



**CERP PROJECT TEAM  
“IMPLEMENTATION OF CEN QUALITY OF  
SERVICE STANDARDS”**

**Brussels, 4 August 2005**

## **FOREWORD**

First of all I would like to thank European Committee for Postal Regulation (CERP) for having placed their trust in me to head this project group. I hope the result will meet its expectations.

However, bringing this task to a favorable conclusion was only possible thanks to the efforts made by all the members of the project team.

First I want to thank the members of the working group, namely Jean Bonar of the Commission for Communications Regulation (Ireland), Piotr Dziubak of the Ministry of Infrastructure – Department of Post (Poland), Igor Hacin of Post and Electronic Communications Agency of the Republic of Slovenia (Slovenia), Frank Raudszus of Regulatory Authority for Telecommunications and Posts (Germany) and Véronique Scardigli of Ministry of Economics, Finances and Industry (France).

Furthermore, I would like to thank two people personally for their unconditional support, firstly Mr Jean-Luc Dutordoit, Administrator at Belgian institute for postal services and telecommunications (BIPT) and Chairman of CERP and secondly Mr Ulrich Dammann, Chairman of WG Standardization and Vice-Chairman of CERP.

Finally I am grateful to my employer, BIPT, for the time, the means and the support I was given to accomplish this task.

Joost Callaert,  
Advisor BIPT  
Chairman of CERP PT "Implementation of CEN quality of service standards"

## **CONTENT**

	<b>Page</b>
Foreword	2
Content	3
Country codes	4
Abbreviations	5
Executive summary	6
Introduction	12
Section A: Status/Current situation	14
Section B: The method of implementation	23
Section C: Future improvement: attitude / intention	35
Section D: Positive elements experienced in the implementation of standards	37
Section E: General questions	40
Section F: Contact persons	42
Section G: Final conclusions	43
Annex 1: List of contact persons	45
Annex 2: List of interesting website links	55
Annex 3: Statistics	60
Annex 4: Letter of the European Commission	75

## COUNTRY CODES

AD	Andorra
AL	Albania
AT	Austria
AZ	Azerbaijan
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina
BE	Belgium
BG	Bulgaria
BY	Belarus
CH	Switzerland
CS	Serbia and Montenegro
CY	Cyprus
CZ	Czech Republic
DE	Germany
DK	Denmark
EE	Estonia
ES	Spain
FI	Finland
FR	France
GB	Great Britain
GR	Greece
HR	Croatia
HU	Hungary
IE	Ireland
IS	Iceland
IT	Italy
LI	Liechtenstein
LT	Lithuania
LU	Luxembourg
LV	Latvia
MC	Monaco
MD	Moldava
MK	Macedonia, the former Yugoslav Republic of
MT	Malta
NL	Netherlands
NO	Norway
PL	Poland
PT	Portugal
RO	Romania
RU	Russian Federation
SE	Sweden
SI	Slovenia
SK	Slovakia
SM	San Marino
TR	Turkey
UA	Ukraine
VA	Vatican City State (Holy See)

## ABBREVIATIONS

ANRC	National Regulatory Authority for Communications of Romania
BIPT	Belgian Institute for Postal services and Telecommunications – National Regulatory Authority of Belgium
CEN	European Committee for Standardisation
CEN/TC331/WG1	Working Group 1 “Quality of Service” of Technical Committee 331 “Postal Services” of the European Committee for Standardisation
CERP	European Committee on Postal Regulations
EN	European Standard
EN 13850	Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail
EN 14012	Measurement of complaints and redress procedures
EN 14137	Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system
EN 14508	Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail
EN 14534	Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail
EU	European Union
IPC	International Post Corporation
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
MS	Member State
NRA	National Regulatory Authority
PT	Project Team
QoS	Quality of Service
SIS	Swedish Standards Institute
SIST	Slovenian Institute for Standardisation
TS	Technical Specification
TS 14773	Measurement of loss and substantial delay of priority and first class mail using a survey of test letters
USO	Universal Service Obligation
USP	Universal Service Provider
WG	Working Group

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Under mandate 240 of the European Commission CEN/TC331/WG1 has adopted the following standards:

- **EN 13850** *Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail;*
- **EN 14012** *Measurement of complaints and redress procedures;*
- **EN 14137** *Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system;*
- **EN 14508** *Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail;*
- **EN 14534** *Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail;*
- **TS 14773** *Measurement of loss and substantial delay of priority and first class mail using a survey of test letters.*

A questionnaire of the CERP Project Team "Implementation of CEN Quality of Service Standards", sent out in May 2004, had as its main focus the current situation, the method used for implementing, attitude toward the implementation of the standards, and positive and negative elements experienced. The National Regulatory Authorities or Ministries in 22 countries answered the questionnaire.

### **Section A: Current situation**

The current situation illustrates that most of the countries are interested in EN 13850 and EN 14012. Almost all countries have implemented EN 13850 and four countries indicated that they are either in the process of implementation or in the planning stages of implementing it. EN 14012 is not yet widely implemented, but there is a great consensus to do so. Only two countries stated that they do not intend to implement the standard EN 14012.

As for the other standards, opinions are divided. It should be pointed out that a quarter of the countries that answered do not have products like single piece non-priority and second-class mail covered by EN 14508. None of the respondents to the questionnaire have implemented TS 14773, but some have the intention to implement it in the future.

Apparently, as a result of lack of obligation many standards are only partially executed and implemented. According to the answers, the implementation of the standards mostly appears to be on a voluntary basis. The majority of the countries only considers EN 13850 as mandatory or has included it in their legislation. It is essential to carry out the measurement and especially ensure that an independent research company conducts the audit.

We wish to draw your attention to the letter of the European Commission to all Members of the Postal Directive Committee of 21 March 2005, announcing that references to the different CEN postal EN standards have been published in the Official Journal of the European Union. As regards EN 13850 the European Commission informs Member States that they have to ensure that the performance levels are measured according to this standard for domestic mail from January 2004, and for cross border mail from January 2005, and that the results are published once a year as required by the Directive. The implementation of EN 13850 becomes mandatory.

## **Section B: Method of implementation**

This section illustrates different ways of how the standards have been implemented in the countries. It ranges from offering to conduct the measurement of the USP up to the creation of a new measurement with all the procedures such as public consultation, tender for research company and publication of the first report. In the table below you will find different approaches regarding EN 13850 implementation:

*Table 1: Different implementation scenarios EN 13850*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Austria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tender process</li> <li>2. Pilot phase</li> <li>3. Implementation</li> <li>4. Adoption</li> </ol>	2001 2002 2003 2005
Belgium	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First wave of independent measurement by BIPT</li> <li>2. Second wave of independent measurement by BIPT</li> <li>3. Agreement between NRA and USP to replace the BIPT system and the internal system of De Post by an independent measurement system</li> <li>4. Describing the requirements and selection of a consultant</li> <li>5. Start of test measurements</li> <li>6. Operational measurement</li> </ol>	1998-2000 2001  End 2000  Beginning 2001 End 2001 2002
Cyprus	Cross-border mail is already being measured by IPC <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For national mail: Terms of Tender regarding implementation of the standard</li> <li>2. Implementation of the standard</li> <li>3. Publication of the first results</li> </ol>	1999 12.2004  During 2005 End 2005
Czech Republic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preparation</li> <li>2. Implementation</li> </ol>	1993 01.1994
Finland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USP's report according to standard</li> <li>2. Auditing report from research company paid by NRA</li> </ol>	31.03.2004 26.5.2004
Germany	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USP &amp; external company presented their measurement system to NRA</li> <li>2. Some modifications in agreement with the NRA</li> <li>3. Invitations to tender for the auditing</li> <li>4. Decision for the auditor</li> <li>5. Auditor's Confirmation</li> <li>6. First results for third quarter of the year</li> </ol>	05.2003  May-Dec 2003 03.2004 04.2004 08.2004 10.2004

Ireland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public Consultation &amp; Report</li> <li>2. Preliminary Interviews</li> <li>3. Tender for Research Company</li> <li>4. Contract in place</li> <li>5. Real Mail Study</li> <li>6. Begin Pilot Measurement Programme</li> <li>7. Commence Live Measurement</li> <li>8. First Quarter Results &amp; Report</li> </ol>	<p>May-Sep 2001 10.2001 12.2001 08.2002 Aug/Sep 2002 10.2002 1.1.2003 05.2003</p>
Luxembourg	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First request for a consultant</li> <li>2. Second request for a consultant</li> <li>3. Placing order with consultant</li> </ol>	<p>30.10.2002 08.04.2003 23.07.2003</p>
Netherlands	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Receiver panel 4 years</li> <li>2. Increasing proportion handwritten</li> <li>3. Changing the distribution of the weights of test letters according to real mail</li> </ol>	<p>2003 2003 2003</p>
Norway	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer to conduct measurement</li> <li>2. Consultation with NRA</li> </ol>	<p>01.2002 06.2003</p>
Poland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analysis of the standard</li> <li>2. Compliance with the specific conditions in Poland – division of the country into 10 test areas and establishment of the sample size – 10,000 items, once a year</li> <li>3. Division of the country into 30 test areas and establishment of the sample size – 9,600 items – 4 times a year</li> </ol>	<p>2002 2002 2004</p>
Portugal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Real mail studies</li> <li>2. Statistical design</li> <li>3. Software development</li> <li>4. Manual of procedures</li> <li>5. Trial period</li> <li>6. ISO certification</li> </ol> <p>Note: annual audits to verify accuracy of the system have been conducted by NRA since 1999. Resulting from these NRA recommended some changes to improve measurement design.</p>	<p>1999 1999 1999 1999 2000 2002</p>
Romania	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure EN 13850 is in the USP licence conditions</li> <li>2. Ensure USP Licence conditions include steps to attain standards</li> <li>3. Agree ANRC procedures for overseeing USP attainments</li> <li>4. Apply a reporting procedure on USP</li> <li>5. Continuous assessment of USP by ANRC</li> </ol>	<p>07.2004</p>



