



**Draft report of the CERP WG “Policy” meeting
Madrid, 2013, March 13-14**

Participants:

Chairmanship: Mrs Anna Karolak (Poland)
Austria: Mr Andreas Hach (Vice-Chair),
Bulgaria: Kalina Dimitrova, Iliana Karafizieva
Denmark: Mrs Bente Bohn
Hungary: Mrs Györgyi Csóka,
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Mrs Olga Mancevska
Norway: Mr Egil Thorstensen, Mrs Jenny Lønn Barvik
Poland: Mr Piotr Łukomski,
Serbia: Mrs Lidija Gligoric, Mrs Marija Kostadinovic
Spain: Mrs Coral Iglesias Carrero, Mrs Angeles de Marco
Switzerland: Mr Pierre Smolik
CERP Chair: Mr Ulrich Dammann

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda.

Agenda was approved with no comments.

2. Green paper *An integrated parcel delivery market for the growth of e-commerce in the EU* – discussion.

Discussion was opened by Bulgaria who informed that the state organized a consultation. National postal operator brought up a problem with cash on delivery due to a frequent unwillingness of customers to pay for the parcel. Problem is to determine who should pay for the return service. The problem was discussed and solutions used in different member countries were presented.

During the discussion it was agreed that delivery of parcels is a very complex issue. Even if the idea itself is sublime, it probably be difficult to solve particular issues, like for example terminal dues between operators. However, there is a will to push the idea of delivery of parcels generated by e-commerce to every EU citizen with an affordable prices. Some share an opinion that delivery costs are unjustifiably high. However this issue is very complex and will not be easy to carry out.

Furthermore, European Union is not uniform in case of legal framework concerning delivery, so harmonization of law will also be necessary.

The question of letters was also raised. And most mail in e-commerce are letters, not parcels. In the postal directive there is no definition of “packet”, which is used in the Green Paper.

Nordic countries have discussed the Green Paper as well. They expressed a concern that if the price cap is introduced and if it is too low, the competition may be disturbed. It may pay more to buy abroad than in Nordic countries.

Participants also agreed that it is questionable if the support to parcel delivery in e-commerce, as proposed in the Green Paper, will “yield very significant results in terms of growth and jobs”. The question is if the growth in e-commerce will not result in decrease in stationary sale in shops in the streets. This issue needs further study.

A good idea in the opinion of participants of the meeting, that was introduced in Green Paper, was a creation of a “certificate given by an industry association that the delivery process of an operator can be trusted as they meet requirements based on best practice.” It would be good to create a certificate, symbol, that would be recognizable by all EU consumers.

Furthermore, it was mentioned that e-commerce is commerce, which is outside universal service – so how can we even try to regulate it?

All in all members expressed their skepticism and are waiting for the European Commission’s conclusions gathered through the consultation and identification of issues relevant to the topic.

3. Literature for the blind – consequences of the adoption of proposal 20.7.1.Rev 1 during 25th Doha Congress.

During the Doha Congress in 2012 the proposal 20.7.1.Rev 1 was adopted. The proposal replaces the term "literature" with the word "element" and extends the scope of items exempted from the postal charges that can be sent and received by blind persons or associations / institutions operating or officially representing the blind.

The problem raised during the meeting was that it is very difficult at this point of time to assess how and if the costs of the delivery of the items for the blind will rise. That would mean that state budgets of many CERP member countries might be affected by this change of UPU Convention. Some countries presented prognosis that does not show any significant growth in the refund paid to the operators. However, there is a possibility of abuse of this right, that unauthorized entities will use the exemption from postal charges.

The solution to this problem may be creating a closed list of entities that are authorized to send items exempted from postal charges. That could be done if the problem occurs.

Furthermore, we should remember that the exemption from postal charges for blind people has historical background. The reason for change in article 7 of the Convention was that the environment is changing constantly and a fact that into the world of blind technology came as well. However, from this point of view it seems discriminatory to other groups of disabled people – why only mail for blind people should be exempted from postal charges? It seems reasonable to either give the privilege to all groups of disabled people or to none.

The issue is being one for further discussion as we will observe what is happening in this regard.

4. Cooperation CERP with UPU – CERP Guide for Postal Policy in developing UPU member countries.

Since 2011 CERP is providing expertise for UPU member countries and restricted unions in order to help and facilitate regulatin of postal sector in member countries.

So far three projects have been conducted: with Swaziland, COMESA and Sudan¹. Furthermore, UPU has shown interest in next projects. And they are being planned

WG Policy wishes, inspired by Serbia, to create a document that would serve as a guide for benefiting member countries and restricted unions. As a model document will serve a paper created for COMESA project.

It was decided that Project Team will be created, that will provide draft “*guide*” for UPU members. The guide will not oblige entities to any implementation nor work. It will only be a paper that will tell what the entity can expect from European experts taking part in the project. For new experts the document will include information what knowledge and expertise is necessary to take part in the activity.

Member countries willing to take part in this work (electronical) are asked to express the willingness to Anna Karolak.

5. Standardization – next steps in this field (CEN). Discussion.

At this point of the agenda Mr Ulrich Dammann gave a presentation on results of the questionnaire concerning future standardisation of regulatory interest concerning the measurement of quality of service and other consumer related issues. The aim of the questionnaire was to set new goals for the working groups of CEN. Details can be found in the annex to this report and will be given in the next CERP newsletter.

