

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	14
A. Why Sector-Specific Regulation Rather Than Antitrust Alone?	18
B. A General Summary of What I Intend to Discuss.	20
CHAPTER I: DEFINING “DIGITAL PLATFORMS” AND WHAT CONSTITUTES A “DOMINANT DIGITAL PLATFORM.”	28
A. Developing Standards to Judge the Behavior of Digital Platforms Requires a Working Definition of Digital Platforms.	29
B. Digital Platforms Are Online Multi-Sided Markets With At Least One Market Operating As a Mass Market Open to the General Public.	30
C. Why Do These Features Matter More Than Others?	32
D. A Multi-Role User in a Multi-Sided Market.	34
E. Why These Factors Potentially Create Enduring Market Power in Ways That Challenge Modern Antitrust Analysis.	36
1. The “Attention Marketplace,” While a Useful Concept in Many Ways, Is Not a Useful Concept for Competition Policy.	37
2. The Two-Sided Platform Structure Creates Perfect Information Asymmetry.	40
F. Defining “Dominant” Is Generally Tricky, and It’s Especially Difficult in the World of Digital Platforms.	41
1. Cost of Exclusion from the Platform (COE) Is a Useful Proxy for Determining the Ability to Exercise Market Power — Especially When Traditional Market Definition Is Extremely Difficult or Impossible to Determine.	42
2. How to Compute COE.	43
3. COE Is Extremely Flexible and Focuses on the Central Reason Why We Care About Dominance.	45
CHAPTER II: WHEN IS SECTOR-SPECIFIC REGULATION NECESSARY?	48
A. The Difference Between Antitrust and Sector-Specific Regulation.	48
B. Regulation to Protect the First Amendment and Democracy.	51
C. Regulation to Address Recurring Issues and Ensure Consistency.	53
D. The Doctrine of Public Utility.	54
CHAPTER III: Lessons From The History Of Communications Regulation.	56
A. Digital Platforms Share Many Important Economic and Social Commonalities with Electronic Media and Electronic Communication.	56
B. Two Streams of the Communications Act — Telecommunications and Media.	59
1. Enduring Fundamental Values Drive Communications Regulation.	59
2. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 — The Great Experiment in Regulating Through Competition and Convergence.	62
CHAPTER IV: THE STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE DIGITAL PLATFORM ACT (DPA).	67
A. DPA Title I: Purpose and Public Interest.	67
1. How Statement of Purpose Shapes the Entire Structure of the Statute.	67
2. Specific Statement of Purpose of the DPA.	71
3. Implementation: Creating the Competition Tool Kit.	72
B. Competition Between Platforms and Competition on the Platform.	73
1. Data Portability.	78
2. Open APIs.	81
3. Intellectual Property as “Essential Facility:” FRAND, SEP and Other Types of IP Bottlenecks.	83
4. Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI).	84
i. Distinguish between what the platform needs to know to provide service and what the platform “knows.”	86

