

**Question 1: Do you agree that Ofcom should grant approval to Royal Mail for the Delivery to Neighbour service? If not please explain your answer. :**

No. It is wrong for an organisation like Royal Mail to make huge assumptions on the customer's behalf as a matter of 'default'.

What if you don't like your neighbours? What if they are criminals? For your valuable goods to be delivered to a neighbour who could be trusted / or not/ as a matter of default is simply wrong and would appear to be purely an attempt by Royal Mail to wring out some more profit by not having to redeliver as many times

I think there is a big difference in someone actively giving permission to have something delivered to a neighbour and it happening by default. And the idea of stickers on your letterbox! Well where to begin. Other than the obvious that they might be stolen, wear off, what about the message it then gives to your neighbour - that you don't trust them! This is just an absolutely awful idea driven by profit. The 'survey' has clearly not been done in any sort of deprived areas and I guess is entirely unrepresentative and commissioned with an end goal in sight - of getting as high a percentage approval rating as possible for a ridiculous idea.

If people want to actively choose to have something delivered to their neighbour if they are not in - that is different. But people should have to actively go out and do this - it should not happen by default.

I also note the survey asked people for their satisfaction 'after' they had successfully had their parcel delivered - I quote " 92% of recipients whose item was left with a neighbour expressed overall satisfaction with the experience." that is clearly not the same as 92% of people thinking this is a good idea. Hence the survey headline being touted on the literature being delivered to people's doors is based on a lie. In itself this should be acted on by Ofcom.

**Question 2: Are there other consequences following the roll out of the service across the UK that we have not included in our assessment? If so, please explain.:**

A single survey like this cannot adequately display all of the problems this may create

First of all while only 4,400 people asked to opt out of the trial (still a significant number) it must be noted that the 'flyer' that comes through the letterbox looks like junkmail and hence a high take up would not be expected

By relying on people to act to opt out Royal Mail is essentially pushing its measure through - knowing that most people's are so busy they will not respond.

What if a parcel is stolen/or damaged/ or the house next door is shared rented property and people 'deny all knowledge' of receiving the parcel. Do you call the police in - sue Royal Mail? Surely the onus should be on people to actively participate in this additional risk to their property rather than it happen by default. If that were the case ofcourse Royal Mail know it would be a waste of time trying to get all of its customers to actively take part in something - hence the reason for doing it this way.

**Question 3:Do you have any comments on the scope and wording of the proposed Notification and approval:**

I concur with some of the findings of Consumer Focus which states that Royal Mail should keep liability for all lost mail and pay where it is proven it has gone missing or been stolen. I don't agree with the sticker principle for the reasons previously given but clearly if this change is railroaded through as appears to be the intention then that would have to happen and stickers would have to continue to be available for re order when lost etc. Also there should be customer service telephone service around lost mail - if this already exists it should be invested in so that waits are not ridiculous. The number for this service should be on the Royal Mail card delivered through the door