Slovakia	1. Working out the measurement methodology in accordance with EN to respect national conditions	31.12.2004
	2. Setting of implementation schedule	31.12.2004
	3. Approval of methodology of measurement	30.03.2005
	4. Realization of study of real mail items	30.06.2005
	5. Execution of the pilot measurement according to approved methodology	30.11.2005
	6. Evaluation of the methodology and its updating according to finding determined by implementation	31.12.2005
Slovenia	1. Publication on SIST web site	1.1.2004
	2. Implementation by Slovenian Post	1.1.2004
Spain	1. Measurement by Waves	Until 2002
	2. Continuous measurement	2003
Sweden	Implementation by Sweden Post	2001

In chapter B.4 you will find further implementation scenarios for the other standards.

The costs depend on the size of these countries and these are sometimes divided into internal and external costs. In most countries the costs are paid by the USP, in two cases they are divided between the USP and the NRA, and in three countries the NRA has paid everything.

In chapter B.5/B.6 you will find an indication regarding the cost of the measurement, but when interpreting these costs, please take into account that the systems in place are often broader than the minimum requirements according to standards.

When asked about problems costs and difficulties in obtaining real mail data are given as answers in most cases. The advice for those who have yet to implement the standards is to look for a credible consultant or research institute as well as bearing in mind that cooperation between the NRA and the USP can be helpful.

### **Section C: Future improvements : attitude/intention**

The attitude of the majority of the NRAs towards the new standards is very positive as a beginning or basis for improving Quality of Service. Asking for plans to improve the Quality of Service covered by the standard, the following answers were given:

*Table 2: Do you plan to improve the Quality of Service covered by the standard?*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) Yes, there are plans to improve Quality of Service in the field	13	5	10	6	4	4
2) No, there are no plans to improve Quality of Service in the field	4	1	3	2	3	2
3) Other, please comment	4	0	3	2	0	0

No one indicated dissatisfaction with the standards. Only one country is fundamentally opposed to the standards, especially to EN 13850.

It should be pointed out, that a large majority of the NRAs is not planning at present to extend the standards to multiple operators, for example EN 13850 (83,3%) and EN 14012 (80%).

## **Section D: Positive elements experienced in the implementation of standards**

Regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the standards, most answers concerned EN 13850 and 14012. The conclusion is nearly the same for EN 14508. The answers for the other standards are less representative due to lack of experience. The main focus of the advantage of EN 13850 is a harmonized measuring system for all countries, that leads to an improvement of the quality of postal services and the fact that it is an objective measurement. The disadvantages are the costs, the system is quite complicated, measurement only of the transit time and the fact that the USP can influence results by changing the collection time. EN 14012 has some additional advantages in its consumer focus and compensation elements but also here the costs and complexity are too high.

## **Section E: General questions**

The majority answered that the development of the standards has contributed to the improvement of the quality of service and that the project team will provide solutions required for those countries that have yet to implement many of the standards that are under review.

## **Section F: Contact persons**

An interesting list of contact persons is given in annex 1.

## **Section G: Final conclusions**

All final conclusions are given in section G, but in general the QoS standards developed by CEN have in the opinion of CERP members contributed to improving the quality of service offered by postal service providers across Europe.

It is worth while noting some additional observations:

1. For the measurement to be reliable, it is essential to have it done by an independent research company. This applies especially to QoS Standards dealing with non-registered letters (EN 13850, EN 14508, EN 14534, TS 14773).
2. Another crucial point about reliability of measurement is an audit of standard EN 13850. Not all member states have been aware that it is an activity that is mandatory to do via an independent body.
3. Despite the advantages of the standards, they were criticised for being complicated and too detailed which in the end makes the implementation costly. This implies a need to simplify, make it less detailed and not so costly when updating the standards.
4. Except of few countries that work on English versions, the majority of countries translate the standards into local languages, so it was extremely important that language used in standards was clear and easy to translate.

5. There is a need to create new possibilities for exchanging information regarding standard implementation. The Project Team hopes that this report will be the first contribution to activate the exchange of information in this field. Moreover some additional steps are proposed:
  - 1) updated experts address list for easy access;
  - 2) publish this report and other relevant information on the CERP website and distribute it among European Committee for Standardisation (CEN), European Commission, PostEurop and International Post Corporation (IPC);
  - 3) present this report during meetings held by interested parties (e.g. CEN plenary meeting in Stockholm on 10<sup>th</sup> of June 2005, the next meeting of CEN WG 1 "Quality of Service");
  - 4) create a system of information frequently distributed by electronic means reporting the latest developments in the field of standardisation.
  
6. There are a lot of topics, where help is needed more than in general. For those sharing of information and best practices among CERP members is highly required.

## INTRODUCTION

Quality of service appears essential to users, it is important that the latter have at their disposal harmonised standards of quality of service and common measurement methods to assess the convergence of quality of service within Europe. Standardisation is essential to promoting interconnection and interoperability of the postal network.

Under mandate 240 of the Commission CEN/TC331/WG1, the following standards have been adopted up to now:

- EN 13850 Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail
- EN 14012 Measurement of complaints and redress procedures
- EN 14137 Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace systems
- EN 14508 Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail
- EN 14534 Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail
- TS 14773 Measurement of loss and substantial delay of priority and first class mail using a survey of test letters

At the moment, four of the above standards are under review by CEN, namely EN 13850, EN 14012, EN 14508 and EN 14534. Due to the extension of existing standards to new EU members, amendments are prepared for the following EN standards: EN 13850, EN 14508 and EN 14534. Two new implementation guides are drafted for EN 14012 and EN 14534, and the existing implementation guide for EN 13850 (TR 14079) is under review.

At the CERP working group « standardisation » on 15 January 2004 in Bonn, it was decided to create a new Project Team «Implementation of CEN quality of service standards ».

The purpose of the project team was to benefit from the experience of countries that have already experienced the implementation of all or part of the QoS standards. Among CERP members it seemed useful to share the experience some regulators have gathered in this field with those who have not yet implemented (all) standards.

The project team was headed by Belgium (Belgian Institute for Postal services and Telecommunications) and its members came from France, Germany, Ireland, Poland and Slovenia.

CEN deals with all kinds of standards including quite a few technical standards that ensure interoperability of the various components of sorting installations and which mainly relate to mail item processing, databases and hybrid mail.

However, this project team has focused exclusively on the standards mentioned above. These QoS standards are implemented unequally in the European countries.

As a first step the project group drew up a questionnaire to gather the information needed from the various ministries and regulators. In annex 3 you will find this questionnaire as well as the results of the questionnaire.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to seek information on the following areas regarding implementation of CEN QoS standards:

- current position regarding implementation of the standard
- methods of implementation being used
- attitude toward the implementation of the standard, and intentions/views for future improvement
- positive / negative experiences in implementing the standard which have been found useful and ready to share with others
- general information about standardisation including the translation issue
- contact persons

The questionnaire was distributed in the course of May 2004 after having been approved by the CERP plenary. This extensive questionnaire was answered by no less than 22 countries, namely Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden.

Based on both the information collected by means of the questionnaire and the discussions held during the meetings of the Project Team and the Working Group "Standardization", we have arrived at the following report.

This is not a country analysis, but – in accordance with the mandate of the project team – a general analysis of the implementation of CEN QoS standards. We hope this general analysis can provide an answer to any questions or problems you may have regarding the implementation of a standard. For information about the number of countries that have implemented a standard in one way or another, we refer to annex 3, where a general summary is given of all the answers. This does not imply however, that the option most chosen is the best way to transpose a particular standard, since this often depends on the national context.

The goal of adding the address file in annex 1 was to create an interactive report, since that address file can be used in case of national problems or questions to contact persons who may offer a solution.

Please note that this report is based on data from 2004. If we have made references to any country situation which are not correct, please contact the PT chairman so that he can correct or modify the report accordingly.

The structure of the report is based on the structure of the questionnaire. So it is recommended to read the report in conjunction with annex 3 (the results of the questionnaire). Furthermore it is important to know that 25 % of the respondents do not have second class mail. Regarding the interpretation of the result, except for EN 13850 and EN 14012, lack of information regarding the other standards was observed.

