

## Your response

Please tell us how you came across about this consultation.

- Somebody told me or shared it with me

Question	Your response
<p><b>Question 2.1:</b> Do you agree with the provisional conclusions set out in our Equality Impact Assessment? Please state your reasons and provide evidence to support your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y</p>
<p><b>Question 2.2</b> Do you agree with our assessment under the Welsh Language Standards? Please state your reasons and provide evidence to support your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y</p>
<p><b>Question 3.1:</b> Do you agree that we have identified the reasonable needs of post users? Please provide reasons and evidence for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N As a greeting card retailer, my own needs and those of my customers are that we can post a card 2<sup>nd</sup> class (which is the only affordable way to post a card) and know it will arrive within 3 working days. The average card in the UK costs around £1.68, sending first class no longer makes financial sense. If on their 2<sup>nd</sup> class service Royal Mail only delivered on alternate weekdays this means that some weeks they will only deliver on 2 days. No-one will know when the post is being collected and when it is supposed to arrive. Why would you take away second class post on Saturdays? In a world that is 24-hours and more and more delivery companies are delivering 7 days a week, why would you cut the second class, affordable service? And to reduce the performance targets are madness. They are not currently being met as it is. The answer is not to reduce the performance target for Royal Mail. How does that help the consumer?</p>
<p><b>Question 3.2:</b> Do you agree that the market is meeting the reasonable needs</p>	<p>Confidential? – N The market is absolutely NOT meeting the needs of post users. As Royal Mail customers</p>

Question	Your response
<p>of post users? Please provide reasons and evidence for your views.</p>	<p>we have been subject to astronomical prices rises in first class stamps since privatisation from 60p to £1.70 and a lowering of standards. That's a 183% increase and yet the card or letter is much less likely to arrive within 24 hours in 2025 than it was in 2013. How can this be? We and our customers do not trust that 2<sup>nd</sup> class post will even arrive so even though it's the affordable option, it's worthless. And now you're proposing to cut the 2<sup>nd</sup> class service even further! Royal Mail has a monopoly on the market, we have no choice but to use them and yet their prices and service standards are appalling. As the regulator you should be ashamed that you are allowing this to happen and have been for years! And the changes you are proposing will only make the situation worse. How can you call yourself a regulator? You are absolutely not looking after consumer needs at all.</p> <p>The above has just been worse by the fact that a "special" postage class has been agreed with Royal Mail and the NHS That really is rubbing salt into the wound!</p>
<p><b>Question 5.1:</b> Do you agree with our proposals and impact assessment on changes to the delivery frequency of Second Class letters so that those items would be delivered every other day from Monday to Friday, and would not have to be collected, processed or delivered on Saturdays? Please provide reasons and evidence in support of your views</p>	<p>Confidential? – No</p> <p>No, I do not agree. The fact that you have allowed Royal Mail to increase first class stamps so dramatically means that you have made it an unviable option for the greetings card industry and also for small retailers like ourselves who often send letter-size post. It is no longer financially viable to send first class. What we thought was going to be our option - second class post - this consultation changes all that. Reducing the days and lowering performance targets means this will be a very unreliable service and therefore won't be used. I expect that you'll then use that as an excuse to allow Royal Mail to cut the</p>

Question	Your response
	<p>2<sup>nd</sup> class service completely citing lack of use of the service. Whereas you'll actually be creating the lack of use!</p>
<p><b>Question 6.1:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to set the First Class national D+1 performance target to 90%? Please provide reasons and evidence for your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No, why would you lower the performance targets to 90%? The price rises in first class stamps means we the consumer expect a first-class next day service! Not a 'nearly' first class service. And again, if you lower the standards, the customer will have less confidence in the service and less people will use it to send greetings cards! As a regulator, you are allowing Royal Mail to damage the greeting cards industry. We and our customers have no option but to use Royal Mail. And yet the prices and standards are way below par. As the regulator we rely on YOU to shout on our behalf, to hold Royal Mail to account, and yet you are failing to do this. In fact your proposals are allowing them to provide a much worse service, which in turn, will have a direct damaging effect on my business and thousands of others.</p>
<p><b>Question 6.2:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to set the First Class PCA D+1 performance target to be 3% lower than the national target (i.e. for the PCA target to be 87% to align with our proposed 90% national target)? Please provide reasons and evidence for your view</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No I do not agree. Again, why would you lower the targets further? See my arguments above. Any further reduction in performance will only fuel ours and our customers concerns about reliability of service. It's no good citing that it's 'still high due to international standards'. That's irrelevant. The UK has a unique 'Royal' postal service that the country has always been proud of. That unique service has allowed the country to grow a unique greeting card industry, which contributes £1.5bn directly to the economy every year and much more indirectly. This original form of communication, which is even more important</p>

Question	Your response
	<p>in this digital economy, and is being recognised as so by the younger generations, is now under threat because as a regulator you are allowing an unreliable and unaffordable postal service from Royal Mail.</p>
<p><b>Question 6.3:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new First Class 'tail of mail' target of 99.5% at D+3? Please provide reasons and evidence for your view</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No I do not agree. It's ridiculous to say that users increasingly prioritise reliability over speed of delivery. Given the shocking service standards the whole country has experienced since 2021, the people who do still use the service are just grateful their post turns up at all – which it so often doesn't! I hear this first hand from our customers!</p> <p>And it doesn't matter whether it's being delivered to remote countryside or in London. There is no consistency and it actually seems to make no difference whether you post 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> class. It's anyone's guess as to when it's going to turn up. My own experiments with this have seen 2<sup>nd</sup> class actually turn up before first class or at the same time! Introducing a new 'tail of mail' target are just words and mean absolutely nothing to the end user.</p>
<p><b>Question 6.4:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to set the Second Class D+3 performance target to 95%? Please provide reasons and evidence for your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>No I do not agree. See details above. And as I have stated. If you lower the standards any more for 2<sup>nd</sup> class post then it becomes irrelevant that it's the 'affordable' option because it is even less reliable than it is now. Therefore, as a consumer we wouldn't trust the service and we wouldn't use it, which Royal Mail would then use as an excuse to fully cut the service. So, by allowing lower targets you the regulator would be speeding up the decline of a service which would then have a direct negative impact on our industry.</p>

Question	Your response
<p><b>Question 6.5:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new Second Class 'tail of mail' target of 99.5% at D+5? Please provide reasons and evidence for your view.</p>	<p>Confidential? –N</p> <p>No as stated for first class mail. A 'tail of mail' target means nothing to the end user.</p>
<p><b>Question 7.1:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to regulate D+3 access services, subject to a margin squeeze control and the other protections outlined above? Please provide reasons and evidence for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p> <p>We now use Amazon for bulk mail as Royal Mail will not provide a tracking service for 2<sup>nd</sup> class post. They blame the USO which has nothing to do with it!</p>
<p><b>Question 7.2:</b> Do you agree with our proposal to change the specification of D+5 access services to remove Saturday as a delivery day? Please provide reasons and evidence for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Question 7.3:</b> Do you agree with our proposals to maintain a margin squeeze control on D+2 access services, where the relevant retail services are Royal Mail's First Class retail bulk services? Please provide reasons and evidence for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Question 7.4:</b> Do you agree with our proposals for pricing transparency and amending how access services are defined? Please provide reasons and evidence for your views.</p>	<p>Confidential? – N</p> <p>See above</p>

Please complete this form in full and return to [futurepostaluso@ofcom.org.uk](mailto:futurepostaluso@ofcom.org.uk).