no questions for Mr Parker but |
| 9 | figure 4, that over time people have been shifting the | 9 | I think just that these issues of whether these |
| 10 | balance of the spend more towards property portals and | 10 | alternative forms of advertising are complements or |
| 11 | away from other types of advertising. | 11 | substitutes comes up in most sort of media markets. To |
| 12 | THE CHAIRMAN: If I may, can I just follow up on that. | 12 | be honest, I think if there is a budget constraint there |
| 13 | I was careful to use the words "market position" and you | 13 | will be a degree of substitutability. I think it is |
| 14 | were very careful, Mr Parker, to differentiate between | 14 | kind of difficult to actually identify what we mean by |
| 15 | relevant market and market position. | 15 | the competitive price in these markets, given that this |
| 16 | It does appear that there is a degree of | 16 | is the return that an advertiser gets for a given amount |
| 17 | substitutability between the portals and the other forms | 17 | of spend and as the price goes up the expected return |
| 18 | of advertising that we've discussed, and it may well be | 18 | may change. |
| 19 | the case that you are right, that the online form of | 19 | But overall in the analysis I think we can stick, as |
| 20 | advertising is becoming more prevalent as the internet | 20 | Mr Parker has suggested, with a sort of narrow portal |
| 21 | grows and as its powers become apparent as demonstrated | 21 | market. I don't think it really makes too much |
| 22 | by your figure 4. So given that estate agents only have | 22 | difference. |
| 23 | a limited amount of budget for advertising, they | 23 | MR FREEMAN: I suppose the only other question is whether we |
| 24 | obviously have to consider where they allocate their | 24 | are observing a trend and whether in the figure 4 charts |
| 25 | spend as you very fairly suggested. | 25 | the red will be everything in ten years' time, whether |
|  | Page 138 |  | Page 140 |
| 1 | But doesn't that suggest that at least as far as | 1 | that makes any difference to your analysis, or is there |
| 2 | estate agents are concerned, in terms of what they are | 2 | a new equilibrium coming where there is still |
| 3 | buying, one needs to look less at the precise | 3 | (inaudible)? |
| 4 | advertising provided by a portal and more at the | 4 | MR PARKER: You will have to forgive me because I am not |
| 5 | substitutes as well in terms of defining the relevant | 5 | looking at a colour copy so if you mean will the wider |
| 6 | market? | 6 | -- |
| 7 | MR PARKER: I think the discussion about relevant market in | 7 | MR FREEMAN: The red is the portal share of advertising |
| 8 | this case was slightly kiboshed by the sort of early | 8 | expenditure. I thought you only ever dealt in colours. |
| 9 | decisions of the Tribunal to try to get to a position | 9 | I don't see how you would be able to follow your graphs |
| 10 | where we didn't have to debate what the relevant market | 10 | otherwise. |
| 11 | was. So I haven't done a big market definition | 11 | MR PARKER: I think it is quite possible that, if you like, |
| 12 | exercise. I think what I would say is, since it is | 12 | the trend in figure 2 towards people looking more and |
| 13 | common ground that, if you like, we have a dominant firm | 13 | more online, if that continues then I think we'll |
| 14 | Rightmove in the property portals market when it faces | 14 | probably see a continuation in the increased share of |
| 15 | some substitutes -- | 15 | the red portal share in terms of overall advertising |
| 16 | MR FREEMAN: We want to come back to that. | 16 | expenditure. I am not sure that that observation |
| 17 | MR PARKER: I understand but I am trying to -- | 17 | particularly makes any difference to the issues in this |
| 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: Do carry on. | 18 | case. |
| 19 | MR PARKER: Putting it in context, if there was only one | 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: No. In other words, looking as we are as the |
| 20 | property portal in the country, do I think it is highly | 20 | market stands at the moment, your view is that if one |
| 21 | likely that it could raise prices above the competitive | 21 | postulates in the portal market a single entity there |
| 22 | level? Yes, I do, given the share of total spend that | 22 | isn't a degree of substitutability to prevent the price |
| 23 | it has. So I don't think regional newspapers or even | 23 | rise and all you would be saying is that if the purple |
| 24 | collectively all these other forms of advertising are | 24 | expands evermore the answer remains the same; it is |
| 25 | a sufficient substitute for property portals so as to | 25 | simply a fortiori? |
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| 1 | MR PARKER: Absolutely. | 1 | MR BISHOP: Yes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | THE CHAIRMAN: So presumably, again this may not matter but | 2 | THE CHAIRMAN: We will be coming to that later but it might |
| 3 | just to get our bearings in this area, if one backtracks | 3 | be worth disentangling the strands there and asking |
| 4 | to the early 2000s when portals were nascent, your | 4 | Mr Parker to comment, but I think what you are saying is |
| 5 | answer would then have been rather different in terms of | 5 | that when one is looking at the revenue figures, which |
| 6 | the substitutability question because portals were | 6 | you gentlemen have very helpfully provided to us and we |
| 7 | really emerging as a new thing and had to establish the | 7 | have looked at, there are multiple different reasons why |
| 8 | results? | 8 | those prices may, as they appear to have done, rise over |
| 9 | MR PARKER: Yes, I think that is probably right. We have | 9 | time. |
| 10 | seen a lot of new -- a lot of markets which have online | 10 | The first is, as Mr Freeman mentioned, add-ons, and |
| 11 | channels now and there is a question when it comes to | 11 | am I correct in understanding that the revenue figures |
| 12 | competition analysis of at what stage firstly do you | 12 | that you have provided to us include, as it were, add-on |
| 13 | take the online channel as being a thing of constraint | 13 | services in addition to the basic listing fee? |
| 14 | on the bricks and mortar channels, and then possibly at | 14 | MR BISHOP: Yes. |
| 15 | some point does that process reverse and you find that | 15 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. That is right, is it? So that is one |
| 16 | really the primary ambit of this is really the online | 16 | explanation of an increase: added value by way of |
| 17 | channel and then it might be the bricks and mortar side | 17 | additional service beyond simply the appearance of the |
| 18 | of that that is a constraint? | 18 | property on the portal. |
| 19 | I think there would have been a flip probably | 19 | The second strand which might inform price increases |
| 20 | somewhere in history, but I think we are now at the | 20 | or, if it goes wrong, price decreases is the perceived |
| 21 | stage, and I am in agreement with Mr Bishop, that one | 21 | usefulness of the listing to estate agents. So when you |
| 22 | can look at a portals market in a sensible way but we | 22 | start off, if we could dial back again to the early |
| 23 | may -- I am sure, from these data, since online portals | 23 | noughties as Mr Maclean would say, one isn't seeing |
| 24 | barely existed in 2000, that there would not have been | 24 | a particular valuable service but 16 years on everyone |
| 25 | a market for online property portals but as they got | 25 | realises that this is a really important way to market |
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| 1 | more popular at some point there would have been | 1 | properties and so they are prepared to pay for the value |
| 2 | something there worth monopolising, which is the | 2 | of what is being offered. And that I think is the |
| 3 | definition of the market. | 3 | second strand that might inform prices. |
| 4 | THE CHAIRMAN: We reach, to coin a phrase, a tipping point | 4 | And is the third strand, or are there more, the |
| 5 | and we are well past it what I think you are both | 5 | potential for market dominance where one has one player |
| 6 | saying. | 6 | in the market or possibly a duopoly, we'll come on to |
| 7 | MR BISHOP: May I make one observation? | 7 | that as well, where they can raise prices which are |
| 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: Please do. | 8 | raised in a manner that is independent of either of the |
| 9 | MR BISHOP: Which is obviously as the property portals | 9 | first two strands? Would that be a fair analysis? |
| 10 | become more important then over time that is relevant | 10 | First of all, have I got those inputs right and |
| 11 | for how we interpret changes in listing fees. Because | 11 | secondly, have I left any out? And if we start I think |
| 12 | an increase in listing fees can reflect just simply that | 12 | on this occasion with Mr Bishop because you set this |
| 13 | estate agents have a higher willingness to pay because | 13 | hare running and then we can move to Mr Parker. |
| 14 | they're getting more bang for their buck by actually | 14 | MR BISHOP: Apologies. No, I think that is a fair summary. |
| 15 | listing. So when we are looking at changes in listing | 15 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Parker? |
| 16 | fees over time it is not just saying: that's just market | 16 | MR PARKER: I think those are the relevant issues. I think |
| 17 | power. That's also that the service being offered is | 17 | in respect of add-ons, my perspective would be that |
| 18 | improving and trying to distinguish between those two | 18 | those are all part of the advertising service that is |
| 19 | effects is quite difficult. | 19 | being sold by the portal, so the add-ons -- so the |
| 20 | MR FREEMAN: When you say "the service being offered" you | 20 | listing fee is the basic listing fee and the add-ons are |
| 21 | don't just mean extra services, you mean the quality of | 21 | ways in which you can get your listings higher up, more |
| 22 | the actual core -- | 22 | prominent, more flashy and so on to try and attract |
| 23 | MR BISHOP: And the quantity of number of visits so in | 23 | people's eye. I would say that's all part of the kind |
| 24 | Mr Parker's report you can see the large number of -- | 24 | of the same service essentially that's being operated by |
| 25 | MR FREEMAN: Mainstream services? | 25 | the property portal. |
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| 1 | I would say there's sort of qualitative difference | 1 | Group, I think it's called, and the revenues for that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | between that type of add-on and potentially other | 2 | are quite substantial and they were included in the |
| 3 | add-ons, such as back office software that is useful for | 3 | H2/2016 figures, five months' worth of revenue there and |
| 4 | estate agents to manage their businesses. That I think | 4 | that was several millions. So you will see that we |
| 5 | would be somewhat -- I would treat that somewhat | 5 | highlighted that in particular and that could be |
| 6 | differently. But I think add-ons are part of the | 6 | stripped out because that's much more material than we |
| 7 | overall advertising and I think one should sensibly | 7 | are talking about here. |
| 8 | include those in the analysis. That's my first thing. | 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That is very helpful in terms of |
| 9 | In terms of perceived usefulness, I completely agree | 9 | understanding the revenue figures. |
| 10 | with that. I think what you get for your money is | 10 | MR LANDERS: I had a question that sort of flowed from that |
| 11 | a very important aspect and then potentially there is | 11 | in terms of the revenue. When we were talking earlier |
| 12 | a market power aspect as well. | 12 | about the comparison with other sorts of advertising, |
| 13 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Sorry, Mr Landers has a point but | 13 | the characteristic of those forms, the media forms and |
| 14 | if I could just take up your time a little more. | 14 | so on, is that your purchasing decision can be terribly |
| 15 | I entirely, if I may say so, understand the | 15 | elastic. You can have more adverts, bigger adverts, you |