In addition this report is going to be published on the CERP website to make it available to everyone. This should also enable us, if necessary, updating the address file on a regular basis.

It is the hope of the project team that this report is a source of enrichment and a tool for implementing the CEN QoS standards.

**SECTION A : QUESTIONS REGARDING STATUS AND CURRENT SITUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STANDARDS**

**A.1/A.2: Have you already implemented the CEN QoS standard and is this implementation compliant with the standard**

The main tendency is that the EN 13850 standard is the only one already widely implemented. EN 14012 has not been largely implemented yet, but there is a great consensus to do so. For the other standards, opinions are divided.

*Table 1: Have you already implemented the CEN QoS standards*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773	All Standards
1) Yes	18 (82%)	7 (39%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	41
2) No, but we intend to.	2 (9%)	3 (17%)	8 (40%)	8 (40%)	5 (25%)	6 (38%)	32
3) No, we do not intend to	0 (0%)	8 (44%)	1 (5%)	8 (40%)	8 (40%)	10 (62%)	35
4) Other	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	8
Total responses	22	18	20	20	20	16	116

*Table 2: Is the standard you have implemented compliant with the CEN standard*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773	All Standards
1) Fully compliant with CEN standard	9 (47%)	5 (63%)	5 (50%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	23
2) Partly compliant with minor changes	10 (53%)	3 (37%)	4 (40%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	3 (100%)	24
3) Partly compliant with significant changes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	3
Total responses	19	8	10	5	5	3	50

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail

Almost all the countries that have answered the questionnaire, have already implemented this standard. 4 remaining countries have the same intention or they have already started to work on it. The implementation is generally considered fully compliant (47%) with the CEN standard or partly compliant with minor changes (53 %). Not one country stated that the implementation is partly compliant with significant changes.

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail

More than one third of the countries have already implemented this standard, mostly complying with the CEN standard, 3 intend to and almost half of them do not intend to implement this standard. The reason is the fact that in a quarter of the countries who answered, this service does not exist.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

Almost half of the countries that answered have already implemented this standard and the other half intend to. Only 1 country has no intention to follow the others. The implementation mostly complies fully (5), or partly (4) with minor changes.

- EN 14137: Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system

Few countries have already implemented this standard (3) in full compliance with the CEN standard and almost half of the others intend to. More than one third of the countries have no intention to implement this standard.

- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail

Half of the countries have implemented it or intend to (10), while the other half (10) have no intention to do so, or have not decided yet. The implementation is totally compliant with the CEN standard in only one case. The other countries that have already implemented it have minor or major changes to put in place to be compliant with the CEN standard.

- TS 14773: Measurement of loss and substantial delay of priority and first-class mail using a survey of test letters

This standard has not been implemented yet and the majority of the countries who answered do not intend to, or do not know yet (10). 6 countries stated that they intend to implement it in the future. This Technical Specification has not been tested in any of the countries and therefore there are no acquired experiences concerning the use of it. Only Portugal has been measuring loss of priority and non-priority mail since 1995

### **A.3: How is compliance with the standard audited**

The general tendency is that compliance of the implementation is not audited in a quarter of the cases. When it is audited, it is mainly done by the NRA or by a consulting company.

*Table 3: How is compliance with the standard audited*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards <sup>1</sup>	All Standards
1. by research company	5 (24%)	1 (11%)	1 (4%)	7
2. by consulting company	5 (24%)	1 (11%)	5 (22%)	11
3. it is not audited	4 (19%)	6 (67%)	7 (30%)	17
4. by NRA	6 (29%)	1 (11%)	9 (40%)	16
5. by governmental body	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
6. other	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	2
Total responses	21	9	23	53

- **EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail**

Auditing of this standard is more or less equally divided into 4 methods: by a research company, by a consulting company, by the NRA, or it is not audited at all (4). One country stated that auditing is done by the USP.

- **EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures**

In more than half of the countries compliance with this standard is not audited. In one country auditing is conducted by a research company and in another one by a consulting company. The NRA's are auditing compliance with the standard in one country.

- **Other standards**

In almost half of the countries compliance with these standards is audited by the NRA, while a quarter of the countries which answered this question conduct auditing through a consulting company. In more than a quarter of the cases compliance is not audited. Only one country audits compliance with the standard using a research company.

<sup>1</sup> EN 14508, EN 14137, EN 14534, TS 14773



#### **A.4: What is the legal status of the standard**

According to the answers, the implementation of the standards mostly appears to be on a voluntary basis, but we can notice important differences between EN 13850 and other standards.

*Table 4: What is the legal status of the standards*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards	All Standards
1. Implementation is voluntary	3 (14%)	3 (19%)	21 (43%)	27
2. Implementation is voluntary, but the issue covered by the standard is regulated	6 (29%)	8 (50%)	13 (27%)	27
3. Implementation is mandatory	12 (57%)	4 (25%)	6 (12%)	22
4. The service covered by the standard does not exist in my country	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	9 (18%)	10
Total responses	21	16	49	86

#### **- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail**

12 countries consider EN 13850 to be mandatory and 6 others have included the issue covered by this standard in their legislation:

- by a law, a decree or an ordinance in two thirds of the countries.
- by a licence or a contract between the USP and the State or the NRA in one third of the countries.

We wish to draw your attention to the letter of the European Commission (see annex 4) addressed to all Members of the Postal Directive Committee of 21 March 2005, announcing that references to the different CEN postal EN standards have been published in the Official Journal of the European Union. As regards EN 13850 the European Commission informs Member States that they have to ensure that the performance levels are measured according to this standard for domestic mail from January 2004, and for cross border mail from January 2005, and that the results are published once a year as required by the Directive. The implementation of EN 13850 becomes mandatory.

Following the mandate given to CEN/TC331, adaptations were needed to the following standards EN 13850, EN 14508 and EN 14534 due to the extension of existing standards to new EU members.

#### **- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures**

In half of the countries implementation is voluntary, but the issue is regulated. In 4 countries implementation is mandatory and voluntary in the other 3.

#### **- Other standards**

In more than half of the countries implementation is voluntary and in almost a quarter of them it is voluntary and the issue is regulated.

### **A.5: Who is responsible for the measurement of the standard**

Most of the measurements are carried out by the USP, half of them according to regulation and half of them by practice.

*Table 5: Who is responsible for the measurement of the standard*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards	All Standards
1. NRA, according to regulation A.4	7 (39%)	1 (14%)	1 (4%)	9
2. NRA, by practice	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	6 (32%)	7
3. USP, according to regulation A.4	5 (28%)	3 (43%)	6 (32%)	14
4. USP, by practice	5 (28%)	3 (43%)	6 (32%)	14
5. Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
Total responses	18	7	19	44

#### **- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail**

In 7 countries the NRA is responsible for the measurement of this standard according to regulation and in 1 case by practice. In more than half of the countries responsibility is in the hands of USP, partly according to regulation and partly by practice.

#### **- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures**

In only one country the NRA (according to regulation) is responsible for measurement, while in the other 6 countries the USP is.

#### **- Other standards**

In one country the NRA (according to regulation) is responsible for measurement. Responsibility for measurement is in other countries equally divided between the NRA (by practice), the USP (according to regulation), the USP (by practice).

### **A.6: To whom are the results of measurement reported?**

Most of the responses indicated that there are cases where the results are reported to more than one organization. The measurements of the standards are in a vast majority reported to the NRA, mainly according to regulation. Otherwise the measurements are reported to the government, customers or simply to the USP.

Chapter 6 of the Postal Directive 97/67 EC lays down the requirements regarding reporting and publication of the results of the measurement of quality of service.

*Table 6: To whom are the results of measurement reported*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards	All Standards
1. To NRA, according to regulation A.4	13 (57%)	6 (50%)	8 (44%)	27
2. To NRA, by practice	4 (17%)	2 (17%)	6 (33%)	12
3. Other	6 (26%)	4 (33%)	4 (23%)	14
Total responses	23	12	18	53

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail

In three quarters of the cases results of the measurement are reported to the NRA, mainly according to regulation, while another quarter includes government, customers or the USP.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

In half of the countries results of the measurement are reported to the NRA, according to regulation, while in the other half of the countries the results are reported to the NRA, by practice (2) or to another organization (4).

- Other standards

In three quarters of the countries results are reported to the NRA.

### **A.7: Is there any obligation concerning publication of the results**

Publication of the measurement is globally mentioned as an obligation in half of the answers, but there are important differences between the EN 13850 and the other standards.

The standard EN 13850 states that reports on the service performance for domestic mail shall be provided at least once a year but it does not state who should publish.

Results of measurement should be published, but in standard EN 13850 there is no demand whether to send these results to the Commission.

*Table 7: Is there any obligation concerning publication of the results*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards	All Standards
1. yes	12 (66%)	5 (50%)	7 (33%)	24
2. no, but the results are published	3 (17%)	1 (10%)	2 (9%)	6
3. no	3 (17%)	4 (40%)	12 (58%)	19
Total responses	18	10	21	49

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail

More than 80% of the countries that answered mentioned the obligation for the EN 13850 to be published.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

In half of the countries there is an obligation concerning the publication of the results of the measurement, while in 40% of the countries this kind of obligation does not exist.

