

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 2.1: Do you agree with Ofcom’s proposed regulatory approach for regulating postal services over the next 5-year period (2022-2027)? If not, please explain the changes you think should be made, with supporting evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes.</p>
<p>Question 3.1: Do you agree with our proposed approach to sustainability of the universal service? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we consider that it is reasonable to broadly maintain the present regulatory framework while strengthening Ofcom’s monitoring of the financial sustainability of the USO. As the postal services market continues to change, it is important that the regulator show an awareness of, and ability to adapt to, this.</p>
<p>Question 4.1: Do you agree with our proposal to maintain the historic approach but with the additional requirement on Royal Mail to set and report against a five-year expectation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, this approach is reasonable given the reasons above.</p>
<p>Question 4.2: Do you agree with our proposals in relation to the monitoring and publication of the efficiency expectations prepared by Royal Mail? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence. Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, these proposals appear to be fair and reasonable.</p>
<p>Question 5.1: Do you agree with our proposed approach of maintaining the current regulatory safeguards of the safeguard cap, high quality of services standards, and requirements on access to universal services? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we agree.</p>
<p>Question 5.2: Do you agree with our proposal to not impose further regulatory requirements on Royal Mail in relation to Redirection pricing, following implementation of its improved Concession Redirection scheme?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we agree.</p>

<p>Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	
<p>Question 5.3: Do you have any further evidence on other issues raised in this section?</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No, we do not have any further evidence.</p>
<p>Question 6.1: Do you agree with our assessment of the parcels market, namely that it is generally working well for consumers, but improvements are needed in relation to complaints handling and meeting disabled consumers’ needs? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we agree that the parcels market is generally working well for consumers. However, improvements are needed for complaint handling, especially in situations where consumers do not know which company to direct their complaint to, and in situations involving disabled and otherwise vulnerable consumers.</p>
<p>Question 6.2: Do you agree with our assessment of the consumer issues in relation to complaints handling and our proposed guidance? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we agree. It is important to ensure clear and easily accessible complaints channels for consumers, and to resolve complaints through fair, transparent, and effective processes.</p> <p>However, as above, focus should be placed on which company has responsibility where things go wrong, particularly in online shopping scenarios (ie. the courier or the seller).</p>
<p>Question 6.3: Do you agree with our assessment of the issues faced by disabled consumers in relation to parcel services and our proposed new condition to better meet disabled consumers’ needs? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we agree that disabled customers face unique problems, and we welcome the new Consumer Protection Condition. It needs to be as straightforward as possible for disabled consumers to identify their needs to providers, in order to get the assistance they need as quickly as possible.</p>
<p>Question 7.1: Do you agree with our proposal not to include tracking facilities within First and Second Class USO services? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>Yes, we agree with this proposal. To include such tracking facilities within the USO would give an advantage over the competition.</p>
<p>Question 7.2 Do you have any further evidence or views on other issues relating to</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p>

USO parcels regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.	No, we do not have any further evidence or views.
Question 8.1: Do you agree with our proposals on the scope of access regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.	Confidential? – N Yes we agree with these proposals.
Question 8.2: Do you agree with our proposals on access price regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.	Confidential? – N Yes we agree with these proposals.
Question 8.3: Do you agree with our approach and proposals for the non-price terms of access regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.	Confidential? – N Yes we agree with these proposals.