| 16 | distinction you are drawing between add-ons that are | 16 | can do all that sort of stuff, whereas with a portal am |
| 17 | effectively related to the selling of the property, so | 17 | I right in thinking that the decision is essentially |
| 18 | they are joined at the hip to the listing itself, | 18 | binary? You are either with Zoopla or you are not with |
| 19 | whether that be a star listing or a listing that comes | 19 | Zoopla with the exception of these add-ons, so that once |
| 20 | at the top of a longer list. I understand that. On the | 20 | you have made that decision the amount you are going to |
| 21 | other side one has, as you say, the back office things, | 21 | spend in a year is pretty well fixed? Does that change |
| 22 | all the arrangement of mortgage services, things that | 22 | the economics? Does that change your analysis of the |
| 23 | are much more related to sale, perhaps, than | 23 | fact that portal purchases are pretty lumpy compared |
| 24 | promulgating a given property. One might have | 24 | with other forms of advertising spend? Or am I wrong? |
| 25 | a difficult line to draw between these different | 25 | MR PARKER: I haven't particularly addressed myself to that |
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| 1 | add-ons. | 1 | question. I don't think you are wrong. The nature of |
| 2 | My basic question was, in terms of the revenue | 2 | the portals and their business model is that you tend to |
| 3 | figures we have it is all in and we are not able to | 3 | have a contract that is on a per office per month basis |
| 4 | differentiate, between the different revenue inputs, | 4 | for a certain period of time and once you've signed up |
| 5 | what's generating the revenue. We just have the single | 5 | to a contract like that you have an incentive to put all |
| 6 | figure. | 6 | your properties on the property portal for as long as |
| 7 | MR PARKER: So that's largely true. I am just trying to | 7 | the contract lasts because essentially you have paid for |
| 8 | find footnote 146, one of my favourites, which I believe | 8 | it. |
| 9 | is on page -- no, 147, page 77. So in the revenue | 9 | I am not sure other than you don't -- I am not sure |
| 10 | figures that we have, we have listing fees, we have | 10 | it particularly changes the analysis from my |
| 11 | premium listing fees as that type of add-on, and then we | 11 | perspective. |
| 12 | have some other software or back office services that | 12 | MR BISHOP: I think that's an extremely relevant point |
| 13 | the portals provide to the estate agents to allow the | 13 | because the decision to list on a portal is a binary |
| 14 | estate agents to do their job a bit better. This | 14 | one. Whereas with print advertising I could list five |
| 15 | footnote suggests that that category is a very small | 15 | of my properties in one paper and ten in a different |
| 16 | proportion of the whole for Zoopla and Rightmove. | 16 | magazine so I can tailor if you like my quantity. |
| 17 | So you can see, I won't read it out, the | 17 | Whereas here it is all or nothing and I think this is |
| 18 | confidential to Zoopla figure on page 78, and similarly | 18 | extremely relevant to when we come to considering the |
| 19 | for Rightmove Mr Notley's view is no higher and may well | 19 | analysis of the alleged price cost per lead and what we |
| 20 | be smaller, and then for OnTheMarket I don't think they | 20 | can take from that. And I'm sure we'll come back to |
| 21 | do any of those. So to the extent that that is | 21 | that issue. |
| 22 | something that one should strip out it is very small and | 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: So I know we really don't want to spend too |
| 23 | so perhaps not too much of a problem that it's in. | 23 | much time on Northern Ireland, but in a sense the |
| 24 | The exception to that is Zoopla in the last | 24 | Northern Ireland market is much more similar to your |
| 25 | financial year bought a company called Property Software | 25 | print market in that you can, or indeed you do, list |
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|  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | properties individually rather than en masse and that is | 1 |
| 2 | rather like choosing to list certain properties in print | 2 |
| 3 | media. | 3 |
| 4 | MR BISHOP: Agreed. | 4 |
| 5 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Parker, do you want to come back on that? | 5 |
| 6 | MR PARKER: No, we will come to variance of these issues | 6 |
| 7 | later on. | 7 |
| 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we have looked a little bit backwards. | 8 |
| 9 | I wonder if we could look forwards a little bit to the | 9 |
| 10 | extent to which there could be elision between portals | 10 |
| 11 | and online estate agents. We have heard evidence about | 11 |
| 12 | the possibility of this and I don't want you to comment | 12 |
| 13 | on the probability or otherwise of this happening. You | 13 |
| 14 | will have heard, like us, the evidence of different | 14 |
| 15 | people and it is fair to say that that evidence went in | 15 |
| 16 | slightly different directions. | 16 |
| 17 | But my question to you is the extent to which it is | 17 |
| 18 | relevant for us to have regard to potential horizontal | 18 |
| 19 | competition between portals and estate agents, in other | 19 |
| 20 | words, that the portals essentially move down as online | 20 |
| 21 | estate agents to compete with what we are calling bricks | 21 |
| 22 | and mortar estate agents, and were that to happen in the | 22 |
| 23 | sort of reasonably medium or short-term future, whether | 23 |
| 24 | that is a factor that we ought to be bearing in mind in | 24 |
| 25 | terms of the markets that we are examining. | 25 |
|  |  |  |
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MR PARKER: So I think at the moment the role of property
portals seems to be primarily as a route to market for the online estate agents. That seems to be if you're online only then it is clearly important to have online channels in order to get to your customer base. That is going to help things.

If it was the case that property portals would
themselves move into being estate agencies then that seems to me a further set of horizontal overlaps that you may wish to consider in your analysis because that would be a further threat to estate agencies, a further competitor set of substitutes for estate agents that maybe one doesn't need to go to an estate agent; one can just look on the property portal and the property portal actually provides what I need. But it is a factual question as to when, how quickly, how extensively that is going to be taken up if at all.
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and if before Mr Bishop responds I could give you something which struck me: I think it was Mr Springett who suggested that there were what he called "aggregators", people who accepted instructions from individual vendors of properties, batched them up and then as an aggregator put them on to one or more portals. I think his suggestion was that if and when the portals decided that that was a profitable route
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| 1 | newspaper market, regional newspapers which were | 1 | material. I think before dismissing them entirely from |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | attracting the vast majority of the spend. Essentially | 2 | consideration, an effect of the One Other Portal rule |
| 3 | the move to online portals I suspect reflects there is a | 3 | I think is that it reduces the addressable market for |
| 4 | new and more efficient way of getting to your customer | 4 | any competing portal that Mr Springett -- it is on the |
| 5 | base and the online portals provide that relative to the | 5 | list, if you like, of other competing portals, which |
| 6 | regional newspapers and that's what's driving the kind | 6 | means if any of those did seek to grow and expand they |
| 7 | of balance of spend. | 7 | would now potentially find it more difficult because the |
| 8 | So even if regional newspaper markets were | 8 | size of the market that they can realistically go for is |
| 9 | competitive there's still ways that you can make things | 9 | reduced, because if your entry strategy is to attract |
| 10 | more competitive by putting in a better mousetrap. | 10 | new agents but for some of those agents you would have |
| 11 | THE CHAIRMAN: In a sense, just going back to Mr Bishop's | 11 | to say, "Well, I know you can't come off OnTheMarket |
| 12 | point, we again heard quite divergent factual evidence | 12 | because you have a five-year contract and you've also |
| 13 | on the level to which bricks and mortar estate agents | 13 | signed up with, say, Rightmove," then I would have to be |
| 14 | ought to be concerned about online estate agents and | 14 | saying, "Well, to get that agent I am going to have to |
| 15 | obviously the fee structure is different and on the | 15 | encourage them to come off Rightmove". I think that's |
| 16 | whole is lower with online estate agents, but for the | 16 | an obviously extremely difficult prospect for a small |
| 17 | most part the evidence was that bricks and mortar estate | 17 | agent. |
| 18 | agents weren't concerned. We heard of divergent | 18 | So whilst I think the small property portals are not |
| 19 | evidence there. | 19 | very large and therefore not very material, they still |
| 20 | But in terms of your answer, Mr Bishop, you in | 20 | face higher barriers to entry as a result of the One |
| 21 | a sense, but correct me if I am mis-stating you, you | 21 | Other Portal rule than they would otherwise do. |
| 22 | don't really care. If it is the case that the online | 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: So perhaps before again we go to Mr Bishop |
| 23 | estate agents produce an offering that is cheaper and | 23 | what you are saying is that whilst in terms of the |
| 24 | better such that vendors choose to instruct them and not | 24 | analysis of the market in a general way it is perhaps |
| 25 | bricks and mortar, that is a more competitive market and | 25 | fair to call these other players insignificant, in terms |
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| 1 | so be it. Would that be a slightly tendentious but fair | 1 | of the impact that you would say the One Other Portal |
| 2 | way of summarising your position? | 2 | rule has on them we need to have in mind that if |
| 3 | MR FREEMAN: Slightly simplified. | 3 | a rational estate agent decides that it is going to sign |
| 4 | MR BISHOP: I think that is a very fair way of putting it. | 4 | up with Agents' Mutual, for reasons we have heard it's |
| 5 | Ultimately if the market, ie consumers, want the online | 5 | very likely that it will be either Rightmove or Zoopla |
| 6 | service rather than the bricks and mortar service then | 6 | and I think the emphasis was more likely Rightmove than |
| 7 | that would be the market telling people that they wanted | 7 | Zoopla but we'll debate that in due course, one thing |
| 8 | this market development. | 8 | you can say is that what we are calling, rather rudely, |
| 9 | THE CHAIRMAN: Whereas if they don't, they don't. | 9 | the insignificant players in that scenario don't get |
| 10 | MR BISHOP: They don't, yes. | 10 | a look in. I think that is what you are saying we need |
| 11 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Parker, before we move on? | 11 | to have in mind. |
| 12 | MR PARKER: I agree with that. | 12 | MR PARKER: I think that's right and they will find it as a |
| 13 | THE CHAIRMAN: If we can move then from the general | 13 | result more difficult to have a look in in the future if |
| 14 | parameters of the market to be a little bit more | 14 | they were seeking to try to enter the market. |
| 15 | specific. Leaving on one side, we'll obviously spend | 15 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Bishop, do you want to come back on that? |
| 16 | some time discussing OnTheMarket, but leaving | 16 | MR BISHOP: Yes, I think these smaller portals are already |
| 17 | OnTheMarket on one side for the moment, and to use | 17 | in the market so it is not a question of a barrier to |
| 18 | a neutral term, at the moment we have really two | 18 | entry and the question is: how successful were they in |
| 19 | significant players only, that is Rightmove and Zoopla, | 19 | competing against Zoopla and Rightmove for estate agents |
