

BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

**REQUEST TO ADD
PRIVATE ADDRESS FORWARDING
TO THE MARKET DOMINANT PRODUCT LIST**

Docket No. MC2013-60

COMMENTS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR POSTAL COMMERCE

Pursuant to Order No. 1858, the Association for Postal Commerce (“PostCom”) hereby submits these comments on Petitioner Sai’s request to add a Private Address Forwarding (“PAF”) product to the Mail Classification Schedule (“MCS”). PostCom urges the Commission to reject the Petitioner’s request.

Rule 3020.50 plainly permits users of the mail to request the addition of a product to the MCS. The language of Rule 3020.50 is identical to Rule 3020.30, which permits the Postal Service to add products to the MCS. Thus, as a threshold matter, the Commission’s rules do not vest sole authority to develop and introduce products in the Postal Service, and Petitioner’s request cannot be denied solely on the basis that the Postal Service is generally provided with discretion to develop new products by 39 U.S.C. § 403(a).

That is not to say, however, that the Postal Service’s views on the appropriateness and feasibility of creating a new product should not be given considerable weight. In fact, the Commission’s rules recognize the need for such deference, as they only permit the Commission to approve the product request without further procedures if the request is consistent with the Postal Service’s position. 39 C.F.R. §3020.55(a); *cf.* 39 C.F.R. §3020.34(a) (permitting the Commission to approve a request initiated by the Postal Service with no similar constraint that

the proposal be consistent with the views of other commenters). As the Postal Service will bear the burden of establishing, offering, and administering the new product, its views on the desirability of the proposed product should be accorded substantial weight.

With respect to the proposed PAF product, the Postal Service has provided compelling reasons for the Commission to reject Petitioner's proposal. PAF is not a variation on an existing product or a new promotion that simply applies well-established principles to a different postal service. Rather, it represents an entirely new method of interfacing with postal customers. As the Postal Service points out, the creation of the PAF product would likely require the creation of new systems for storing records and may require significant modifications to existing equipment and software. *See* Comments of the United States Postal Service in Response to Notice and Order Concerning Request to Add Private Address Forwarding to the Market Dominant Product List (Oct. 16, 2003) at 4-5. It is unreasonable to force the Postal Service to undertake the effort and incur the expense of attempting to resolve the potential legal and operational issues associated with PAF in service of what is likely to be a niche product with undetermined revenue potential.

Accordingly, PostCom urges the Commission to reject Petitioner's request.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew D. Field

Matthew D. Field

Ian D. Volner

Venable LLP

575 7th Street, NW

Washington, DC 20004-1601

idvolner@venable.com

mfield@venable.com

Counsel for Association for Postal Commerce

November 18, 2013