- Other standards

In more than half of the countries there is no obligation concerning the publication of the results.

### **A.8: How often are the results published**

Generally when the results of the measurement are published, it is usually once a year. In some cases it is published more frequently, e.g. every 3 months.

### **A.9: Where are the results published**

A number of the responses indicated that the results are published in more than just one media. Some NRAs inform the press to publish it in the newspaper.

*Table 8: Where are the results published*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards	All Standards
1. NRA website	6 (25%)	2 (33%)	2 (19%)	10
2. USP website	4 (17%)	2 (33%)	4 (36%)	10
3. NRA bulletin / annual report	6 (25%)	1 (17%)	1 (9%)	8
4. USP bulletin / annual report	7 (29%)	1 (17%)	4 (36%)	12
5. Other	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1
Total responses	24	6	11	31

#### **- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail**

Publishing the results is almost equally spread between the NRA (website or bulletin/annual report) and the USP (website or bulletin/annual report). Only one country published the results in newspapers.

#### **- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures**

Three countries published the results through the NRA, another 3 through the USP.

#### **- Other standards**

A quarter of the countries published the results with the assistance of the NRA, three quarters with the support of the USP.

#### **A.10: Who conducts measurement in accordance with the standard**

In some cases, the NRA conducts the measurement by using internal resources. Most of the time, the USP conducts the measurement by itself or mandates an external company.

*Table 9: Who conducts measurements in accordance with the standard?*

	EN 13850	EN 14012	Other standards	All Standards
1. NRA, external company	4 (19%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	5
2. NRA, internal resource	3 (14%)	1 (14%)	4 (25%)	8
3. USP, external company	10 (48%)	1 (14%)	6 (38%)	17
4. USP, internal resource	4 (19%)	5 (72%)	5 (31%)	14
Total responses	21	7	16	44

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail

In two thirds of the countries the USP conducts the measurement in accordance with the standard, mainly using an external company. In the other third of the countries the NRA is the one who conducts the measurement.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

Out of 7 countries which answered this question, the USP conducts the measurement in 5 cases, using internal resources.

- Other standards

In 70% of the countries the USP is the one who conducts the measurement, either by using external or internal resources. In a quarter of the countries the NRA (internal resources) conducts the measurement and there is one country where this obligation is in the hands of the NRA with the help of an external company.

## **SECTION B: QUESTIONS REGARDING STATUS AND CURRENT SITUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STANDARDS**

This section focuses on the methods of implementation currently used by CERP members and/or methods to be used in the future for the QoS standards that are under review by the project team.

### **B.1: Implementation Timetable**

Out of the 22 responses received 20 countries have commenced implementation of at least one, if not more, of the QoS standards.

#### **- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail**

Of the responses received to this question, all but 2 have commenced measurement of single piece priority mail and first class mail. The 2 remaining countries will commence late 2004 and early 2005. It is worthy to note that the Czech Republic has been measuring quality of service of single piece mail since 1994, Portugal since 1995, Sweden since 1996, Belgium since 1998. Norway, France and Estonia have been measuring since 2000; Finland, Hungary and Poland since 2002; Luxembourg, Ireland, Germany, Netherlands, Spain and Austria since 2003; and Slovakia and Slovenia commenced measurement in 2004. The measurement systems in place at the beginning were often different from the EN 13850 but have been adopted later accordingly EN 13850. Cyprus and Sweden have also indicated that quality of cross-border mail has been measured since 1999 and 1995 respectively.

#### **- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail**

Portugal has been measuring quality of service of single piece non-priority and second class mail since 1995. Norway started using this measurement in 2000, Belgium and Hungary in 2002, Poland mid-2003 and Slovakia at the beginning of 2004.

#### **- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures**

Estonia has been measuring complaints and redress procedures since April 2002, Hungary and Belgium also in 2002, Finland and Sweden from 2003, Slovenia is reviewing the steps required to implement this standard and Austria commenced measurement at the beginning of 2004.

#### **- EN 14137: Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system**

Slovenia is reviewing the steps required to implement this standard. Estonia commenced measurement in March 2003 and Finland has been measuring since the end of 2003.

- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail

France has been measuring Bulk Mail quality since 2001, Estonia since late 2002. Belgium has been measuring Bulk Mail quality since 2003 while Finland has commenced measurement in this field in April 2004. The remaining respondents to this questionnaire are not currently measuring quality of Bulk Mail transit.

- TS 14773: Measurement of loss and substantial delay of priority and first-class mail using a survey of test letters

It is worthy to note that none of the respondents to the questionnaire have started to use this technical specification to date, but it should be noted that Portugal has already been measuring loss of priority and non-priority mail since 1995.

**B.2: Work required to implement the standards**

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail

Half of the countries needed to adapt a previous measurement standard to comply with EN 13850 while for the remaining countries it was the first measurement to be conducted.

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail

Four respondents that are currently implementing this standard stated that they have had to adapt a previous measurement system. Belgium and Poland have implemented it in accordance with the standard as a first measure from 2002 and 2003 respectively. Six countries stated that the service does not exist in their country and five responses say they have no intention of implementing this standard.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

Of the seven countries currently using this standard three stated that it was a new or first time measure, one stating that a previous system had to be adapted, one stated that it was a voluntary step taken by the operator while the others did not indicate what steps had to be taken to comply. Most of the other responses indicated an intention to implement this standard at some time in the future.

- EN 14137: Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system

Two countries replied that measurement is being conducted for the first time.



- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail

Of the four countries replying that measurement is being conducted one stated that no measurements had been adopted or conducted before, another stated that it was the first measurement while the remaining two countries needed to adapt a previous measurement standard.

**B.3: What forced the need to conduct measurements**

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail

Of the responses received to this question 14 countries stated that it was implemented as a result of a national regulatory requirement, of which 5 of these respondents stated that there was a need for the NRA to follow the USP's activity and with 6 of these responses stating that customer needs were also taken into account. Two countries stated that the USP requested to implement this standard, one of which saying that mutual agreement was reached between the USP and the NRA. Another stated that there was a need to ensure compliance between USO services and Standards. Other reasons included a need to comply with a mandatory standard while another stated that the NRA's requirement to follow USP activity and consumer needs alone was what forced the need to comply.

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail

Of the six countries using this standard the majority stated that it was implemented as a result of a national regulatory requirement combined with a need to follow USP activity and consumer needs were also taken into account. Two countries stated that it was implemented as a result of the USP's request.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

Of the five countries responding to this question two stated that it was a national regulatory requirement combined with a need to follow USP activity by the NRA and consumer needs. Other reasons included mutual agreement between the USP and the NRA, a combination of customer needs and the NRA's need to follow USP activity and the USP requesting to implement this standard.

- EN 14137: Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system

Of the countries that responded saying that measurement is being conducted one said there was a need for the NRA to follow the USP activity while another stated that there was a need to ensure compliance of USO services with the standards (see above).

- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail

Of the three responses to this question one said there was a need for the NRA to follow the USP activity while the others stated that consumer needs were the driver to implement the standard. (see above).

#### **B.4: Steps to implement**

In the tables below you will find different approaches regarding EN implementation:

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail:

*Table 10: Different implementation scenarios EN 13850*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Austria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tender process</li> <li>2. Pilot phase</li> <li>3. Implementation</li> <li>4. Adoption</li> </ol>	2001 2002 2003 2005
Belgium	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First wave of independent measurement by BIPT</li> <li>2. Second wave of independent measurement by BIPT</li> <li>3. Agreement between NRA and USP to replace the BIPT system and the internal system of De Post by an independent measurement system</li> <li>4. Describing the requirements and selection of a consultant</li> <li>5. Start of test measurements</li> <li>6. Operational measurements</li> </ol>	1998-2000 2001 End 2000 Beginning 2001 Second half 2001 2002
Cyprus	Cross-border mail is already being measured by IPC <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For national mail: Terms of Tender regarding implementation of the standard</li> <li>2. Implementation of the standard</li> <li>3. Publication of the first results</li> </ol>	1999 12.2004 During 2005 End 2005
Czech Republic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preparation</li> <li>2. Implementation</li> </ol>	1993 01.1994
Finland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USP's report according to standard</li> <li>2. Auditing report from research company paid by NRA</li> </ol>	31.03.2004 26.5.2004
Germany	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USP &amp; external company presented their measurement system to NRA</li> <li>2. Some modifications in agreement with the NRA</li> <li>3. Invitations to tender for the auditing</li> <li>4. Decision for the auditor</li> <li>5. Auditor's Confirmation</li> <li>6. First results for third quarter of the year</li> </ol>	05.2003 May-Dec 2003 03.2004 04.2004 08.2004 10.2004
Ireland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public Consultation &amp; Report</li> <li>2. Preliminary Interviews</li> <li>3. Tender for Research Company</li> <li>4. Contract in place</li> <li>5. Real Mail Study</li> <li>6. Begin Pilot Measurement Programme</li> <li>7. Commence Live Measurement</li> <li>8. First Quarter Results &amp; Report</li> </ol>	May-Sep 2001 10.2001 12.2001 08.2002 Aug/Sep 2002 10.2002 1.1.2003 05.2003