| 20 | and would it be fair to say that the other players, | 20 | prior to the entry of OTM? And it seems on the evidence |
| 21 | again leaving OnTheMarket on one side, we can | 21 | not much, really. So their position may well have been |
| 22 | acknowledge they exist and may be choices in certain | 22 | made more difficult relative -- you know, once OTM has |
| 23 | cases, but they are for the purposes of our | 23 | entered but has it gone from being impossible to |
| 24 | consideration not particularly material? | 24 | impossible plus epsilon? It is how the entry of OTM has |
| 25 | MR PARKER: I think that they are generally not particularly | 25 | actually changed their ability to compete. |
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| 1 | THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr Bishop, it came out on the [draft] | 1 | a nexus there, but you differentiate? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | transcript as it has "gone from being impossible to | 2 | MR PARKER: Yes, because I think the vendors if you like |
| 3 | impossible plus excellence", which I don't think -- | 3 | wear two hats here, which is obviously not helpful |
| 4 | MR BISHOP: Epsilon. | 4 | either. For analytical simplicity they wear one hat as |
| 5 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We will crack on. | 5 | also a house-hunter in many situations, and they are |
| 6 | Sorry, I interrupted you there. | 6 | looking on property portals to find properties and they |
| 7 | MR BISHOP: No, I had finished. | 7 | are consumers of the property portal service. But when |
| 8 | MR FREEMAN: We don't do Greek I think on the . | 8 | they become a vendor they're also consumers of the |
| 9 | MR BISHOP: I apologise. | 9 | estate agency service because they go to the estate |
| 10 | THE CHAIRMAN: We certainly do now. | 10 | agent and ask them to sell their house and so on. |
| 11 | Mr Parker, had you anything to add or should we move | 11 | If it is helpful I set this out at 3.4.8 of my first |
| 12 | on? | 12 | report which is pages 27 and 28. |
| 13 | MR PARKER: I don't think I have anything to add. | 13 | MR BISHOP: I think the main issue here or the main area of |
| 14 | MR FREEMAN: Before we move on, just to get one point out of | 14 | dispute between myself and Mr Parker seems to be on the |
| 15 | the way: you have both talked about consumers and you | 15 | level of pricing of Rightmove following the entry of OTM |
| 16 | have talked about it during the trial. Competition | 16 | and therefore for me it seems the most relevant issue |
| 17 | policy operates at the moment according to a consumer | 17 | is: to what extent are prices increased to estate agents |
| 18 | welfare standard. "Consumers" in this context primarily | 18 | and thereby passed on to their customers? |
| 19 | means house-hunters but also vendors presumably? | 19 | So for me that is the prime element of consumer |
| 20 | MR BISHOP: Agreed. | 20 | welfare that we should be considering. That is not to |
| 21 | MR FREEMAN: Do you attach any significance to the | 21 | say that there aren't the other categories that |
| 22 | relatively free way in which the word "consumer" has | 22 | Mr Parker has talked about but I think, given we want to |
| 23 | been used? Is it going to come back and bite us? | 23 | get some clarity that's where the major area of dispute |
| 24 | Mr Parker? | 24 | is and that's where we should be focusing our consumer |
| 25 | MR PARKER: I would highlight three groups, perhaps. | 25 | welfare analysis. |
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| 1 | I would look at estate agents as being customers of | 1 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, so you are saying that the other side, |
| 2 | portals. I would look at vendors, who are in their role | 2 | the house purchaser side in terms of being affected by |
| 3 | as customers of estate agents, so like an indirect | 3 | increases in the costs of listing on portals, because of |
| 4 | customer of a portal, and then I would look at | 4 | course they aren't paying anything anyway, are for the |
| 5 | house-hunter/vendors, property seekers, who are the | 5 | purposes of our present enquiry less relevant than the |
| 6 | other side -- the consumers on the other side of the | 6 | direct/indirect groups that Mr Parker identified of |
| 7 | portals market. | 7 | estate agents and the vendors. Is that a fair summary |
| 8 | MR FREEMAN: It sounds a bit like hunter gatherers. You | 8 | of what you're saying? |
| 9 | would put them all together into the consumer interest? | 9 | MR BISHOP: It is, yes. |
| 10 | MR PARKER: I think they are all separate groups of | 10 | THE CHAIRMAN: Again, Mr Parker, do you want to come back on |
| 11 | consumers and I think we should think about the effects | 11 | that? |
| 12 | on all of them, and that might explain some of the loose | 12 | MR PARKER: I don't think we should entirely rule out |
| 13 | language because depending on the context -- and I am | 13 | looking at house-hunter/vendors because what they |
| 14 | not saying unreasonably loose language but depending on | 14 | benefit from on a particular portal is the aggregation |
| 15 | the context you might talk about consumers vis à vis | 15 | of a lot of properties into a particular place. I think |
| 16 | a certain context and they may be a different group | 16 | when we come to the look at the effects of the One Other |
| 17 | because we have quite a number of groups here we need to | 17 | Portal rule we will find that the quality of certain |
| 18 | keep in mind. | 18 | websites' propositions has been reduced because they no |
| 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: But essentially three groups you would say? | 19 | longer have like a full service picture of the market. |
| 20 | MR PARKER: I would say. | 20 | So to that extent those house-hunters who were using |
| 21 | THE CHAIRMAN: Although I think you would accept they, at | 21 | that property portal now have -- and continue to do so |
| 22 | least as regards house purchasers and house sellers will | 22 | they have a lower quality proposition that they get for |
| 23 | overlap and I am not quite sure what you define as the | 23 | their time. Like what they are giving up, they don't |
| 24 | relationship between estate agents and property vendors | 24 | have a cash cost but they have a time cost of searching |
| 25 | but you use the term "indirect" so there is obviously | 25 | on property portals and people are busy and they don't |
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| 1 | spend all of their time searching, so it is helpful to | 1 | it is some way in the future. So I think one can |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | get a better product from the house-hunter side than | 2 | probably proceed without having to worry about that. |
| 3 | a less good product. | 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Bishop, do you want to come back? |
| 4 | So I think we shouldn't rule that out entirely and | 4 | MR BISHOP: Just on that last point, I fully agree with |
| 5 | particularly if we start looking at the future and we | 5 | Mr Parker. I think that's an interesting question but |
| 6 | start thinking about scenarios in which potentially | 6 | not one for this issue. |
| 7 | there is a tipping point and Zoopla disappears, Zoopla | 7 | I think what's relevant here when we talked about |
| 8 | offers other services out there to house-hunters as it | 8 | the house-hunters, of course there is a particular |
| 9 | is part of its differentiation, its way of attracting | 9 | scenario in which you have got two portals both offering |
| 10 | people to the Zoopla website. If Zoopla did disappear | 10 | a comprehensive offering of all property listings, so |
| 11 | those services would potentially disappear and they | 11 | two portals are basically offering all properties, but |
| 12 | would be lost to the market and in particular they would | 12 | some visitors only go to portal A and other people only |
| 13 | be lost to the house-hunter/vendors, the property | 13 | go to portal B and in that situation I don't really see |
| 14 | seekers. | 14 | that it is much different from the hypothesised single |
| 15 | So I accept that the primary focus here is rightly | 15 | portal which you put forward, Mr Chairman, because |
| 16 | on estate agents but I wouldn't completely rule out | 16 | estate agents would have to be on both portals. |
| 17 | looking at house-hunter/vendors as well. | 17 | THE CHAIRMAN: It's a technical question but I think you are |
| 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: Before I invite Mr Bishop to come back on | 18 | agreed that in the technical sense Rightmove is but |
| 19 | that, can I ask you one point, or possibly two. You are | 19 | Zoopla is not dominant. That is something which you've |
| 20 | really identifying, leaving on one side the additional | 20 | been asked I think to assume and have both in your |
| 21 | services that a portal offers to specifically the | 21 | reports assumed. Is that a fair summary? |
| 22 | house-hunter, you are identifying the convenience of | 22 | MR BISHOP: In my report I have actually taken no view on |
| 23 | finding all the properties on a single portal so you | 23 | that. I have actually just taken the view that we need |
| 24 | don't have to switch between them and therefore save | 24 | to assess the impact of OnTheMarket with the OOP rule on |
| 25 | time. I think that was one of the advantages. | 25 | whether that has enhanced Rightmove's pricing power. So |
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| 1 | MR PARKER: Yes, that's right. | 1 | whether that is -- taking a view that Rightmove was |
| 2 | THE CHAIRMAN: That of course would rather indicate in | 2 | dominant pre-entry or charging competitive levels |
| 3 | favour of a single dominant provider in terms of | 3 | pre-entry I think the analysis is the same. |
| 4 | portals. | 4 | MR FREEMAN: If it is dominant now then it has the freedom |
| 5 | MR PARKER: From the house-hunter point of view. | 5 | already to raise its prices unconstrained by its |
| 6 | THE CHAIRMAN: From the house-hunter point of view. | 6 | competitors. |
| 7 | MR PARKER: I think agents may be a bit concerned if that | 7 | MR BISHOP: It would suggest that Zoopla is not providing an |
| 8 | eventuality transpired. | 8 | effective competitive constraint, yes, if you assume |
| 9 | THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure they would be, yes. So in a sense | 9 | that it's dominant. |
| 10 | that's no more than a good illustration of what are | 10 | MR FREEMAN: It is a fairly fundamental point, we might |
| 11 | perhaps countervailing interests amongst the three | 11 | think. |
| 12 | groups that you have identified. | 12 | THE CHAIRMAN: I would quite like to unpick these a little |
| 13 | MR PARKER: Yes, and I think as we go more into this the | 13 | further but before we do let Mr Parker have his twopenny |
| 14 | linkages and interactions between these groups are | 14 | worth. |
| 15 | really important when thinking how competition works and | 15 | MR PARKER: As you rightly say, we have been instructed to |
| 16 | how the effects in this case of the One Other Portal | 16 | assume that Rightmove, it is common ground that |
| 17 | rule play out in this type of market. | 17 | Rightmove is dominant and that Zoopla is not dominant |
| 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: It may be more a question of law, and if so | 18 | and we should perhaps discuss collective dominance as |
| 19 | please excuse me, than economics but ought to have at | 19 | well subsequently because there has been I think some |
| 20 | the back of our minds the potential that a portal, if | 20 | confusion in the language so far in earlier parts of |
| 21 | sufficiently strong in the market, might actually be | 21 | this trial. |
| 22 | able to charge not simply estate agents for listing but | 22 | Let's come back to single firm-type dominance. From |
| 23 | house-hunters for viewing? | 23 | an economic perspective there is no magic in getting |
| 24 | MR PARKER: I haven't considered that. As far as I know | 24 | over the threshold for dominance and suddenly |
| 25 | it's never happened, so if it does happen it feels to me | 25 | everything, all competitive constraints, completely |
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| 1 | disappear. There is a continuum of potential market | 1 | attach the label but in fact in advance the assumption |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | power. At some point we define legally that we are in | 2 | of dominance adds nothing one way or the other. We need |