There was a short discussion if there is a need to create new standards whatsoever. However, there is only one obligatory standard (EN13850).

6. Recent regulatory developments in member countries.

Denmark is currently looking into the postal law from 2011.

Bulgaria is working on secondary legislation implementind 3rd Postal Directive.

Norway has given a new licence for the national postal operator for the next four years. However after elections in September there may be a change in the monopoly regime.

In Germany for the first time in 15 years tarriffs increased (for example from 55 to 58 eurocent for the 20g letter).

Hungary informed that since 01.01.2013 new postal law is in force. The first license may be given to a subsidiary company of Austrian Post, the procedure is still going on. Hungarian Post was designeted to provide universal services for five years.

Serbia – in respect with the latest progress within the postal sector regulatory framework, the Serbian Ministry of Foreign and Internal Trade and Telecommunications has begun its work on preparing the new sectoral strategic document for the next mid-term period. This document shall lay down strategic framework for the sustainable development of the postal sector and its economy and further improvement of quality of the postal services and efficiency of the postal network, as well. Namely, particular Working group established by the Ministry

¹ Detailed presentation concerning the suppert projects was given during CERP plenaries in Cyprus.

competent for the area of postal services and composed of the representatives of all postal stakeholders (i.e. ministry, national regulatory authority, public postal operator and relevant postal faculty) has prepared Draft Strategy on Postal Services Development in Serbia for the period 2013-2016, with the Action plan for the implementation of the Strategy. In February 2013, public discussion on this issue was organized, and all useful and justified suggestions and proposals were considered. Furthermore, draft Strategy has been sent to the EC expert for postal services, and his comments are of great importance. In this stage, draft Strategy is in the process of inter-sectoral alignment, and its adoption by the Serbian government is foreseen for April, 2013. In addition, the Ministry of Foreign and Internal Trade and Telecommunications has recently formed Working group for drafting amendments to the Law on Postal Services in terms of the upcoming merger of the regulatory agencies in the field of electronic communications and of postal services.

In Poland new postal law is in force since 01.01.2013 and government is working on a secondary legislation.

7. Next meeting.

Place and venue to be determined in due time.

8. AOB.

No issue was raised in this item of the agenda.

Anna Karolak
WG Policy Chair



CERP Questionnaire on future Standardisation – Evaluation (27 Countries) *)

(BA, BE, BG, CH, CY CZ, DE, EE, ES, GR, HR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MK, MT, NO, PL, PT, RO, RS, SE, SI, SK, UK)

1. The standards for the measurement of quality of service developed so far have contributed to the enhancement of the quality of postal services in Europe:

∅	5	4	3	2	1	0
4,4	12	11	3	0	0	0

2. The existing standards for the measurement of quality of service should be developed further on to guaranty the availability of up-to-date tools for regulatory purposes:

∅	5	4	3	2	1	0
4,0	9	12	4	2	0	0

3. Facing decreasing letter mail volumes and changing environments due to technical developments and substitution, the development of new standards for the measurement of quality of service for letter mail should be postponed until future market trends have been validated:

∅	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,9	2	8	10	1	1	4

4. Taking into account the raising importance of e-commerce accompanied by increasing parcel post volumes, the development of standards for the measurement of quality of service for parcels should be fostered:

∅	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,8	8	11	2	4	1	0

5. Considering the growing parcel market and the increasing number of parcels that need to be notified, technical standards for parcel delivery boxes should be developed:

∅	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,1	6	8	3	4	2	3

6. Relevance of new topics for future standardisation:6.1 Letter Post

a) Measurement of transit time for multi-operator scenarios

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,6	8	10	2	3	1	2

b) Measurement of transit time for partial pipeline

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,1	6	7	3	4	3	2

c) Damage/theft

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,7	4	7	7	0	5	4

d) Re-forwarding

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,6	4	5	7	2	6	3

e) Wrong/incorrect delivery

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,7	5	6	6	0	7	3

f) Consistency of delivery times

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,4	4	6	4	2	6	5

6.2 Hybrid/electronic services

a) Transit time and consistency

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,3	5	8	9	0	2	2

b) Choice of the recipient for the nature of the support for the message (printed or electronic)

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,9	4	9	3	3	4	3

c) Security and privacy of the data

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
4,0	11	9	4	0	2	0

6.3 Parcels

a) Measurement of transit time

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,7	7	14	2	1	2	1

b) Measurement of transit time for multi-operator scenarios

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,5	7	11	2	4	1	2

c) Measurement of transit time for partial pipeline

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,1	6	7	3	6	2	2

d) Damage/theft

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,1	7	6	6	3	1	4

e) Re-forwarding

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,9	6	5	6	3	3	4

f) Wrong/incorrect delivery

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,9	5	9	3	2	4	4

g) Consistency of delivery times

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,6	4	8	2	4	4	5

6.4 Access

a) Distance to post-boxes

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,0	6	8	5	0	5	3

b) Distance to PO-Boxes

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,5	4	4	6	4	5	4

c) Distance to post-offices

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,2	7	9	4	0	4	3

d) Post offices opening hours

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
2,5	3	6	6	4	3	5

e) Collection time

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,0	5	7	7	2	3	3

f) Complaint services

Ø	5	4	3	2	1	0
3,4	9	9	2	1	3	3

*) Indication of the level of consent: 5 = totally agree / 0 = disagree