Luxembourg	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First request for a consultant</li> <li>2. Second request for a consultant</li> <li>3. Placing order with consultant</li> </ol>	<p>30.10.2002 08.04.2003 23.07.2003</p>
Netherlands	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Receiver panel 4 years</li> <li>2. Increasing proportion handwritten</li> <li>3. Changing the distribution of the weights of test letters according to real mail</li> </ol>	<p>2003 2003 2003</p>
Norway	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer to conduct measurement</li> <li>2. Consultation with NRA</li> </ol>	<p>01.2002 06.2003</p>
Poland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analysis of the standard</li> <li>2. Compliance with the specific conditions in Poland – division of the country into 10 test areas and establishment of the sample size – 10,000 items, once a year</li> <li>3. Division of the country into 30 test areas and establishment of the sample size – 9,600 items – 4 times a year</li> </ol>	<p>2002 2002  2004</p>
Portugal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Real mail studies</li> <li>2. Statistical design</li> <li>3. Software development</li> <li>4. Manual of procedures</li> <li>5. Trial period</li> <li>6. ISO certification</li> </ol> <p>Note: annual audits to verify accuracy of the system have been conducted by NRA since 1999. Resulting from these NRA recommended some changes to improve measurement design.</p>	<p>1999 1999 1999 1999 2000 2002</p>
Romania	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure EN 13850 is in the USP licence conditions</li> <li>2. Ensure USP Licence conditions include steps to attain standards</li> <li>3. Agree ANRC procedures for overseeing USP attainments</li> <li>4. Apply a reporting procedure on USP</li> <li>5. Continuous assessment of USP by ANRC</li> </ol>	<p>07.2004</p>
Slovakia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Working out the measurement methodology in accordance with EN to respect national conditions</li> <li>2. Setting of implementation schedule</li> <li>3. Approval of methodology of measurement</li> <li>4. Realization of study of real mail items</li> <li>5. Execution of the pilot measurement according to approved methodology</li> <li>6. Evaluation of the methodology and its updating according to finding determined by implementation</li> </ol>	<p>31.12.2004  31.12.2004 30.03.2005 30.06.2005 30.11.2005  31.12.2005</p>
Slovenia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Publication on SIST web site</li> <li>2. Implementation by Slovenian Post</li> </ol>	<p>1.1.2004 1.1.2004</p>
Spain	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Measurement by Waves</li> <li>2. Continuous measurement</li> </ol>	<p>Until 2002 2003</p>
Sweden	Published by SIS	20.12.2002

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail:

*Table 11: Different implementation scenarios EN 14508*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Belgium	Identical to EN 13850	
Norway	Offer to conduct measurement	01.2002
Poland	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analysis of the standard</li> <li>2. Compliance with the specific conditions in Poland – division of the country into 10 test areas and establishment of the sample size – 10,000 items, once a year</li> <li>3. Division of the country into 30 test areas and establishment of the sample size – 9,600 items – 4 times a year</li> </ol>	<p>2003 2003  2004</p>
Portugal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Real mail studies</li> <li>2. Statistical design</li> <li>3. Software development</li> <li>4. Manual of procedures</li> <li>5. Trial period</li> <li>6. ISO certification</li> </ol> <p>Note: annual audits to verify accuracy of the system have been conducted by NRA since 1999. Resulting from these NRA recommended some changes to improve measurement design.</p>	<p>1999 1999 1999 1999 2000 2002</p>
Slovakia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Working out the measurement methodology in accordance with EN to respect national conditions</li> <li>2. Setting of implementation schedule</li> <li>3. Approval of methodology of measurement</li> <li>4. Realization of study of real mail items</li> <li>5. Execution of the pilot measurement according to approved methodology</li> <li>6. Evaluation of the methodology and its updating according to finding determined by implementation</li> </ol>	<p>31.12.2004  31.12.2004 30.03.2005 30.06.2005 30.11.2005  31.12.2005</p>
Slovenia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Publication on SIST web site</li> <li>2. Acquaintance by Slovenian Post</li> </ol>	<p>1.1.2004 1.1.2004</p>
Sweden	Implementation by Sweden Post	2001

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures:

*Table 12: Different implementation scenarios EN 14012*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Austria	1. Design 2. Tender phase 3. Pilot phase 4. Adoption 5. Implementation (partly) 6. Adaptations	4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr 2002 1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr 2003 2003 2003 2004 ongoing
Cyprus	1. Study of the terms of the standard 2. Definition of the implementation timetable	During 2004 2005
Finland	1. USP's report according to standard 2. Auditing report from research company paid by NRA	31.03.2004 26.5.2004
Norway	1. Research 2. Test version 1 3. Test version 2 4. Implementation for use 5. Full version in use	10.09.2001 15.12.2001 01.05.2002 01.07.2002 01.12.2002
Slovakia	1. Modification of the system of measurement of complaints according to requirements of EN 2. Implementation of the system of measurement of complaints 3. Evaluation of the system of measurement of complaints	31.12.2004 31.12.2005 30.04.2006
Slovenia	1. Publication on SIST web site 2. Acquaintance by Slovenian Post	01.01.2004 01.01.2004
Sweden	Implementation by Sweden Post	2001

- EN 14137: Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system:

*Table 13: Different implementation scenarios EN 14137*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Slovenia	Publication on SIST web site <sup>2</sup>	01.01.2004
Sweden	Published by SIS <sup>3</sup>	19.09.2003

- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail:

No information was provided regarding the necessary steps to be used to implement this standard.

<sup>2</sup> See above

<sup>3</sup> Swedish Standardization Institute (section EN 13850)

## **B.5 and B.6: Costs of implementation and who bears the costs**

From the responses received the costs incurred for implementing the standards varied greatly from one country to another. As this information may be sensitive the project team decided not to detail individual country costs. The following tables are intended to provide an indication of how wide-ranging the costs involved can be. As you will note a number of countries refrained from providing the costs involved.

To understand the cost of implementation, the following elements should be taken into account:

- In our questionnaire, we asked for the cost of the current system which covered mostly more than the minimum requirements of the standards (For example: some countries have a sample design of 3 times the minimum size required by the standard or have a much more detailed stratification because a lot of USP's use the operational measurement as a management tool.)
- Regarding the cost, we have only asked in our questionnaire the total cost. This total cost often includes internal and external costs (For example: the cost of the consultant, but also the labour cost of the persons in charge of the measurement system within the USP and/or NRA.)

It is worthy to note at this point that contact details are listed at the end of this Report and it may be possible to clarify more precisely the extent of the costs involved in implementing some of the QoS standards under review by this team by using the contact details provided.

In the tables below you will find relevant information regarding the cost of implementation:

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail:

*Table 14: Costs of implementation of EN 13850*

<b>Not Stated</b>	<b>Less than 100 000 EUR</b>	<b>Between 100 000 and 250 000 EUR</b>	<b>More than 500 000 EUR</b>
9 (50%)	4 <sup>4</sup> (22%)	2 (11%)	3 <sup>5</sup> (17%)

*Table 15: Costs borne regarding EN 13850*

<b>USP 100%</b>	<b>NRA 100%</b>	<b>USP/NRA</b>	<b>Not stated</b>
10 (56%)	4 (22%)	3 <sup>6</sup> (17%)	1 (5%)

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail:

*Table 16: Costs of implementation of EN 14508*

<b>Not Stated</b>	<b>Less than 100 000 EUR</b>	<b>Between 100 000 and 250 000 EUR</b>	<b>More than 500 000 EUR</b>
4	2 <sup>7</sup>	0	1 <sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> In one case costs are split into internal and external with internal costs being provided for in terms of manpower time required.

<sup>5</sup> In one case the costs are divided between internal and external – values provided in this particular case also include the cost of measuring non-priority and second class mail.

<sup>6</sup> In one case a proposal to share the cost between the USP & NRA is under consideration, another splits the costs between the cost of audits and cost of implementation while the other splits the costs on a 60/40 basis between NRA/USP

Table 17: Costs borne regarding EN 14508

USP 100%	NRA 100%	USP/NRA	Not stated
3	1	1 <sup>9</sup>	2

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures:

Table 18: Costs of implementation of EN 14012

Not Stated	Less than 100 000 EUR	Between 100 000 and 250 000 EUR	More than 500 000 EUR
6	1	0	1

Table 19: Costs born by regarding EN 14012

USP 100%	NRA 100%	USP/NRA	Not stated
6	0	2 <sup>10</sup>	0

- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail

Table 20: Costs of implementation of EN 14534

Not Stated	Less than 100 000 EUR	Between 100 000 and 250 000 EUR	More than 500 000 EUR
4	0	0	1

Table 21: Costs borne regarding EN 14534

USP 100%	NRA 100%	USP/NRA	Not stated
2	0	0	3

<sup>7</sup> In one case the costs are split between internal and external costs.