| 3 | the world of dominance but one can certainly get more | 3 | to look at what the prices are telling us. |
| 4 | dominant, have more market power after we pass the | 4 | Do you want to go first, Mr Parker, and then |
| 5 | threshold. That, if you like, is inherent in some of | 5 | Mr Bishop, you can come back? |
| 6 | the legal concepts about, for example, super-dominance | 6 | MR PARKER: It is a bit of a tricky one to answer given that |
| 7 | or about the idea that a merger in old money was | 7 | earlier in this process we were essentially instructed |
| 8 | a problem if it led to the creation or strengthening of | 8 | to proceed on the basis -- and I think, as I understand |
| 9 | the dominant position. It must be the case that if you | 9 | the motivation for that was that if it is common ground |
| 10 | can strengthen a dominant position that it is not just | 10 | between all the parties that a certain situation |
| 11 | we have reached a level and that's it. | 11 | pertains then one, if you like, can save time and |
| 12 | So I think a dominant firm will often still be | 12 | resource by assuming that that is the case and -- |
| 13 | constrained by whatever competition there is in the | 13 | MR FREEMAN: Also Rightmove is not here to defend itself |
| 14 | market and if the remaining competition gets weaker that | 14 | so ... It may have a different view. |
| 15 | dominant position can be strengthened. | 15 | MR PARKER: It may well do, but we're probably getting into |
| 16 | MR FREEMAN: Lawyers get terribly excited about dominance | 16 | legal territory that is well beyond my expertise. |
| 17 | because you can't abuse a non-dominant position, so I am | 17 | I mean, I have proceeded on the basis, as instructed, |
| 18 | told. | 18 | that Rightmove is dominant. It seems to me, whilst that |
| 19 | MR PARKER: I think from an economic perspective that's | 19 | is a question for abuse, it seems to me it does come up |
| 20 | not -- there isn't a kind of threshold above which | 20 | elsewhere. As I say, in the old money merger test it |
| 21 | suddenly we think all these problems could arise. There | 21 | was all about the preventing, creating or strengthening |
| 22 | is a scale of materiality and legally from an abuse | 22 | of a dominant position. In the new money -- I am |
| 23 | perspective to say we define something -- | 23 | thinking EC here -- in the new money merger test it is |
| 24 | MR FREEMAN: You are talking like somebody who has extensive | 24 | whether it results in a significant impediment to |
| 25 | experience of market investigations. | 25 | effective competition, including by virtue of a creation |
|  | Page 166 |  | Page 168 |
| 1 | MR PARKER: Alas, this is the case, yes. | 1 | or strengthening of a dominant position. |
| 2 | MR FREEMAN: Where that is a very familiar combination. | 2 | MR FREEMAN: That is merger control. |
| 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: We'll rise in a moment for the shorthand | 3 | MR PARKER: That is merger control, but we have -- there is |
| 4 | writers' break but I wonder if we can just spend | 4 | an example in abuse. There is an example in merger |
| 5 | a couple of minutes exploring this and just floating the | 5 | control. |
| 6 | duopoly point which, Mr Parker, you have touched on. | 6 | MR FREEMAN: We are not assessing a merger here, are we? |
| 7 | Speaking simply as a lawyer, and this is in no way | 7 | MR PARKER: No, that's correct. |
| 8 | a criticism of the economists, I was a little | 8 | MR FREEMAN: We are assessing the effects with retrospect. |
| 9 | uncomfortable at the notion of an assumption of | 9 | MR PARKER: But one might think that if something leads to |
| 10 | dominance and I wonder if the fair way of putting it is | 10 | the strengthening of a dominant position by whatever |
| 11 | this: that to the lawyer dominance really only matters | 11 | means, competition policy generally seems to have |
| 12 | in a context of abuse. Here we are much more interested | 12 | frowned on that now, but we are probably getting beyond |
| 13 | in what is happening to the prices. We will obviously | 13 | my expertise. |
| 14 | have to come on to how one defines prices and what data | 14 | MR FREEMAN: We are not trying to trick you into betraying |
| 15 | we have in relation to those, but what we are interested | 15 | your instructions or sort of giving up an assumption. |
| 16 | in is the effect as between Rightmove and Zoopla and | 16 | We are just trying to get at the nature of the market |
| 17 | then with the addition of OnTheMarket on the prices that | 17 | power distribution in the portals markets, Rightmove, |
| 18 | have been charged to the market. | 18 | Zoopla, OnTheMarket, and we are trying to sort of get |
| 19 | Now, it may be that a notion of dominance could be | 19 | behind the labels I think. |
| 20 | used as an appropriate label after the event to define | 20 | MR PARKER: So if the question is, "Do we think Rightmove |
| 21 | what's going on in the market once we have looked at the | 21 | has a very material market position?" it seems to me the |
| 22 | data, but would you agree with me, or if not tell me why | 22 | answer to that is "yes". We see all over the disclosure |
| 23 | you disagree, that the label of "dominance", to use it | 23 | we have references to Rightmove being the must-have, |
| 24 | in advance, it is unhelpful? It may be that after the | 24 | I think we had a similar discussion last week about |
| 25 | event, after the analysis has been done, one might | 25 | Rightmove being the gorilla. We have the shares that |
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43 (Pages 166 to 169)

| 1 | I report in section, I think it is 4, are on whatever | 1 | actually not a necessary part of your analysis at all. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | basis you look they are above standard thresholds for | 2 | MR PARKER: I think that I look at a range of issues to |
| 3 | dominant positions, so 50 per cent and above the | 3 | determine whether I think it's a major theory and |
| 4 | presumption of dominance. | 4 | credible evidence to assess what I think the effects of |
| 5 | We have I think common ground that there are | 5 | the One Other Portal rule are on the market, and as part |
| 6 | barriers to entry and expansion in this market which | 6 | of that the background context of Rightmove having an |
| 7 | would tend to support such a position. We have the | 7 | existing and very strong position, so I am instructed to |
| 8 | observation that of the people that joined OTM, I think | 8 | assume but as I say, the facts that I have seen are |
| 9 | here it is also common ground that 90 per cent of them | 9 | consistent with that, I think one can't get away from |
| 10 | remained with Rightmove. | 10 | that market context, if you like. It is not an abstract |
| 11 | It seems to me that that collection of facts would | 11 | thing. It is an existence of -- it describes the sort |
| 12 | at least be consistent with the view that Rightmove had | 12 | of level of where we start from. Does that help? Maybe |
| 13 | the dominant position, and has, and that is -- if you | 13 | not. |
| 14 | like, the instructions that I have are to assume that it | 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: No, it does. I think we have been pressing |
| 15 | does have a dominant position but to the extent that | 15 | on you, because it's the assumption you have been asked |
| 16 | I have looked at the facts on this issue it does seem | 16 | to make and, Mr Bishop, you quite rightly corrected me |
| 17 | that there is some support for that, but I am not taking | 17 | saying you don't make that assumption. I wonder though |
| 18 | it any further than that. | 18 | whether you would like to come back on the various |
| 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: Let me make perhaps three points clear and in | 19 | points we have been discussing with Mr Parker. |
| 20 | a sense I am slightly signalling beyond you, gentlemen, | 20 | MR BISHOP: Yes, I think it's really important whether I am |
| 21 | in the front row to the assembled masses of lawyers | 21 | here as an economist or as a lawyer, and I am here |
| 22 | behind you. | 22 | obviously as an economist, having a dominant position in |
| 23 | There isn't the slightest suggestion of criticism | 23 | and of itself is not a problem and we are here to |
| 24 | that you have been asked to assume and have assumed | 24 | assess: what is the impact of the entry of OnTheMarket |
| 25 | dominance. I suppose where I am coming from is that | 25 | with the OOP rule? And according to Mr Parker's theory |
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| 1 | either the issue of dominance matters, in which case | 1 | of harm that entry with the OOP rule is anti-competitive |
| 2 | I am slightly uncomfortable in following an assumption | 2 | because it enhances Rightmove's pricing power. |
| 3 | rather than making a finding of fact, or it doesn't | 3 | Now, I would say it's kind of -- I'm indifferent |
| 4 | matter because what we are looking at is not so much | 4 | about whether that's enhancing Rightmove's pricing power |
| 5 | a question of Rightmove's subjective dominance, nor | 5 | relative to whether it is a competitive level or |
| 6 | still less are we looking at any question of abuse. | 6 | a dominant level. The real issue is about whether it is |
| 7 | What we are asking ourselves is: what is the effect in | 7 | enhancing the pricing power relative to where Rightmove |
| 8 | this market where yes, Rightmove clearly is the biggest | 8 | was prior to that entry. |
| 9 | player? What is the effect of Agents' Mutual's entry in | 9 | I think it would be remiss in the economic analysis |
| 10 | terms of the prices that Rightmove and to an extent | 10 | if we just start using -- inserting a legal analysis |
| 11 | Zoopla were able to charge to the market? | 11 | which says: Rightmove is dominant, Zoopla is weakened, |
| 12 | Now, if that is the question, and the finding of | 12 | therefore we can jump immediately to a weakening of the |
| 13 | dominance is something which we may or may not choose to | 13 | number 2, it must inevitably lead to enhanced pricing |
| 14 | make at the end of the day, then I am very happy. But | 14 | power on the part of Rightmove. I think that that is |
| 15 | if on the other hand the analysis starts by saying: yes, | 15 | the key area of disagreement between us and that is |
| 16 | it is important to the analysis that Rightmove are | 16 | a legal analysis, not an economic analysis. |
| 17 | dominant and you need to see the data in the light of | 17 | MR FREEMAN: Can I just be clear: you are definitely here as |
| 18 | that finding of fact, then speaking entirely for myself | 18 | an economist? |
| 19 | I am slightly uncomfortable about being asked to assume | 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, absolutely. |
| 20 | that fact. | 20 | MR FREEMAN: You should put the legal labels out of your |
| 21 | So I suppose what I am seeking is a sense of where | 21 | mind really. I understand what you are saying about the |
| 22 | dominance fits into the analysis and I appreciate we | 22 | disagreement between you being over the effect of |
| 23 | have not heard yet from Mr Bishop but I think, | 23 | OnTheMarket's entry with its OOP rule on the ability to |
| 24 | Mr Parker, you are agreeing, but tell me if I am wrong, | 24 | raise prices. But the ability to raise prices is |
| 25 | that whilst "dominance" may be a convenient label it is | 25 | a function, it may be even sort of the visible sign of |
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| 1 | market power, and are you saying that the level of | 1 | MR FREEMAN: Could you tell us what a duopoly is? A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Rightmove's market power at the time of entry is | 2 | two-person oligopoly or a two-person monopoly? |
| 3 | irrelevant to your assessment of whether it is enhanced | 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: We'll rise for five minutes for the shorthand |
| 4 | by the entry or not? Does the starting point make | 4 | writers. |
| 5 | a difference? | 5 | ( 3.30 pm ) |
| 6 | MR BISHOP: Not in my view, no. | 6 | (A short break) |
| 7 | MR FREEMAN: So you are willing to take Rightmove as having | 7 | ( 3.40 pm ) |