ii. Limit the ability to collect information from third-party providers of content or services that use the platform to reach customers.	87
iii. CPNI is a complement to consumer privacy protection, and must be compatible with broader privacy protections.	88
5. Horizontal Caps and Limitations on Vertical Integration — Including Possible Breakups of Existing Platforms.	88
i. What Do “Horizontal Caps” Mean in Cyberspace?	90
ii. Unique Concerns Around Vertical Integration: ICE v. The Black Swan.	93
iii. Vertical Integration Limits.	94
iv. Consideration of Structural/Behavioral Conditions for Both Horizontal and Vertical Acquisitions.	97
v. Divestitures and the Starfish Problem.	99
6. Product Unbundling and Structural Separation.	101
i. Different Gradations of Structural Separation.	101
ii. Structural Separation and Affiliates.	102
7. Nondiscrimination.	105
i. Nondiscrimination versus Common Carriage.	105
ii. Applying These Lessons to Digital Platforms.	108
8. Privacy by Design and Limitations on Use.	116
9. Due Process Rights.	116
C. Enforcement and the Need for Private Rights of Action.	118
CHAPTER V: Competition In The Marketplace of Ideas — Diversity, Censorship, and The Problem of Content Moderation.	119
A. Defining the Problem: Discouraging “Bad” Content While Promoting “Good” Content.	120
B. A Basic Framework for Moderating Harmful Content.....	122
1. Direct Government Regulation of Content and the Confusing Question of First Amendment Standards: Commercial Speech Doctrine, Strict versus Intermediate Scrutiny, Reasonable Time and Space Restrictions, “Intrusiveness,” and Other Mitigating Doctrines.....	123
2. A Checklist for Congress on Content Moderation Laws.	127
i. An Example: Addressing the Problem of Hate Speech on Platforms.	131
3. Platforms as Gatekeepers: Advantages and Problems of Private Censorship; Potential First Amendment Issues.	133
C. “Publisher Liability,” Section 230 and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA).	138
1. History of Section 230 and How It Has Confused the Current Content Moderation Debate.	139
2. Lessons from Existing Content Moderation Regimes: SESTA, DMCA, and NetzDG.	143
i. Impact of SESTA — Simple Civil Liability.	144
ii. DMCA and NetzDG: Notice and Takedown and Safe Harbors.	146
D. Specific Recommendations for Content Moderation Policies Designed to Maximize Effectiveness and Minimize Unintended Consequences.	149
1. Recommendation 1: A Mixed Model of Government Prohibition, Reporting Requirements, and Private Policing with Government Oversight.	149
2. Recommendation 2: Distinguish Between the Broadcast/Many-to-Many Functions and Common Carrier/One-to-One; Distinguish Between Passive Listening and Active Participation; and Limit Penalties Imposed for Off-Platform Conduct.	153
3. Recommendation 3: Determining the Goal of Regulation of Bad Content and Measuring Its Effectiveness.	156

CHAPTER VI: A Basic Framework For Promoting “Good” Content and Exposure to Diverse Sources of News and Viewpoints.	158
A. The Marketplace of Ideas and the “Diversity Principle” In Electronic Media versus the Individual Speaker Right in Common Carriage.	160
B. Specific Recommendations to Promote a Robust Marketplace of Ideas.	164
1. Recommendation 1: The Wobbly Algorithm.	165
2. Recommendation 2: Eliminate Suspect Classifications, or Actively Reverse Them, at Random Intervals.	166
3. Recommendation 3: Encourage Development of New Tools to Identify Reliable Sources of Information.	167
4. Recommendation 4: Use Traditional Safeguards of Structural Regulation to Promote Competition.	169
5. Recommendation 5: Promote News and Media Literacy as a Component of Education.	169
CHAPTER VII: Public Safety, Disability Access, and Consumer Protection.	171
A. Consumer Protection and the Importance of Rulemaking Authority.	171
B. Typical Consumer Harms.	173
C. Harms Uniquely Amplified by The Nature of the Sector.	174
1. Harms Unique to the Nature of the Sector.	176
D. Enforcement Powers and Private Rights of Action.	178
1. Costs to Stakeholders Are Not Irrelevant, but Are Not Determinative and Are Often Over-Exaggerated.	180
E. Application to All Platforms versus Application to Platforms with Market Power.	181
1. Why Sector-Specific Regulation Frequently Distinguishes Between Dominant and Non-Dominant Firms.	182
2. Important Differences Between Regulatory Determinations of Dominance and Antitrust Determination of Dominance.	183
CHAPTER VIII: WHO WILL BELL THE CAT? DESIGNATION OF A FEDERAL OVERSIGHT AGENCY AND CONSIDERATIONS WITH REGARD TO PREEMPTION.	188
A. The FTC: Pro and Con.	190
B. The FCC: Pro and Con.	192
C. The “Digital Platform Commission”: Pro and Con.	194
D. Continued Need for Traditional Antitrust Enforcement and Consumer Protection by Federal and State Agencies.	195
1. The More Complicated Question of Preempting State Law.	198
CONCLUSION	201
BIBLIOGRAPHY/REFERENCES	203