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Different market developments and different regulatory approaches

- Number of parcel lockers
- Shift of demand
- Access to USP’s parcel lockers
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Should USP’s parcel lockers be open?

Are parcel lockers essential/indispensable for providing parcel delivery services?

In Oscar Bronner v Mediaprint (C-7/97), ECJ developed restrictive test → refusal to supply constitutes abuse if: all competition is eliminated + no objective justification + no actual or potential substitutes

Parcel lockers have substitutes

Parcel lockers are not essential facilities

No obstacles prevent duplication of parcel lockers network
Should USP’s parcel lockers be regulated at all?

Why to regulate?

- Positive environmental & urban/logistic effects
- Inefficient use of resources
- Increased network coverage
- Better met users’ needs

Sharing of parcel lockers generates positive social outcome

How to regulate?

Social regulation as a primary instrument, sector specific regulation as a supplement
Supportive role of sector specific (postal) regulation

Parcel lockers enable sending, receiving and generating proof of delivery for all postal items.

Open parcel lockers as automated points of contact? Postal infrastructure / services within the scope of USO?

One-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate!
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