| 8 | whatever market power it has and then you look at what | 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, so I think beginning again with |
| 9 | the change is? | 9 | Mr Parker, we'll have your two minutes' view on the |
| 10 | MR BISHOP: Yes: has the new entry, together with the OOP | 10 | relationship between Rightmove and Zoopla. |
| 11 | rule, enhanced Rightmove's pricing power? | 11 | MR PARKER: So I think the easiest way to maybe get into |
| 12 | MR FREEMAN: Can you do that without taking a view on what | 12 | this is to think about how competition takes place |
| 13 | its, then current level of market power was? | 13 | between property portals, following on from something |
| 14 | MR BISHOP: I believe you can, yes. Because then what it is | 14 | that Mr Bishop said, and also perhaps if I can take you |
| 15 | is the -- ultimately you have pre-merger, you have | 15 | to page 43 of my second report. So the agents in this |
| 16 | Rightmove subject to a competitive constraint from | 16 | case are paying, the question is how much they are |
| 17 | Zoopla, whatever that is. Then the question is: how | 17 | paying for a property portal and what is the nature of |
| 18 | does the entry of OnTheMarket with the OOP rule alter, | 18 | competition between property portals as experienced by |
| 19 | change Zoopla's competitive constraint on Rightmove or | 19 | the agent? |
| 20 | indeed, actually to be more precise, what are the | 20 | What you have is the level of competition between |
| 21 | overall competitive constraints operating on Rightmove's | 21 | property portals is in my view determined by the overlap |
| 22 | pricing, pre-entry and post-entry and how are those | 22 | between their house-hunter basis from the agents' side, |
| 23 | changing? | 23 | and actually when we come to look at it later between |
| 24 | MR FREEMAN: Okay. | 24 | the agent basis and the house-hunter side. So what I |
| 25 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Parker, do you want to have a final word | 25 | care about as an agent is what house-hunters I can get |
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| 1 | on that? | 1 | from looking at a property portal and the listing fee or |
| 2 | MR PARKER: No. | 2 | the overall price I pay, and then what I care about as |
| 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: No. What we will do is we'll rise but as | 3 | a house-hunter is the agents on the property portal and |
| 4 | a special treat give you a sneak preview of what we are | 4 | other value added services that that portal might |
| 5 | going into next so you can think about how to put your | 5 | provide. Put the house-hunters to one side for now |
| 6 | answers more pithily. What we want to discuss at | 6 | because we are talking about from the agents' |
| 7 | a fairly high level of generality, because we will be | 7 | perspective. |
| 8 | coming back to it, is the nature of the relationship | 8 | Mr Bishop rightly pointed out that if one portal has |
| 9 | between Rightmove and Zoopla, again leaving OnTheMarket | 9 | access to a unique group of house-hunters, a totally |
| 10 | out of account for the moment. Because, as Mr Parker | 10 | unique separate group of house-hunters and the other |
| 11 | has certainly flagged, we have heard an awful lot of | 11 | property portal has another unique and different group |
| 12 | mention of duopolies in the evidence and I for one am | 12 | of house-hunters, then essentially these are two totally |
| 13 | not inclined to attach any particular meaning, or at | 13 | separate routes to market. They are both, if you like, |
| 14 | least no single meaning to the way in which the | 14 | monopolists over their customer bases. So in that world |
| 15 | witnesses used that phrase. | 15 | each property portal can charge the sort of value that |
| 16 | But I would be grateful if you could set out in | 16 | it has inherent in its customer base and there isn't |
| 17 | fairly short order what you consider the relationship | 17 | really competition between them. |
| 18 | between Rightmove and Zoopla to be, what you understand | 18 | So now let's go to the other extreme. Now we have |
| 19 | the duopoly relationship, if it is such a thing, to be | 19 | exactly the same house-hunter base available on each |
| 20 | and whether in contrast you consider that Zoopla acts as | 20 | portal. In that world, competition between the portals |
| 21 | a constraint on Rightmove or not. That is a package of | 21 | is extremely strong because if one portal tries to |
| 22 | questions. Obviously we will be coming back to that but | 22 | charge me more than the other portal I will just list on |
| 23 | it will be very interesting to have a sense of where you | 23 | the second portal. I can get access to all of the |
| 24 | differ because this is I think one of the critical | 24 | house-hunters, the agents can trade off those two |
| 25 | points. | 25 | portals against each other. They are perfect |
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| 1 | substitutes, the prices fall to marginal cost, which in | 1 | this stuff in the middle where they are substitutes. So |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | this case is essentially zero because these are not | 2 | I think there has been quite a lot of discussion around |
| 3 | really marginal cost businesses, they are fixed cost | 3 | whether the existence of multi-listing means that two |
| 4 | businesses, at least in respect of many individual | 4 | firms in this type of market are not competing. I don't |
| 5 | agents. Marginal costs of dealing with an agent are | 5 | think that's the case at all. I think it's the level |
| 6 | very small compared to the costs of running the website, | 6 | of -- the fact that people multi-list is merely, if you |
| 7 | the costs of doing the marketing and so on. | 7 | like, a corollary of the fact that they both have to |
| 8 | MR FREEMAN: So no agents' fees, no listing fees. | 8 | some extent unique customer bases but they also are at |
| 9 | MR PARKER: No listing fees in that world but that is not an | 9 | least partial and maybe increasing substitutes as far as |
| 10 | equilibrium, unfortunately, because -- the ideal outcome | 10 | the overlapping customer base goes. |
| 11 | for agents but the problem is no money, no marketing, no | 11 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Before we move over to Mr Bishop, |
| 12 | IT cost being covered, you can't have -- one of the | 12 | can I ask you two factual questions relating to the data |
| 13 | portals will go out of business. It is probably | 13 | you have looked at. |
| 14 | a chicken game as to which of them goes out of business | 14 | The first one is we obviously have a finite number |
| 15 | but one of them goes out of business and you are left | 15 | of properties being listed in the United Kingdom, let us |
| 16 | with one portal. | 16 | say for sake of argument. Excluding idiosyncrasies like |
| 17 | So these are the two extremes, two total | 17 | Northern Ireland is it the case that if you take all of |
| 18 | monopolists, two identical portals, but we have seen | 18 | the properties listed on Rightmove and all of the |
| 19 | that that is not an equilibrium. So instead we have | 19 | properties listed on Zoopla you will have the totality |
| 20 | a range of intermediate scenarios where there is one | 20 | of listings in our UK minus Northern Ireland market? |
| 21 | intermediate scenario you have a set of unique customers | 21 | MR PARKER: So putting Northern Ireland on one side, because |
| 22 | for this portal, let us call it Rightmove because it is | 22 | I haven't looked at that, as far as I know the best |
| 23 | on my right, so I am going to try and remember that, and | 23 | evidence available on this is in figure 13 of my first |
| 24 | a set of unique customers for Zoopla and then you have | 24 | report which is on page 65. So just to be clear how to |
| 25 | some substitute customers, and what you will see is the | 25 | interpret this figure, which is by the way also the data |
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| 1 | unique customers for Rightmove are now a smaller set and | 1 | that was provided to you in response to a data request. |
| 2 | the unique customers for Zoopla are a smaller set. | 2 | The top big circle is Zoopla, the bottom big circle is |
| 3 | Rightmove, its selling point to the agents is: these | 3 | Rightmove and the two little separate circles are OTM. |
| 4 | are people you can get on me that you can't get anywhere | 4 | So Zoopla has 2,307 agent branches that are only listing |
| 5 | else. They provide additional value over what you can | 5 | on Zoopla, 9,817 that are listing on Zoopla and |
| 6 | get on Zoopla so Rightmove will be able to say: "Well, | 6 | Rightmove, and 578 that are listing on Zoopla and OTM. |
| 7 | here's what I can offer and let's do a deal that is | 7 | That's an estimated figure. We will come to that but |
| 8 | worth you coming on the portal and accessing these | 8 | these are all I think ballpark figures. |
| 9 | customers so that you get some surplus but I also get | 9 | Rightmove similarly, 9,817 listing on Zoopla, 3,020 |
| 10 | some surplus because I'm providing you with some value | 10 | that are listing on Rightmove alone and then 5,201 that |
| 11 | and we share that". That's the sort of trade. | 11 | are listing on Rightmove and on OTM. |
| 12 | Then the same thing happens for Zoopla. Zoopla has | 12 | To the best of my knowledge, I am not aware of any |
| 13 | some unique customers as well and what you would expect | 13 | estate agents that are listing on OTM alone, so |
| 14 | to see is Zoopla would do a deal with an agent: "Come | 14 | therefore there doesn't seem to be any property to my |
| 15 | and list on my portal. I will charge you X amount. | 15 | knowledge that is being listed just on OnTheMarket. |
| 16 | Because I have some unique customers, you can't get them | 16 | I think Mr Springett said there may be isolated |
| 17 | elsewhere". But the competitiveness between them is | 17 | examples. I think there was one comment, a sort of |
| 18 | driven by the overlap. | 18 | testimonial from an estate agent in the disclosure that |
| 19 | Now, in that world what you are likely to get is | 19 | that estate agent in, I think it may have been Wootton |
| 20 | a lot of multi-listing because these are part | 20 | had come off both. I don't know whether that still |
| 21 | complement, part substitute. They are separate routes | 21 | remains the case, but I think we are in the world of |
| 22 | to market and provide you with to some extent a new and | 22 | exceptions to rules here. I think the vast majority of |
| 23 | additional customer base. You would expect to find | 23 | properties are available, the overwhelming majority on |
| 24 | people listing on both but that doesn't mean that they | 24 | Rightmove or Zoopla and it is not clear that there is -- |
| 25 | are not competing. They are competing because of all | 25 | MR FREEMAN: So if an agent lists, it lists all its |
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| 1 | properties? | 1 | of around about October 2015 where they were starting to |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR PARKER: In GB that is right because of the -- | 2 | try and target agents on one other portal, who were only |
| 3 | MR FREEMAN: Leaving aside Northern Ireland. | 3 | listing on one other portal, ie only Zoopla or only |
| 4 | MR PARKER: -- nature of the branch-based fee | 4 | Rightmove, because they felt that the unattractive |
| 5 | THE CHAIRMAN: And so if one were in this diagram to map in | 5 | aspects of the One Other Portal rule in terms of forcing |
| 6 | the various other portals that I have very rudely called | 6 | people to come off the portal might be mitigated |
| 7 | insignificant or not material, they would appear within | 7 | somewhat if they focused on attracting people who were |
| 8 | the two overlapping circles you have drawn and wouldn't | 8 | already only on one portal. |
| 9 | to your knowledge appear in the yellow area outside the | 9 | So those data of October 2015, I have tried to match |
| 10 | two circles? | 10 | that with the OTM total number for around |
| 11 | MR PARKER: To the best of my knowledge and to the extent that they are, if you like, standard residential type | 11 | about October 15. I have applied a 90/10 split between |
| 12 |  | 12 | those agencies that remain on Rightmove and those that |
