

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? – Y / N</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? – Y / N</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? – Y / N</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? – Y / N</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? – Y / N</p>
<p>Question 5.2: Do you agree with our proposal to not impose further regulatory requirements on Royal Mail in relation to Redirection</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p>

<p>pricing, following implementation of its improved Concession Redirection scheme? 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? – Y / N</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 in general but there are some aspects you need to reflect on. Some sellers (like eBay) use agents (Packlink based in Spain) who add additional conditions on postings and add extra cost into the charges for distribution irrespective of which carrier you use. Packlink has no UK presence, no email addresses or phone numbers and can only be contacted through the eBay portal. I have experienced instances where a carrier has lost/damaged items; has admitted fault but Packlink still refuse to pay compensation or refund postage. This can be because Packlink impose additional packaging requirements above those needed by the carrier and require you to prove (after the event) these requirements have been made). It can be because Packlink request photo evidence of damage in a specific format but the buyer does not/cannot supply such evidence in the right format.</p> <p>Packlink is the ‘approved’ carrier of eBay but will not cover the shipping of some items (like china or glassware) even if the carrier accepts such items. Damaged items are rarely covered by Packlink compensation. Packlink appear to accept compensation from carriers but not pass that money to posters. These 3rd part agents should be covered by your rulings</p> <p>The damage to goods is not well covered by your proposals as it is poor handling by carriers that causes the problem. You should consider how carriers or 3rd party agents should be required to prove they handled the item with care.</p>

	<p>3rd party agents like Packlink and P2G are an important development in the market who impose a set of posting conditions that exceed those required by the actual carrier used. They should come fully under your rulings and be required to prove they have delivered items with care.</p> <p>Posters need good access to these 3rd party carriers as when you use them the actual carrier will not discuss and complaint you have. It has to be conducted by the 3rd party. Access is very limited to these 3rd party agents often limited to a computer generated web chat. Posters need to be able to identify an individual who will look at the case and enter into dialogue by more secure means and more interactive means such as email/phone etc.</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? – Y</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? – Y</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? – Y / N</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.	Confidential? – see my comments above
Question 8.1: Do you agree with our proposals on the scope of access regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.	Confidential? – Y / N
Question 8.2: Do you agree with our proposals on access price regulation? Please substantiate your response with reasons and evidence.	Confidential? – Y / N
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? – Y / N