<sup>8</sup> Values provided include the cost of measuring single piece priority and first class mail

<sup>9</sup> Values provided split the costs on a 60/40 basis between NRA/USP

<sup>10</sup> In one case the values provided split the costs on a 10/90 basis between NRA/USP and in the other case a proposal to share costs is under consideration without providing values.

## **B.7: Problems and solutions**

The following tables highlight problems, experiences and provide some solutions:

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail:

*Table 22: Possible problems with suggested solutions regarding EN 13850*

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Solution</b>
Requirements for the system of measurement (e.g. continuity of measurement) cause considerable financial requirements for its realization	Implementation of EN step by step, according to the financial possibilities
Funding	Phasing the implementation
Lack of human resources	Recruitment
New concepts and requirements	Research & innovation
Selecting representative regions	Task ordered to external company
Difficulties in obtaining data concerning real postal item streams	Negotiations
Finding a consultant	Two trials
USP does not like independence	Explain reasons, methodology & get answers right
Real Mail stream	Not yet available
Insufficient expertise within research company carrying out the auditing of the measurement	-
Knowledge	Study and follow-up
Design of the survey	External consulting
Acceptability of the results	Internal communication
Technical	Discussion with NRA

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail:

Same as table 22



- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures:

*Table 23: Possible problems with suggested solutions regarding EN 14102*

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Solution</b>
Implementation of EN requires modification of the current system of measurement of complaints (new forms, instructions, recording of parameters, which have not been recorded before, etc)	Realization step by step
Make the system cooperate with other systems	Working with the owner of other systems for making this one
Speed of system	Still working on
Access to system	Different user groups
Tracing of what is being put into the system	Access control and saving of user in database
Sufficient expertise within research company carrying out the auditing of the measurement	-
Complaint process	Consequent streamlining
Complex standard provisions	Adaptation of process and system to both USP's and customer needs
Human resources	Training, staffing

### **B.8: Lessons learned from implementation**

*Table 24: Lessons learned from implementation*

Building up knowledge of CEN standards makes it possible to put such standards into force as soon as possible. Everyone in the organisation wants to contribute to such a system. Much easier to meet obligations to the NRA. Able to locate faults in the system and correct them in the exact unit that made it.
Expertise is required, as well as significant human and financial resources
Implementation was difficult due to the irregular postage: however, it was essential to find out the real transit time for mail – it is a basis to assess the postal services quality
Due to uniformity of the standards, a comparison from year to year is possible
The standard implementation is too expensive for small countries
Important to follow rules set out in the standard for EN 13850. NRA result was more accurate than previous USP study. Credible research company important. Panel selection – get proper mix and number.
Differences exist between the measurement of the transit time and the measurement of end-to-end services. EN 13850 is related only to the transit time and not to the end-to-end services.
To start the work cooperation is needed between NRA, USP and research company conducting the measurement and auditing of it.

Standards difficult to implement due to complex provisions. Standards sometimes do not satisfy USP's and customer needs to the necessary extent. Statistical requirements are too complex and do not deliver appropriate results. In the framework of implementation adaptations are necessary. The implementation of standards is an essential cost factor. Standards are necessary to assess performance and comparisons.
The introduction of CEN QoS standards for measuring the transit time for priority mail has enormously increased the importance of QoS objectives within the organization of the USP. Through this independent measurement system you obtain indubitable results. Furthermore, it allows implementation of an adequate and reliable management system because you can detect weakness within your operational organization.

**B.9: Advice for those who have yet to implement**

*Table 25: Advice to others wishing to implement QoS standards*

Get advice from a consultant and know the best practices across European Regulators
Made the system at the same time as the customer service was centralized – the coordination was very important and has made implementation much easier. Made it possible to import and export data to other systems being used. The system made it possible to report on product development, sales and produced data for employees in the organisation who required the data for their work.
Phasing the implementation and training the human resources
Make use of experience of other European NRAs in order to avoid mistakes. Cooperation between USP & NRA is essential
Foresee enough time to prepare the implementation procedure
Credible Company. Panel Management Experience.
Cooperation between NRA and USP can be helpful.
Use best practice and know-how from other operators and consultants. Do not re-invent the wheel.

## SECTION C : FUTURE IMPROVEMENT/ATTITUDE/INTENTION

This section analyses future improvements on the one hand and the attitude and intention regarding the standardisation work on the other.

### **C.1: What is your Organisation's attitude/view towards implementing the standard?**

The majority of the National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) take a rather pragmatic stance on the fact that these standards are the only possible harmonised method for measuring quality of service across the whole of Europe. There are two countries that do not see any advantages in implementing the standards; one NRA is against all standards, while on the other hand 5 NRAs are really "happy" to implement the standards especially EN 13850 and EN 14012, in the manner specified.

*Table 26: What is your Organisation's attitude/view towards implementing the standard?*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1. We are happy to implement the standard in the manner specified	5	1	5	1	0	1
2. It is the only possible harmonised method or measuring transit time across Europe	12	5	6	7	5	4
3. We do not see any advantages in implementing the standard, but we accept the decision to implement it	2	2	2	2	2	3

### **C.2: Does your Organisation plan to extend the standard to multiple operators?**

A large majority of the NRAs is not planning at present to extend the standards to multiple operators. Many NRAs answered that it should be discussed again, perhaps in a few years' time. For the moment there is only one USP or the market share is not high enough etc. There is no country where standards have already been extended and only in three countries there are plans to extend the standards.

*Table 27: Does your Organisation plan to extend the standard to multiple operators?*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1. Yes, the standard has already been extended	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Yes, there are plans to extend the standard	3	2	2	2	1	1
3. No, we do not plan to extend the standard to multiple operators	15	4	8	4	4	3

**C.3: Do you plan to establish new regulations/laws imposing mandatory application of the standard in your country?**

In most countries there are no plans to establish mandatory applications by new laws or new regulations. Only standard EN 13850 shows that there is a special interest, i.e. where new regulations have already imposed mandatory applications (7 answers) or where there are plans to establish new regulations to impose mandatory applications (2 answers).

*Table 28: Do you plan to establish new regulations/laws imposing mandatory application of the standard in your country?*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1. Yes, new regulations have already imposed mandatory application	7	3	4	3	0	1
2. Yes, it is planned to establish new regulations to impose mandatory application	2	1	2	2	2	2
3. No, there are no plans to establish mandatory application	8	6	7	6	6	6

**C.4: Do you plan to improve the Quality of Service covered by the standard?**

The answer given by most of the NRAs (13 answers) is that there are plans to improve the Quality of Service covered by the standard. Only 5 NRAs (4 NRAs in respect of EN 13850) wrote that there are no plans to improve the Quality of Service in this field.

*Table 29: Do you plan to improve the Quality of Service covered by the standard?*

	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1. Yes, there are plans to improve Quality of Service in the field	13	5	10	6	4	4
2. No, there are no plans to improve Quality of Service in the field	4	1	3	2	3	2
3. Other, please comment	4	0	3	2	0	0

## **SECTION D: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS EXPERIENCED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARDS**

This section does not ask if standards are implemented, but asks about the attitude, positive or negative, toward the different standards.

### **D.1: Are you fully satisfied with the standard and does it fulfill its purpose**

In general most countries are satisfied, fully or partly, with the current standards. They are most satisfied with standard EN 13850 regarding measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail and standard EN 14012 regarding the measurement of the complaints and redress procedures.

In case the respondents are only partly satisfied, the reason given is that some procedures are too complicated.

In most cases the respondents have no opinion because they will not implement the standard or the implementation process has not been completed yet.

#### **- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail**

In general most countries are satisfied (fully or partly) with this standard. None of the respondents is not satisfied with this standard. In case the respondents are only partly satisfied, the following reasons are mentioned :

- the standard covers only transit time and not for example last time of collection, number of letter boxes, etc...;
- some procedures are too complicated.

#### **- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail**

Countries who have implemented the standard are satisfied or partly satisfied. Some of the respondents have no opinion because they will not implement this standard as they do not have any second-class mail items.

#### **- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures**

In general most countries, who have implemented it, are satisfied with this standard. In most cases the respondents have no opinion because the implementation process has not been completed yet, but most of the respondents intend to implement this standard in the near future.

- EN 14137: Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system

In general most countries that have experience with this standard are satisfied. None are not satisfied with this standard.

- EN 14534: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail

In general most countries, that have implemented this standard, are satisfied. In case the respondents are only partly satisfied, they mention the following reason:

- the standard is applied for each client and there is no need to measure the quality of service as a whole.

## **D.2: Advantages and disadvantages of each standard**

In the following tables you will find the advantages and disadvantages of the different standards:

- EN 13850: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail:

*Table 30: Advantages and disadvantages of EN 13850*

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
1. A harmonized measuring system	1. Costly
2. Objective measurement	2. Not end-to-end services quality
3. A measurement system of QoS harmonized for all countries	3. Complicated measurement system
4. Improvement of postal services quality provision	4. A lot of work to establish real mail studies
5. Comparability of results	5. USP can influence results by changing the collection time
6. Definition of an appropriate methodology, design	6. Incompatibility with the existing measurement system
7. Statistically reliable and accurate	7. Annex A is not applicable
8. Independent measurement	8. Complexity of design requirements
9. A management system to detect network weakness	

We can conclude that the advantages are having a harmonized, objective and common measurement system which helps the USP to detect the weakness in the network. The disadvantages are that the implementation is costly. Furthermore the system is quite complicated.

