

2014 Agreement through the Annual Compliance Report. *Id.* at 6. The Postal Service also invokes, with respect to service performance measurement reporting under rule 3055.3(a)(3), the standing exception in Order No. 996 for all agreements filed in the Foreign Postal Operators 1 product grouping. *Id.*<sup>5</sup>

**Consistency with applicable statutory criteria.** The Postal Service states that under 39 U.S.C. 3622, the criteria for the Commission's review are whether the 2013 Agreement: (1) Improves the net financial position of the Postal Service or enhances the performance of operational functions; (2) will not cause unreasonable harm to the marketplace; and (3) will be available on public and reasonable terms to similarly situated mailers. *Id.* at 7. The Postal Service states that Part I.A. of its Notice addresses the first two criteria. *Id.* With respect to the third criterion, the Postal Service asserts there are no entities similarly situated to Singapore Post Limited in their ability to tender broad-based Letter Post flows from Singapore under similar operational conditions, nor are there any other entities that serve as a designated operator for Letter Post originating in Singapore. *Id.*

**Functional equivalence.** The Postal Service posits that the 2014 Agreement is functionally equivalent to the Singapore Post Agreements previously included in the product grouping for Foreign Postal Operators 1 because it is very similar to 2013 Agreement (approved by the Commission in Docket No. R2013–8). *Id.* at 8. It states that the main difference is the addition of one sentence to Annex 2. *Id.* The Postal Service observes that the 2013 Agreement was found to be appropriately classified in the Foreign Postal Operators 1 product grouping because it met all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. *Id.* It further states that the 2014 Agreement, like the 2013 Agreement, fits within the Mail Classification Language for the Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreements with Foreign Postal Operators 1, so both therefore conform to a common description. *Id.* The Postal Service also states that the two agreements share a common market and have similar financial models for projection of costs and revenues. *Id.* The Postal Service therefore submits that the 2014 Agreement is functionally equivalent to its predecessor (the 2013 Agreement), and asserts the predecessor

is a logical baseline for purposes of the functional equivalency comparison. *Id.* at 8–9. The Postal Service acknowledges the existence of two differences (the extension to March 31, 2015 and the additional sentence in Annex 2), but asserts that neither has an effect on the similarity of market characteristics or the similarity of cost differences. *Id.* at 9. The Postal Service therefore states that the differences do not detract from the conclusion that the 2014 Agreement is functionally equivalent to its predecessor agreement (the 2013 Agreement) in the Foreign Postal Operators 1 product grouping. *Id.*

**Supplemental information.** The sentence that is added in Annex 2 reads: “The Exempt indicator in the PREDES message will reflect ‘N’.” *Id.*, Attachment 2 at 1. The sentence immediately preceding the additional sentence refers to number of receptacles and number of individual pieces. *Id.* The Postal Service is directed to explain what the “N” in the new sentence refers to and to provide a brief explanation of PREDES. The Postal Service is also directed to address how the inclusion of the new sentence alters contractual obligations relative to the 2013 Agreement.

A response is due no later than February 24, 2014.

### III. Commission Action

The Commission, in conformance with rule 3010.44, establishes Docket No. R2014–5 to consider issues raised by the Notice. The Commission invites comments from interested persons on whether the 2014 Agreement is consistent with 39 U.S.C. 3622 and the requirements of 39 CFR part 3040. Comments are due no later than February 25, 2014. The public portions of this filing can be accessed via the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>). Information on how to obtain access to non-public material appears at 39 CFR 3007.40.

The Commission appoints Lyudmila Bzhilyanskaya to serve as Public Representative in this docket.

### IV. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. R2014–5 for consideration of matters raised by the Postal Service's Notice.

2. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Lyudmila Bzhilyanskaya is appointed to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

3. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than February 25, 2014.

4. The Postal Service is directed to provide the supplemental information requested in the body of this order no later than February 24, 2014.

5. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–03827 Filed 2–21–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2014–29; Order No. 1989]

### New Postal Product

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.  
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning the addition of Global Reseller Expedited Package Contracts 1 negotiated service agreement to the competitive product list. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* February 26, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Corcoran, Acting General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Contents of Filing
- III. Notice of Proceeding
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Introduction

**Background.** On February 14, 2014, the Postal Service filed a notice pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5 announcing that it has entered into an additional Global Reseller Expedited Package Contracts 1 (GREPS 1) negotiated service agreement (Agreement).<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Notice of United States Postal Service of Filing a Functionally Equivalent Global Reseller

<sup>5</sup> Docket No. R2012–2, Order Concerning an Additional Inbound Market Dominant Multi-Service Agreement with Foreign Postal Operators 1 Negotiated Service Agreement, November 23, 2011 (Order No. 996).

