

Additional comments:

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 shouldn't be necessary to deface one's property just to maintain the privacy of incoming mail. Households willing to have their mail delivered to neighbours (jeopardising their privacy) should be the ones made to affix a RM sticker to their property.

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.:

If under this DTN scheme, RM leaves an item with a neighbour, the act of doing that makes it known to that neighbour that at that moment no-one is home at the intended recipient's address. If that neighbour is inclined, that information could lead to burglary of the recipient.

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

If this scheme is approved in its proposed form, RM's offers to households of a (free of charge) opt-out and retention of liability for loss/damage of items of mail should be stated as legally-binding conditions of any Ofcom consent which may be given; Ofcom should not rely upon RM "pledges".

The interest of the sender in the delivery of items of mail seems to have been overlooked, which is odd as they're the party who has paid for service. A proper way to allow RM an alleviation of the present strict requirement on them, would be to allow them to invite SENDERS to state an alternative to delivery to the addressee, if that has failed. In practice, senders are likely to consult their recipients prior to despatch of mail, to obtain that alternative instruction; so in this way, the instruction to RM would always - as it should be - be acceptable to both the mail sender and recipient. If no alternative instruction is stated by an item's sender, the item should be dealt with according to the present arrangements.