Another point is that EN 13850 is measuring only the transit time, the operative delivery time of the provider and not end-to-end, the delivery time of the customer. Delivery time for the customer means the time between posting a letter in a post box or at one of the operator's acceptance points at the normal times of business or day, and receipt by the addressee. The time starts as soon as the letter is out of the customer's hands. Measured, then, is the time from end to end, from sender to addressee. Variable closing times do not have any bearing on the results of this method. But measuring the transit time of end-to-end services, the provider can influence results by changing the collecting time.

- EN 14508: Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail

The advantages and disadvantages are the same as above because this standard is the same as EN 13850 except for some changes in the statistical requirements regarding accuracy, etc.

- EN 14012: Measurement of complaints and redress procedures

*Table 31: Advantages and disadvantages of EN 14012*

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
1. Harmonized system	1. Costly
2. Includes compensation elements	2. Too much detail
3. Implementation of objective methodology of measurement of complaints	3. Necessity to change current measurement system
4. Consumer focus highlighted	4. Over-ambitious coverage
5. Transparency as to where problems lie	5. Complexity/technical requirements
6. Clarifies the requirements of the Postal Directive	
7. Flexible enough	
8. Increases level of quality of service	
9. Describes the complaint process	
10. Defines categories to report complaints	

We can conclude that the advantages are having a harmonized measurement system which includes compensation elements. The disadvantages are that the implementation is quite costly and the standard is too detailed.

- EN 14137/EN 14534/TS 14773:

Responses have not indicated any advantages and disadvantages regarding these standards.

## **SECTION E: GENERAL INFORMATION REGARDING CEN STANDARD IMPLEMENTATION**

In section E four questions were asked. Below there is a summary of the answers.

### **E.1: Would you consider that the development of the standards that are under review of this Project Team, has contributed to the improvement of the Quality of Service offered by Postal Service Providers throughout Europe?**

The Project Team has received 15 answers (out of 22 questionnaires delivered) to the question about the impact of the standards development. The majority of countries have declared that the standards have positively influenced the Quality of Service offered by Postal Service Providers throughout Europe. The EN 13850 standard was mentioned seven times as a standard which “has contributed to improvement of the quality” or “has created comparability of results in measurement and improvement of quality of service”.

It was also stated that the development of the standards “does not directly contribute by itself to quality of service improvements”, but has “contributed for the definition of harmonized measurement methods.”

Some countries were unable to assess the impact of the standards at European level.

### **E.2: Do you agree that the work of this Project Team will provide the solutions required for those countries that have yet to implement many of the standards which are under review?**

There were 19 answers to the question about the role of the Project Team. The vast majority (14 answers) has agreed with the sentence that “Project Team will provide the solutions required for those countries that have yet to implement many of the standards which are under review”. Some countries have stated that the work of the project team is already useful. Some expectations were announced that “the Project Team will provide the required solutions” and “PT will provide useful information to countries that have / want to implement standards”.

The information on how the Project Team might provide solutions was also given:

- “Experiences of those who have already implemented standards can help to reduce costs for others by sharing information”,
- “Especially when they take into consideration the special needs of the small sized countries”,
- “Working groups, where problems concerning quality of service would probably be more visible”.

Some doubts were also expressed “It might be possible, but a more thorough review of the needs of the countries interested in implementing the standards is most probably necessary.”



### **E.3: Has the National Standards Body translated any/all of the standards**

A different approach was also observed toward the translation of the standards. Some countries do not translate standards and work on the English version. This is the case for English-speaking countries like Ireland, but also for Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden.

Countries which translate standards to their local languages do this in two different ways:

- The first solution is to translate via the National Standards Body. Some countries were able to translate all standards, others selected the priorities and translated the standards according to the implementation plan. This approach is represented by Austria, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.
- The second solution is to have the standards translated by the interested organisation like the postal operator or the regulatory body. In this approach, represented by Finland and Slovenia, the translation is even more related to the implementation plan than the translation by the National Standards Body.

### **E.4: Other topics not covered by the questionnaire concerning the standards implementation**

The Project Team has received a few comments on the issue of standardisation that were not covered by the questionnaire. According to the answers received the possibility to exchange information should be examined (e.g. about auditing companies, about the experience of other countries in the performance of the real mail studies).

There was also one doubt expressed concerning the role of standardisation:

“We should always ask ourselves whether these standards are necessary for the regulation of the postal market, for the safeguarding of the interest of the user or whether they are sometimes only a kind of marketing instrument.”

## SECTION F: CONTACT PERSONS DEALING WITH STANDARDISATION

Please find below the summary table of persons to contact regarding standardisation issues within:

- the NRA
- the Ministry
- the USP
- Others

*Table 32: List of contact persons*

The authorities indicated in green can be contacted.

	NRA	MINISTRY	USP	OTHER
AUSTRIA		YES	YES	
BELGIUM	YES		YES	
CZECH REPUBLIC	YES	YES	YES	YES
CYPRUS	YES	YES	YES	
ESTONIA	YES	YES		YES
FINLAND	YES	YES	YES	YES
FRANCE		YES	YES	
GERMANY	YES			
HUNGARY	YES	YES	YES	YES
IRELAND	YES			
LATVIA	YES		YES	
LITHUANIA	YES			
LUXEMBOURG	YES			
NETHERLANDS	YES		YES	
NORWAY	YES		YES	
POLAND	YES	YES		
PORTUGAL	YES		YES	
ROMANIA	YES			
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	YES	YES	YES	
SLOVENIA	YES	YES	YES	YES
SPAIN	YES			
SWEDEN	YES			YES
UNITED KINGDOM	YES			

You can find the details of the contact persons in Annex 1.

## **SECTION G: FINAL CONCLUSIONS**

- A. In general QoS standards developed by the European Committee for Standardization (CEN TC 331 to be exact) have, in the opinion of CERP members, contributed to the improvement of the Quality of Service offered by Postal Service Providers throughout Europe.
- B. Only EN 13850 “Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail” is obligatory for EU Member States, as decided during Postal Directive Committee meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> of November 2002. Despite the references to the standard being published in the Official Journal on 5<sup>th</sup> of February 2005 it was already considered by the majority of the countries as mandatory or has been included in domestic legislation.
- C. Another relatively popular standard is EN 14012 “Measurement of complains and redress procedures”, which is not yet widely implemented, but there is a great consensus to do so. Other standards are only partly executed and implemented.
- D. For the measurement to be reliable, it is essential to have it done by an independent research company. This applies especially to QoS Standards dealing with non-registered letters (EN 13850, EN 14508, EN 14534, TS 14773).
- E. Another crucial point about reliability of measurement is an audit of standard EN 13850. The most essential point regarding the reliability of the measurement system is that the audit made by an independent company concludes for the independence of the measurement system and for the accuracy of the results, independently of who measures the quality of service. Not all member states have been aware that it is an activity that is mandatory to do via an independent body.
- F. Big differences were observed with the costs of measurement between countries of similar size.
- G. That majority of countries, answered negatively to the question whether they intend to implement TS 14773. The conclusion about the future status of TS 14773 (change TS into EN) is not positive. Until now Portugal is the only country who has been measuring loss of priority and non-priority mail.
- H. The advantages for EN 13850 and EN 14012 are a harmonised, objective and common measurement system. EN 13850 helps the USP to detect the weakness in the network and EN 14012 includes compensation elements. The disadvantages for those standards are that implementation is costly and that standards are complicated and too detailed. This implies a need to simplify, make it less detailed and not so costly when updating the standards.
- I. Except of few countries that work on English versions, the majority of countries translate the standards into local languages. This must be taken into account when evaluating time and costs of standards implementation in different countries.
- J. More attention is necessary when creating a standard. The language used in the standards must be clear and easy to translate.
- K. The Project Team hopes this report will be a good start for sharing information and best practices among CERP members, especially those who have yet to implement standards. To find solutions to any practical problems concerning implementation of standards one can appeal to our list of contact persons, and their preparedness to help.

- L. The CEN TC331 WG 1 “Quality of service” should try to avoid too detailed, too expensive and too complex standards.
- M. We should think about the role of standardisation in the new regulatory models and in the activities of the NRA’s and the Ministries.
- N. There is a need to create new possibilities for exchanging information regarding standard implementation. Besides the report itself some additional steps are proposed:
  - 1) updated experts address list for easy access,
  - 2) publish this report and other relevant information on the CERP website and distribute it among European Committee for Standardisation (CEN), European Commission, PostEurop and International Post Corporation (IPC).
  - 3) present this report during meetings held by interested parties (e.g. CEN plenary meeting in Stockholm on 10<sup>th</sup> of June 2005, the next meeting of CEN WG 1 “Quality of Service”);
  - 4) create a system of information frequently distributed by electronic means reporting the latest developments in the field of standardisation.
- O. There are a lot of topics, where help is needed more than in general. Here are two examples where sharing of information and best practices among CERP members is highly required:
  - 1) A lot of questions were about the real mail study. There is some indistinctness concerning this important matter. Many countries would like (also countries who intend to implement standards in the future) to know more about experience in the performance of real mail studies. A simple guide through that important step in the field of implementation is necessary, as the real mail study in EN 13850 is complex and difficult to understand.
  - 2) The same problem is geographical stratification. It could be explained in a simple way for countries intending to implement the EN 13850 standard.