Agreement is the successor agreement to the contract previously approved in Docket No. CP2013–20.<sup>2</sup> The Postal Service seeks to have the Agreement included within the existing GREPS 1 product on grounds of functional equivalence to the baseline agreement filed in Docket No. CP2010–36.<sup>3</sup>

## II. Contents of Filing

*Agreement.* The Postal Service asserts that the Agreement is functionally equivalent to the baseline agreement approved in Docket No. CP2010–36. Notice at 3.

The Postal Service filed the following material in conjunction with its Notice, along with public (redacted) versions of supporting financial information:

- Attachment 1—a redacted copy of the Agreement;
- Attachment 2—a certified statement required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2);
- Attachment 3—a redacted copy of Governors' Decision No. 10–1; and
- Attachment 4—an application for non-public treatment of materials filed under seal.

*Functional equivalency.* The Postal Service asserts that the Agreement is substantially similar to the baseline agreement filed in Docket No. CP2010–36 because it shares similar cost and market characteristics and meets criteria in Governors' Decision No. 10–1 concerning attributable costs. *Id.* at 4. The Postal Service further asserts that the functional terms of the Agreement and the baseline agreement are the same and the benefits are comparable. *Id.* It states that prices offered under the Agreement may differ due to postage commitments and when the Agreement is signed (due to updated costing information), but asserts that these differences do not alter the functional equivalency of the Agreement and the baseline agreement. *Id.* at 5. The Postal Service also identifies differences between the terms of the two agreements, but asserts that these differences do not affect the fundamental service being offered or the fundamental structure of the Agreement.<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 5–7.

*Effective date; term.* The contract previously approved in Docket No.

CP2013–20 is set to expire February 28, 2014. *Id.* at 3. The intended effective date for the Agreement is March 1, 2014. *Id.* The Agreement will remain in effect for one calendar year, unless terminated sooner pursuant to contractual terms. *Id.*, Attachment 1 at 6.

## III. Notice of Proceeding

The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2014–29 for consideration of matters raised by the Postal Service's Notice. Interested persons may submit comments on whether the Agreement is consistent with the requirements of 39 CFR 3015.5 and the policies of 39 U.S.C. 3632 and 3633. Comments are due no later than February 26, 2014. The public portions of this filing can be accessed via the Commission's Web site, <http://www.prc.gov>. Information on how to obtain access to material filed under seal appears in 39 CFR 3007.40.

The Commission appoints James F. Callow to serve as Public Representative in the captioned proceeding.

## IV. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2014–29 for consideration of matters raised by the Postal Service's Notice.

2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than February 26, 2014.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, James F. Callow is appointed to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2014–03889 Filed 2–21–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2014–28; Order No. 1991]

### New Postal Product

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.  
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning the addition of International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 negotiated service agreement to the competitive product list. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* February 26, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Corcoran, Acting General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Postal Service Filing
- III. Commission Action
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

### I. Introduction

On February 14, 2014, the Postal Service filed notice pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5 announcing that it has entered into an additional International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 (IBRS 3) negotiated service agreement (Agreement).<sup>1</sup> The Agreement is the successor agreement to the contract previously approved in Docket No. CP2013–50.<sup>2</sup> The Postal Service seeks to have the Agreement included within the existing IBRS 3 product on grounds of functional equivalence to the baseline agreement filed in Docket Nos. MC2011–21 and CP2011–59.<sup>3</sup>

### II. Postal Service Filing

*Background.* The Postal Service filed its Notice, along with four attachments, pursuant to 39 CFR 3015.5. The attachments consist of:

- Attachment 1—a redacted version of the Agreement;
- Attachment 2—a certified statement required by 39 CFR 3015.5(c)(2);
- Attachment 3—a redacted copy of Governors' Decision No. 08–24; and
- Attachment 4—an application for non-Public treatment of materials filed under seal.

*Functional equivalency.* The Postal Service asserts that the Agreement is

<sup>1</sup> Notice of the United States Postal Service Filing of a Functionally Equivalent International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Negotiated Service Agreement, February 14, 2014 (Notice).

<sup>2</sup> Docket No. CP2013–50, Order No. 1668, Order Approving New International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Agreement, February 25, 2013.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 3. *See also*, Docket Nos. MC2011–21 and CP2011–59, Order No. 684, Order Approving International Business Reply Service Competitive Contract 3 Negotiated Service Agreement, February 28, 2011.

Expedited Package 1 Negotiated Service Agreement, February 14, 2014 (Notice).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 1. *See also* Docket No. CP2013–20, Order No. 1571, Order Approving an Additional Global Reseller Expedited Package Contracts 1 Negotiated Service Agreement, December 10, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> Notice at 3. *See also* Docket Nos. MC2010–21 and CP2010–36, Order No. 445, Order Concerning Global Reseller Expedited Package Contracts Negotiated Service Agreement, April 22, 2010 (based on Governors' Decision No. 10–1).

<sup>4</sup> Differences include a new "Whereas" paragraph, numerous revisions to existing Articles, and five new Articles. *Id.*