| 13 | properties. I mean, there may be exceptions for farms | 13 | remain on Zoopla within OTM and then I have tried to |
| 14 | and industrial and commercial property but those are | 14 | make these all add up to what Rightmove and Zoopla think |
| 15 | very much separate to what we are talking about here. | 15 | are their total agent numbers at the relevant time |
| 16 | So yes, as far as I know the Rightmove and Zoopla | 16 | periods. |
| 17 | portals cover the universe of properties to a very large | 17 | Now, that process doesn't come up with exact numbers |
| 18 | extent. | 18 | that are precise, that precisely match up but I think as |
| 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: The way you have analysed overlap, and of | 19 | a general representation of the basic picture I think |
| 20 | course I see why you are doing that, by reference to | 20 | this is correct or reasonably correct. |
| 21 | agents that are common or not common to the two | 21 | THE CHAIRMAN: Of the picture whilst OTM was on the market? |
| 22 | providers, Zoopla and Rightmove, that's because they | 22 | MR PARKER: Yes. |
| 23 | list all of their properties and so focusing on an | 23 | THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, that was a joke I didn't intend. Of |
| 24 | agency head is, you would say, the best way of defining | 24 | course, I think you would agree that it would be nice |
| 25 | overlap because we don't I think have any data regarding | 25 | but I see from the data you have provided on our |
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| 1 | analysis of individual properties that are listed on the various sites, not surprisingly. | spreadsheet, it is the category of "would be nice but we |  |
| 2 |  | can't have" by annual figures showing how this overlap |  |
| 3 | MR PARKER: Yes, that's right. I think agents are probably | 3 | evolved. It would be very helpful if we had on |
| 4 | -- they are a good proxy for properties. Having looked | 4 | a regular basis the agents, as it were, within each |
| 5 |  | 5 | circle, Zoopla and Rightmove and the overlap because |
| 6 | in Zoopla's property base and the decline in its agent | 6 | that might give us a further tool to analyse the data we |
| 7 | base following the entry of OTM were very similar in | 7 | do have in terms of prices. But all we can do, I think, |
| 8 | terms of proportions, so that gave me comfort that | 8 | is note what you very fairly said is a collocation of |
| 9 | looking at agents was a good proxy for properties and | 9 the information that is available to you and we will |  |
| 10 | then, as you say, sir, the fact that agents will be | 10 | have to treat it for what it is worth. |
| 11 | listing all their properties by virtue of the structure | 11 | MR PARKER: I think this is the best that there is. |
| 12 | of the fee, looking at agencies is probably sensible and | 12 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr Parker, that was very helpful. Mr Bishop? If I can give particular |
| 13 | the data we have on agents is a bit better as well. | 13 |  |
| 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I recall you have provided us with more data because figure 13 is at a particular point in time. | 14 | congratulations for not mentioning "duopoly" once in the |
| 15 |  | 15 | course of your explanation, thank you. |
| 16 | It is a snapshot, isn't it? | 16 | MR FREEMAN: It will come. |
| 17 | MR PARKER: It is, but I don't think we have within this | 17 | MR BISHOP: I think Mr Parker's description of the |
| 18 | process better data and I wouldn't go so far as to say | 18 | competition between the two portals was very clear but |
| 19 | that it is a snapshot -- I wouldn't go as far as to say | 19 | I think again here is the big point of disagreement between us because he talked about where the two portals |
| 20 | it is a snapshot at a particular point in time. I have | 20 |  |
| 21 | had to pull together data from somewhat different | 21 | have an overlap audience, but what he didn't then go on |
| 22 | sources because we don't have -- | 22 | to talk about was: well, what does that mean for the |
| 23 | MR FREEMAN: So it is a collage, is it, of snapshots? | 23 | extent of price competition between those two portals? |
| 24 | MR PARKER: It is a bit of a collage, exactly. Yes, so the data, the 2,307 figure is from an OnTheMarket document | 2425 | And I think we can distinguish between two situations. <br> The first one is where an estate agent is only going |
| 25 |  |  |  |
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| 1 | to choose to list on one of those portals and then you | 1 | -- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | can see that there is likely to be direct price | 2 | MR FREEMAN: Can you say that again? You think it is not |
| 3 | competition between the two portals because one will | 3 | about threats. |
| 4 | choose whichever value is the best. | 4 | MR PARKER: I think it is about threats but it is not |
| 5 | But where an estate agent is choosing to list on | 5 | really -- there is not that much actual switching. |
| 6 | both portals, then even where there is an overlap in | 6 | MR FREEMAN: You had better get the transcript changed. |
| 7 | a common audience there is also a situation where each | 7 | MR PARKER: It is about the threat. But I wouldn't expect |
| 8 | is providing access to a unique audience and as | 8 | there to be much actual switching. |
| 9 | Mr Parker put it, each portal will essentially have | 9 | MR FREEMAN: Would you expect there to be evidence of |
| 10 | a monopoly over access to that unique group. So to the | 10 | threats or is the threat a purely theoretical construct? |
| 11 | extent that estate agents think for whatever reason that | 11 | Does threat mean the possibility in the portal's mind |
| 12 | they need to list on both, then the competition between | 12 | that the agent might switch? |
| 13 | Rightmove and Zoopla in terms of price competition prior | 13 | MR PARKER: I think that's what restricts -- |
| 14 | to the entry of OTM would have been limited. | 14 | MR FREEMAN: So far as a portal has a mind. |
| 15 | MR FREEMAN: Do you mean by that a threat to switch from one | 15 | MR PARKER: Let's go back to this because I think this |
| 16 | to the other wouldn't be credible because the portal | 16 | potentially might help. What we are talking about is |
| 17 | would know that it has a unique audience that that agent | 17 | here we have our two monopolists, totally separate |
| 18 | needs? Is that what you are saying? | 18 | customer bases. Now we have a world where there is |
| 19 | MR BISHOP: Exactly, and there's also no incentive for | 19 | a little bit of overlap but they still have an awful lot |
| 20 | Zoopla to cut its price in order to try and attract | 20 | of unique customers. So at that point Zoopla can charge |
| 21 | customers away from Rightmove because what it is | 21 | for a very large number of customers, that is very |
| 22 | offering is a value and obviously it makes a difference | 22 | attractive, Rightmove can charge for a very large number |
| 23 | on how big that unique audience is for both Rightmove | 23 | of customers, it is very attractive. |
| 24 | and for Zoopla. And in the figure 12A that Mr Parker | 24 | As we gradually increase the level of overlap, here |
| 25 | pointed to, if they can get to a situation where there | 25 | we are still in a world where both have some unique |
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| 1 | is no overlap then there are two firms with their | 1 | customers but Rightmove only has control of a small |
| 2 | completely independent demands, then there is no price | 2 | number of unique customers because all the other of its |
| 3 | competition between them at all on the assumption that | 3 | customers can be got on Zoopla, and similarly Zoopla. |
| 4 | the estate agent needs to list on both. | 4 | So here prices will be much cheaper because there is |
| 5 | I entirely accept that if estate agents are only | 5 | much less unique -- there is much less differentiation |
| 6 | choosing one or the other, then there would be direct | 6 | between the two. There is much more overlap. |
| 7 | price competition and that is what -- but the question | 7 | So the level of competition is determined by the |
| 8 | is: how important is that in the overall size of the | 8 | level of overlap. Here I would still expect there to be |
| 9 | market? | 9 | multi-listing in very large degrees because both of the |
| 10 | MR FREEMAN: Do we have any information or data on switching | 10 | channels, they are a somewhat separate route to |
| 11 | behaviour, including threats to switch other than | 11 | marketing but because there is a lot of overlap between |
| 12 | theoretical ideas about how this might occur? | 12 | them it is a lot more competitive, a lot more |
| 13 | MR BISHOP: I have no -- | 13 | competition. |
| 14 | MR FREEMAN: I am sticking with Mr Bishop to start with. | 14 | Another way to think about this is portals are a bit |
| 15 | MR BISHOP: No, I have no data. | 15 | like supermarkets in this case. They are supermarkets |
| 16 | MR FREEMAN: Mr Parker, you are the data man. | 16 | for estate agents. Let us imagine we had two |
| 17 | MR PARKER: There isn't data but I would like to comment on | 17 | supermarkets. |
| 18 | Mr Bishop's approach to thinking about competition. | 18 | MR FREEMAN: An industry you know a little bit about, |
| 19 | I disagree with the way he presents it. So -- | 19 | Mr Parker. |
| 20 | MR FREEMAN: But we don't actually know how estate agents | 20 | MR PARKER: An industry which I think both of us know |
| 21 | switch or threaten to switch from one portal to the | 21 | a little about. Many people in this room know something |
| 22 | other between these two portals? | 22 | about supermarkets. |
| 23 | MR PARKER: I think it is very clear. I think it is not | 23 | What you have is you have Sainsbury, you have Asda, |
| 24 | about threats to -- I think it is entirely about threats | 24 | and they have very much overlapping customer bases, but |
| 25 | to switch but very little is about actually switching so | 25 | they also have slightly unique customer bases and what |
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|  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | you find is that your suppliers want to list on all the | 1 |
| 2 | different supermarkets. So Kellogg's, for example, will | 2 |
| 3 | be wanting to list cornflakes in Sainsbury's and Asda | 3 |
| 4 | and Tesco and Morrison's and corner shops and Budgens | 4 |
| 5 | and a whole range of stores because it wants to get very | 5 |
| 6 | wide access. But in a world where there was -- and you | 6 |
| 7 | don't really see actual switching. So you don't see | 7 |
| 8 | Kellogg's taking its products off the shelves very often | 8 |
| 9 | to try and get a better deal out of a supplier. | 9 |
| 10 | That all goes on within the negotiation. There is | 10 |
| 11 | a threat there and you can imagine a world where if | 11 |
| 12 | there was only one supermarket and there was no threat | 12 |
| 13 | that supermarket would be able to get very advantageous | 13 |
| 14 | prices out of its suppliers. If there was another | 14 |
| 15 | supermarket out there who was providing an alternative | 15 |
| 16 | route to market, largely overlapping but with some | 16 |
| 17 | unique customers I would expect the suppliers to list on | 17 |
| 18 | both and I wouldn't expect to see a lot of switching | 18 |
| 19 | between them. And you do occasionally see these | 19 |
| 20 | negotiations break down and there is a debate about the | 20 |
| 21 | additional value that's being provided by a supermarket | 21 |
| 22 | and the additional value, the price that the branded | 22 |
| 23 | supplier is willing to accept. Occasionally you just do | 23 |
| 24 | get this relationship break down but it is so rare as to | 24 |
| 25 | be actually newsworthy and we saw that last year in the | 25 |
|  |  |  |
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debate between Unilever and Tesco which made the news in around about September, I believe it was, and Marmite was one of the brands that was mentioned. But that's newsworthy precisely because it's so rare. You don't see that happening very often. But that doesn't mean that if Tesco is the only game in town that the suppliers wouldn't have a very different experience from negotiating with Tesco than they do given the existence of Asda, Sainsbury, Morrison and so on as alternative routes to market.

