

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>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>Yes</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>Yes</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>No. Ofcom measurement of RM efficiencies programme is not robust. If Ofcom are depending on shareholder incentives as the approach I don't see proof of how this has worked since Royal Mail's float in 2013. Shareholders are incentivised by dividends not efficiencies and RM paid out £400m in a special dividend and share buyback in Jan 2022. RM customers are paying above inflation price increases for RM products and services. RM customers are paying for RM staff to reduce their working hours from 39 per week to 35 per week, therefore by extension reducing their productivity. This is as per the "Four Pillars of Security" agreement between RM and CWU (Sept 2018).</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.

Yes. Quadient UK Limited are fully supportive of the Ofcom policy to retain the existing scope of the USO services, including metered mail remaining in the USO. This is a help to hard pressed small business that are the main user of the meter channel.

The majority of Meter mail users are from the SME community and value this channel with 14% using a franking machine versus the 2% that use bulk mail services provided by other postal operators. 85% of SME Meter mail users stated that this method of sending mail was "important" or "very important" to their business. In a community that has been hard hit over the past 2 years and making changes to the way they conduct their business would not be seen a supportive to their organisations.

From franking industry survey's, it has been found that the prime reason SME's use Meter mail is convenience, as for single piece mail there is little or no sortation and depositing the mail at a Post Office, Royal Mail collection, or inserting into a pillar box make the process simple.

Some franking machine users do generate larger volumes, and for convenience, management information and flexibility like to frank their mail.

This channel has been a feature of the postal market for almost 100 years and works very well for its users, it does not need to be further regulated or removed from the universal service.

https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0022/208219/2019-20-annual-monitoring-update-postal-market.pdf

<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? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 5.3: Do you have any further evidence on other issues raised in this section?</p>	<p>No</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>Yes</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 6.3: Do you agree with our assessment of the issues faced by</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>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>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>No. A tracked parcel product is required for the USO, RM have lobbied for this, but Ofcom do not plan to make tracking part of the requirement for USO parcels. I think this is the wrong conclusion. The reason for this is it has been shown that Signed For does not work – signatures were not required during the pandemic and are still not being asked for at the delivery point.</p>
<p>Question 7.2 Do you have any further evidence or views on other issues relating to USO parcels regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Question 8.1: Do you agree with our proposals on the scope of access regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 8.2: Do you agree with our proposals on access price regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

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.	Yes

Please complete this form in full and return to postalreview@ofcom.org.uk