# Article information:

Почему маркетплейсы наотрез отказались платить сбор в пользу «Почты России»
[https://www.bfm.ru/news/533845?utm\_source=yxnews=desktop](https://www.bfm.ru/news/533845?utm_source=yxnews&utm_medium=desktop)

# Article summary:

1. E-commerce market players in Russia are strongly opposed to the introduction of a 0.5% infrastructure payment from turnover in favor of Russian Post.

2. The Russian Post proposed this payment as a way to support unprofitable branches and deliver goods to areas where no one else does.

3. If the payment is implemented, it is expected that prices for consumers will increase, according to experts and business owners.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article discusses the opposition of e-commerce market players to the introduction of a 0.5% infrastructure payment in favor of Russian Post. The proposal suggests that large companies should pay this fee as a way to support unprofitable branches and ensure delivery to remote areas. However, the article does not provide a balanced analysis of the issue and contains several potential biases.

Firstly, the article presents the viewpoint of e-commerce market players who are categorically against the infrastructure payment. It mentions that the Association of Internet Trade Companies (AKIT) opposes the measure but does not provide any counterarguments or perspectives from those who support it. This one-sided reporting limits the reader's understanding of both sides of the debate.

Secondly, there is no evidence provided to support the claim that Russian Post delivers goods to places where no one else can deliver. While this may be true in some cases, it is important to consider whether this justifies imposing an infrastructure payment on e-commerce companies. Without supporting evidence, this claim appears unsubstantiated and potentially biased towards promoting Russian Post's interests.

Additionally, the article includes statements from individuals who argue against the introduction of such a payment. For example, Larisa Naumenko, an expert on legal protection of business at Opora Rossii, states that if such a payment is introduced, prices for consumers will definitely increase. However, there is no exploration of counterarguments or alternative viewpoints that could provide a more comprehensive analysis.

Furthermore, there is no mention of potential risks or drawbacks associated with implementing this infrastructure payment. For instance, it would be relevant to discuss how this fee could impact small businesses or startups operating in the e-commerce sector. By omitting these considerations, the article fails to provide a well-rounded analysis.

Overall, this article exhibits biases by presenting only one side of the argument and lacking evidence for certain claims made. It also fails to explore counterarguments and potential risks associated with the proposed infrastructure payment. A more balanced and comprehensive analysis would provide a clearer understanding of the issue at hand.

# Topics for further research:

* Arguments in favor of the proposed infrastructure payment in e-commerce sector Russia
* Impact of infrastructure payment on small businesses in e-commerce sector
* Alternatives to infrastructure payment for supporting unprofitable branches in Russian Post
* Analysis of the delivery capabilities of Russian Post compared to other logistics providers
* Potential drawbacks and risks of implementing an infrastructure payment in e-commerce sector
* Perspectives from experts on the potential effects of infrastructure payment on consumer prices in e-commerce sector Russia
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