So I think it's all about the threat and I wouldn't expect to see that much actual switching.
THE CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr Bishop, before we let you come back on that can I throw another query into the mix which arose out of your answer. So far we have been looking at these overlapping circles without really making any form of hypothesis or assumption regarding the types of agent that are putting the properties in, or indeed the types of property that they are putting in. What I want to explore with you and then perhaps with Mr Parker is how far we ought to have this factor in mind.

Let me explain why I am thinking this. Suppose one has two portals, A and B, and A specialises in or happens to have agents who only put into the portal,
because that's their business, high end properties, so they focus on the million-plus pound properties and portal B is lower priced properties, how its clientele has evolved, and it looks at up to a million in terms of value.
Now, you might find that there were some agents who are in the overlap area -- you know, they are selling properties just above or just below a million and therefore they see an advantage in being in both, but it could be the case that one would have, because of the types of agent or types of property that those agents are putting into the two circles, an overlap that's almost defined by the nature of their business. You might do it on geography as well. You might find portal A is north of England and portal B is south of England and then you have an area where the agents in the middle are effectively obliged because of where they are geographically to deploy in both circles.
It does seem to me that that makes something of a difference in terms of agent choice in that what it is doing is it is really saying that the overlap may be conditioned by agents whose business attracts them to both portals.

I wonder whether that is something which -- I know we don't have the data, but whether that is a fact that
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we ought to be bearing in mind when considering these rather complicated overlaps. Let's start with Mr Bishop. Answer that and indeed come back to what Mr Parker was saying and then we'll let Mr Parker have the last word.
MR BISHOP: To answer that question, it is not one that I have considered but I would think that that's where portals would probably compete in terms of what kind of estate agents to attract and also what kind of visits to that portal. And so it could be that it ends up with one portal that is only ever visited by people who want very expensive properties. I guess in that situation they might need to change their rules about which properties an estate agent wants to list because an estate agent may have over a million pound properties and also under. So I think that would be an issue for a portal but it all goes down to what kind of people they are attracting to that portal in the first place.
Going back to Mr Parker's point his -- I forget, was it Tesco's and Marmite, that is a negotiation between Tesco's and Marmite over the value of listing, and I think the same applies here. If I am a monopoly and I have a unique group of customers and that's worth 10 to an estate agent, I can charge that estate agent 10. If it folds in half and I only have a unique audience of

| 1 | 5 and that's only worth 5 to an estate agent I can | 1 | content of the properties in the portal but it might be |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | charge 5. | 2 | a range of other factors as well. It depends on |
| 3 | That is a situation where I'm a monopolist going | 3 | subjectively what that group of people is attracted to. |
| 4 | from offering a value of 10 , I extract 10 , to | 4 | MR BISHOP: Correct. |
| 5 | a situation where I'm only offering a value of 5, I can | 5 | THE CHAIRMAN: And so -- this is a slightly absurd |
| 6 | extract 5. But this distinction between offering | 6 | example -- if one had a situation where one portal was |
| 7 | a unique audience of 10 going down to 5 is exactly the | 7 | so attractive in terms of dynamic and user |
| 8 | same as if there is a portal offering common ownership | 8 | attractiveness but over time the content overlapped with |
| 9 | but the amount that I can extract for my unique audience | 9 | another, but the attractiveness was so great that the |
| 10 | is the same and it is not a threat of switching to the | 10 | audience continued coming to that portal, then on that |
| 11 | other portal which gets that, it is just the overall | 11 | hypothesis the estate agent would be paying the same |
| 12 | value which I am offering has gone down. It is not | 12 | even though there was 100 per cent overlap. I know that |
| 13 | a threat of switching between portals which has given | 13 | is an extreme example, but it's a question of what is |
| 14 | rise to that, if you like, price decrease. It is the | 14 | driving the visitors, the house purchasers to the site. |
| 15 | reduction in the value that the portal is offering to | 15 | MR BISHOP: What's driving that is what's available for them |
| 16 | the estate agent, the incremental value. And this is | 16 | to view on the website, the attractiveness, the |
| 17 | a really important point of distinction between us. | 17 | functionality of the website and the degree of marketing |
| 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: I just want to summarise what Mr Bishop is | 18 | which the portal was undertaking to get people to come |
| 19 | saying and then do come in, Mr Parker. So in terms of | 19 | and visit. |
| 20 | the driver of value, the price that the portal owner can | 20 | Now, if I'm lucky enough to get lots of unique |
| 21 | charge you say that the determinant, and let's assume | 21 | visitors, I will have a more valuable service or |
| 22 | that all other things are equal in terms of the quality | 22 | something additional to sell to estate agents relative |
| 23 | of access and the efficiency and things like that, just | 23 | to if everyone I attract is also going to another |
| 24 | looking at what properties one has on the portal, you | 24 | portal. |
| 25 | say that the key measure is the unique properties. | 25 | MR FREEMAN: Do we have any evidence for what makes a viewer |
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| 1 | MR BISHOP: Sorry, the unique audience. | 1 | view a property portal? Is there any survey evidence? |
| 2 | THE CHAIRMAN: I am so sorry. | 2 | Anything more than the theory? |
| 3 | MR BISHOP: It is the unique audience. And Mr Parker's | 3 | MR PARKER: We may be jumping into issues you want to come |
| 4 | original situation where you have two portals and if you | 4 | tomorrow but I think we have quite a lot of evidence |
| 5 | assume that they are all offering all properties, so | 5 | from the factual witnesses who run property portals that |
| 6 | they are both operating with the same properties but | 6 | its properties, its marketing, its valued added |
| 7 | portal A has 100 unique visitors and portal B has 100 | 7 | features -- |
| 8 | unique visitors and assume that's the total market, | 8 | MR FREEMAN: There is no survey of portal viewer attitudes |
| 9 | then, as Mr Parker said, and I agree with him, you have | 9 | we can refer to? Property portal viewer attitudes? |
| 10 | essentially got two independent portals. There is no | 10 | MR PARKER: I don't think so. But there is very strong |
| 11 | price competition between them. | 11 | evidence I think or strong views expressed by lots of |
| 12 | My view is what I'm arguing, and this is the point | 12 | people that properties matter. So marketing matters and |
| 13 | of disagreement, where as that overlap comes up yes, the | 13 | value added features matter and the functionality of the |
| 14 | overall value which the portals can extract will go down | 14 | website matters too. |
| 15 | but that's driven by the overlap in the audience, not | 15 | THE CHAIRMAN: But you have also been provided, the two of |
| 16 | through direct price competition -- | 16 | you, with a certain amount of data on audience overlap |
| 17 | MR FREEMAN: Overlap meaning smaller unique audience? | 17 | from, is it Nielsen Netview? |
| 18 | MR BISHOP: It is a smaller unique audience. So I am | 18 | MR PARKER: Yes. |
| 19 | delivering lower incremental value to the estate agent. | 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: Again, Mr Parker, we will be coming back to |
| 20 | MR FREEMAN: Right. | 20 | you, but Mr Bishop you will be suggesting that that |
| 21 | MR BISHOP: And therefore I can extract less from it. | 21 | overlap or lack of overlap is something that we ought to |
| 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: This is very helpful because it is entirely | 22 | be paying quite a lot of heed to. Would that be a fair |
| 23 | my fault, I hadn't quite grasped that aspect of what you | 23 | comment? |
| 24 | are saying. So what drives or causes an audience to | 24 | MR BISHOP: That is a fair comment and it is related to the |
| 25 | stick to one portal rather than another may be the | 25 | fact that many agents, estate agents are multi-listing. |
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| 1 | If they weren't multi-listing, then you would expect to | 1 | because you then get increased overlap and what |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | see direct price competition between the two portals on | 2 | Mr Bishop then says is quite right, if there is |
| 3 | the assumption they were only going to list on one. But | 3 | a reduction in the uniqueness of the house-hunter base, |
| 4 | if they are going to list on both, then the price they | 4 | that is price competition. That's how price competition |
| 5 | end up paying on each portal will be driven by the | 5 | emerges, because of a threat of coming off Rightmove. |
| 6 | incremental value of each portal which is determined by | 6 | Here the threat of coming off Rightmove is you lose |
| 7 | their unique audience. | 7 | everything. Here the threat of coming off Rightmove is, |
| 8 | MR FREEMAN: What's your answer to Mr Parker's supermarket | 8 | I keep these because I can get those on Zoopla. That's |
| 9 | analogy that all the food companies are multi-listing? | 9 | why Rightmove's price has gone down so it is all about |
| 10 | MR BISHOP: Well, fortunately I don't have that much | 10 | the threat, the overlap. |
| 11 | experience of the supermarket industry. I mean, | 11 | MR BISHOP: But it is not a threat in terms of Zoopla |
| 12 | whether Marmite listed or not wasn't a threat of | 12 | threatening to undercut Rightmove's prices. It is all |
| 13 | switching. It was just a negotiation with Tesco's over | 13 | driven by the extent of the overlap in the viewing |
| 14 | the terms of trade. | 14 | audience. So I am agreeing, I think, Mr Parker's |
| 15 | MR FREEMAN: It was a threat of withdrawal. | 15 | articulation apart from the last bit was spot on. There |
| 16 | MR BISHOP: Yes, and it is the same here. I'm an estate | 16 | is competition between Zoopla and Rightmove to attract |
| 17 | agent, I want to list on your property portal. You are | 17 | more and more unique viewers because that's what they |
| 18 | putting forward a price. It's kind of, do I think that | 18 | can extract the value from, but there is not direct |
| 19 | that makes it worthwhile or not to pull off or accept | 19 | price competition in terms of saying: "Come to me, I'll |
| 20 | it? It is not the threat I'm going to switch to another | 20 | undercut whatever Rightmove's offering," and vice versa |
| 21 | portal. | 21 | where they are multi-listing. If they are not |
| 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Parker, do come back on that. | 22 | multi-listing then there will be direct price |
| 23 | MR PARKER: I do think that Mr Bishop's conclusion is | 23 | competition. |
| 24 | entirely wrong. Your threat to withdraw from listing on | 24 | MR PARKER: I think the whole multi-listing single issue |
| 25 | a portal and the economics of negotiation is all about, | 25 | thing is a red herring actually because you either |
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| 1 | what's my next best alternative? So it is all about | 1 | choose to multi-list and if you multi-list then you list |
| 2 | Zoopla, Rightmove, here we are, if I come off Rightmove, | 2 | on Rightmove and you pay up to 5 and you list on Zoopla |
| 3 | then what can I still get on Zoopla? And if I come off | 3 | and you pay up to 5 and your threat of coming off |
| 4 | Zoopla, what do I still get on Rightmove? That's what | 4 | Rightmove is that you just stay on Zoopla. So now I am |
| 5 | determines the outcomes of the negotiations. | 5 | in a world where I am deciding: should I be on Rightmove |
| 6 | So when Mr Bishop says, well, here I have got 10 and | 6 | or should I be on Zoopla? If I decide not to be on |
| 7 | here I have got 10 and they can both charge 10. When we | 7 | Rightmove, I choose to be on Zoopla, that is exactly the |
| 8 | put them together and now this one's got 5 , it can | 8 | same threat. So whether you choose to multi-list or not |
| 9 | charge 5 and this one has got 5 and it can charge 5, you | 9 | is whether you decide that listing on a further route to |
| 10 | can list on both now for 10 . Whereas here you can list | 10 | market provides you with more surplus than not listing |
| 11 | on both here for 20. | 11 | on that further route to market. But I think whether |
| 12 | So, if you like, competition takes place for this | 12 | you single list or multi-list is actually totally |
| 13 | person trying to expand their unique house-hunter base | 13 | irrelevant. |
| 14 | and get more value into their portal and this person is | 14 | I think it is looking at this through the wrong end |
| 15 | also trying to do the same and what happens is by trying | 15 | of the telescope. What this says is: you will end up |
| 16 | to attract users they end up attracting them from each | 16 | single listing where there is perfect overlap. Where |
| 17 | other. | 17 | you have perfect overlap single listing, where you have |
| 18 | So that new users into the market or users who had | 18 | some level of uniqueness, you won't. But that's to |
| 19 | previously used Rightmove and Zoopla will be trying to | 19 | mistake -- what's driving single listing is perfect |
| 20 | attract them to just use Zoopla and to try and get more | 20 | overlap. If you get perfect overlap you get single |
| 21 | unique users. So competition is driving them to try and | 21 | listing but the competition and the threat is all about |
| 22 | attract house-hunters on to the portal because then they | 22 | the overlap. It is not about the single listing. That |
| 23 | can charge more but that process of attracting | 23 | is an outcome. |
| 24 | house-hunters is going on in both directions and that | 24 | THE CHAIRMAN: Can I try and unpick it here. I think, but |
| 25 | potentially is what is driving increased competition | 25 | perhaps both of you could correct me if I am wrong, that |
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| 1 | you see that the driver of what the portal can charge to | 1 | even better properties, more and better or different |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the estate agent turns on the amount of audience that | 2 | properties, or you need some other differentiated |
| 3 | they can attract that is in particular unique. Do you | 3 | proposition that will attract house-hunters to you in |
| 4 | both agree with that? | 4 | addition to them going to the existing property portal. |
| 5 | MR PARKER: Yes. | 5 | So the discussion around Zoopla's entry strategy was it |
| 6 | MR BISHOP: Yes. | 6 | started by essentially being a provider of property |
| 7 | THE CHAIRMAN: So what are we to make of this: if we have | 7 | information, getting potentially house-hunters but |
| 8 | a situation where the portals are both, let us assume, | 8 | people to visit its website to get information about |
| 9 | listing exactly the same properties and yet the audience | 9 | property, not listings at that stage, information about |
| 10 | is enjoying the experience of accessing both? In other | 10 | property, and then it started acquiring property |
| 11 | words, you have not merely a high overlap of properties | 11 | portals. Having already built up a customer base that |
| 12 | but a very high overlap of audience. You would expect | 12 | people were coming to, it was then attracting people to |
| 13 | the price to fall but in a sense what the audience | 13 | the package of listings and some value added features. |
| 14 | overlap is telling you is that there is actually a value | 14 | It had this valuation tool which provided other |
| 15 | being attributed to the same properties being listed in | 15 | information about the local area and so on. |
| 16 | two different places. Is that a factor that I really | 16 | So the competition between the property portals, on |
| 17 | ought to be dismissing from my mind as just slightly | 17 | the house-hunter side you are trying to attract as many |
| 18 | strange or is there value in the fact that there are the | 18 | house-hunters as possible. If you offer |
| 19 | same properties listed in different ways to the same | 19 | a differentiated proposition from the other offers in |
| 20 | people? | 20 | the market, whether that is by offering different |
| 21 | MR PARKER: Value for whom? Shall I start? I am not quite | 21 | properties or other different features, then |
| 22 | sure who is -- | 22 | house-hunters might look at your site as well as the |
| 23 | THE CHAIRMAN: It was directed to both of you but do start, | 23 | site of the other portal because they'll go to one |
| 24 | Mr Parker. I am talking I suppose in terms of value, | 24 | portal for lots of property and go to another portal for |
| 25 | I think what we are -- we will proceed on the basis that | 25 | something more specific. |
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| 1 | if the audience, that is to say the property purchaser, | 1 | So if you like, because the house-hunter doesn't pay |
| 2 | sees value in a listing then the portal will be able to | 2 | you have to offer them something different, which goes |
| 3 | extract value from the estate agent. After all, we are | 3 | back to Mr Freeman's comment about to have sellers you |
| 4 | interested in really what drives the dynamic of the | 4 | need to have buyers. You need to get lots of buyers |
| 5 | estate agent's desire to pay, if that answers the | 5 | there. That's what ultimately estate agents want so |
| 6 | question. | 6 | that's what the portals try to give them. |
| 7 | MR PARKER: This is where we start getting properly into our two-sided market. We have been talking very much about one side of the market and why estate agents might pay | 7 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am afraid, Mr Bishop, you are going to be resuming tomorrow. We have to rise now |
| 8 |  | 8 |  |
| 9 |  | 9 | because not least we have another venue to go to. |
| 10 | for house-hunters, access to house-hunters, but we also | 10 | We'll resume at 10 o'clock tomorrow. I am quite |
| 11 | need to look at house-hunters and why might they visit | 11 | conscious that we are suffering from a problem that |
| 12 | portals to then start seeing how these dynamics play | 12 | Mr Harris had. The conversation is so interesting that |
| 13 | through on both sides. | 13 | we are going longer than I think we thought but we will |
| 14 | So as I think we have discussed, house-hunters | 14 | finish at 1 o'clock tomorrow. So 10 o'clock tomorrow. |
| 15 | generally are going to want to see properties. That is | 15 | MR HARRIS: May I make an enquiry, sir. Do you have any |
| 16 | the main reason why they are going to a property portal. | 16 | closer views yet as to who will be going first in terms |
| 17 | More properties will be more attractive than fewer | 17 | of cross-examination? |
| 18 | properties. I think that has to be a common theme | 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am sorry. That is a very fair point. |
| 19 | throughout all of this. | 19 | I think we will stick to the order as was originally |
| 20 | Let's suppose there is a large portal there and they | 20 | adumbrated. That is to say, with Mr Parker going first, |
| 21 | have got all the properties and the house-hunters are | 21 | your expert, and Mr Bishop following, to follow the |
| 22 | already used and habituated to going on that property | 22 | opening submissions. |
| 23 | portal. Well, as a competing property portal how do you | 23 | MR HARRIS: Thank you. |
| 24 | try and compete in that market? How do you try and | 24 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for raising that. I don't need to |
| 25 | attract a customer base? Well, you probably need either | 25 | say it but I will anyway. Don't speak to anyone. |
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DTI

| A | achieve 24:25 27:2 | additional 20:10 | advice 11:7,10 | 186:5,17 187:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| à $159: 15$ | 31:11 54:22 60:21 | 49:23 86:17,17 | 22:10 26:20,23 | 188:12 191:18 |
| Aberdeen 134:17 | 74:22 | 144:17 162:20 | 39:5 41:11 63:21 | 192:11,20 193:14 |
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