## ANNEX 1: LIST OF CONTACT PERSONS

### AUSTRIA

#### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Dr. Ronald Pichler**

Österreichische Post AG

Tel: 0043 1 515 51 35510

Fax: 0043 1 515 51 35508

E-mail: [ronald.pichler@post.at](mailto:ronald.pichler@post.at)

Website: [www.post.at](http://www.post.at)

Postal address: Postgasse 8, 1010 Wien, Austria

#### Contact person in Ministry

**Dr. Alfred Stratil**

Ministry for Transport, Innov. and Technology

Tel: 00431 797 31 4100

Fax: 00431 797 31 4109

E-mail: [alfred.stratil@bmvit.gv.at](mailto:alfred.stratil@bmvit.gv.at)

Website: [www.bmvit.gv.at](http://www.bmvit.gv.at)

Postal address: Ghegastrasse 1, 1030 Wien, Austria

### BELGIUM

#### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Joost Callaert**

Advisor

BIPT

Tel: +32 2 226 88 32

Fax: +32 2 226 89 99

E-mail: [joost.callaert@bipt.be](mailto:joost.callaert@bipt.be)

Website: [www.bipt.be](http://www.bipt.be)

Postal address: Sterrenkundelaan 14, box 21  
1210 Brussels – Belgium

#### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Luc Hillewaert**

DE POST

Tel : +32 2 226 24 43

Fax : +32 2 226 89 99

E-mail: [luc.hillewaert@post.be](mailto:luc.hillewaert@post.be)

Website: [www.depost.be](http://www.depost.be)

Postal address: Muntcentrum,  
1000 Brussels – Belgium

## CZECH REPUBLIC

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mrs. Jaroslava Hamsikova**

Ministry of Informatics  
Postal Services Department Counsellor  
Tel: 00 4 20221008315  
Fax: 00 4 20222717677  
E-mail: [jaroslava.hamsikova@micr.cz](mailto:jaroslava.hamsikova@micr.cz)  
Website: [www.micr.cz](http://www.micr.cz)  
Postal address: Havelkova 2, 130 00 Praha 3,  
Czech Republic

### Contact person in Ministry

**Mr. Jiri Rehola**

Ministry of Informatics  
Head of Strategy and International Relations Department  
Tel: 00 4 20221008301  
Fax: 00 4 20222717677  
E-mail: [jjiri.rehola@micr.cz](mailto:jjiri.rehola@micr.cz)  
Website: [www.micr.cz](http://www.micr.cz)  
Postal address: Havelkova 2,130 00 Praha 3,  
Czech Republic

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Tomas Urban**

Deputy Director General  
CZECH POST  
Tel: 00 4 20267196346  
Fax: 00 4 20271774403  
E-mail: [urban.tomas@cpost.cz](mailto:urban.tomas@cpost.cz)  
Website: [www.cpost.cz](http://www.cpost.cz)  
Postal address: Czech Post, 225 99 Praha 025,  
Czech Republic

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Mr. Jaroslav Adam**

TESTCOM  
Tel: 00 4 20271192422  
Fax: 00 4 20272934560  
E-mail: [adam@testcom.cz](mailto:adam@testcom.cz)  
Website: [www.testcom.cz](http://www.testcom.cz)  
Postal address: TESTCOM, Hvozdanska 3, 14801  
Praha 4, Czech Republic

## CYPRUS

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Ioannis Vassiliades**

Officer of Economic Affairs  
Office of the Commissioner for  
Telecommunication and Postal Regulation  
Tel: +357 226 93123  
Fax: +357 226 93070  
E-mail: [ioannis.vassiliades@octpr.org.cy](mailto:ioannis.vassiliades@octpr.org.cy)  
Website: [www.octpr.org.cy](http://www.octpr.org.cy)  
Postal address: Helioupoleos 12, 1101 Nicosia,  
Cyprus

### Contact person in Ministry

**Mrs. Militsa Kastellani Georgiou**

Administrative Officer A  
Ministry of Communications and Works  
Tel: +357 228 00119  
Fax: +357 227 73123  
E-mail: [mkastellani@mcw.gov.cy](mailto:mkastellani@mcw.gov.cy)  
Website: [www.mcw.gov.cy](http://www.mcw.gov.cy)  
Postal address: Acheon 28, Ayios Andreas, 1101  
Nicosia, Cyprus

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Sofronis Tsiartas**

Postal Officer  
Department of Postal Services  
Tel: +357 228 05743  
Fax: +357 226 61133  
E-mail: [cyprus.gov@cytanet.com.cy](mailto:cyprus.gov@cytanet.com.cy)  
Postal address: 1900 Nicosia, Cyprus

## ESTONIA

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Guido Pääsuke**

Head of Postal Affairs and Universal Services Department

Estonian National Communications Board

Tel: +372 693 1196

Fax: +372 693 1155

E-mail: [guido.paasuke@sa.ee](mailto:guido.paasuke@sa.ee)

Website: [www.sa.ee](http://www.sa.ee)

Postal address: Ädala 2, 10614 Tallinn, Estonia

### Contact person in Ministry

**Ms. Alice Vood**

Deputy Counsellor

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications

Tel: +372 639 7666

Fax: +372 631 3660

E-mail: [alice.vood@mkm.ee](mailto:alice.vood@mkm.ee)

Website: [www.mkm.ee/eng/](http://www.mkm.ee/eng/)

Postal address: Harju str 11, 15072, Tallinn, Estonia

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Ms. Signe Ruut**

Enquiry Point Officer-Information and Marketing Department.

Estonian Centre for Standardization (EVS)

Tel: +372 605 5062

Fax: +372 605 5063

E-mail: [enquiry@evs.ee](mailto:enquiry@evs.ee)

Website: [www.evs.ee](http://www.evs.ee)

Postal address: Aru 10, 10317, Tallinn, Estonia

## FINLAND

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Matti Linnoskivi**

Legal Counsel

FICORA

Tel: +358 96966822

Fax: +358 96966760

E-mail: [matti.linnoskivi@ficora.fi](mailto:matti.linnoskivi@ficora.fi)

Website: [www.ficora.fi](http://www.ficora.fi)

Postal address: P.O.Box 313, FI-00181 Helsinki

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Matti Akonniemi**

Finland Post Corporation

E-mail: [matti.akonniemi@posti.fi](mailto:matti.akonniemi@posti.fi)

Website: [www.posti.fi](http://www.posti.fi)

### Contact person in Ministry

**Ms. Elina Normo**

Ministry of Transport and Communication

E-mail: [elina.normo@mintc.fi](mailto:elina.normo@mintc.fi)

Website: [www.mintc.fi](http://www.mintc.fi)

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Mr. Tero Laine**

The Finnish Consumers' Association

E-mail: [tero.laine@kuluttajaliitto.fi](mailto:tero.laine@kuluttajaliitto.fi)

Website: [www.kuluttajaliitto.fi](http://www.kuluttajaliitto.fi)

## FRANCE

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mrs. Veronique Scardigli**

Head of "postal markets"

Ministry of Economy, Finances and Industry/DIGITIP

Tel: +331 53 44 92 34

Fax: +331 53 44 97 37

E-mail: [veronique.scardigli@industrie.gouv.fr](mailto:veronique.scardigli@industrie.gouv.fr)

Website: [www.industrie.gouv.fr](http://www.industrie.gouv.fr)

Postal address: MINEFI/DIGITP/SIMAP

12 rue Villiot, 75572 Paris cedex 12, France

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Hardy Constant**

Consultant

La Poste

Tel : +331 64 73 64 00

Fax : +33 1 64 73 66 40

E-mail: [constant.hardy@laposte.fr](mailto:constant.hardy@laposte.fr)

Postal address: 2 bd Newton 77453  
CHAMPS/MARNE CEDEX, France

## GERMANY

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Frank Raudszus**

Deputy head of section

Reg TP

Tel: +49 61 31 18 18 21

Fax: +49 61 31 18 56 03

E-mail: [frank.raudszus@regtp.de](mailto:frank.raudszus@regtp.de)

Website: [www.regtp.de](http://www.regtp.de)

Postal address: Canisiusstrasse21, 55122 Mainz,  
Germany



## HUNGARY

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Ms Erzsébet Törő**

National Communications Authority, Hungary

Tel: +36 1 457 7361

Fax: +36 1 457 7212

E-mail: [torone@nhh.hu](mailto:torone@nhh.hu)

Website: [www.nhh.hu](http://www.nhh.hu)

Postal address: H-1525 Budapest, P.O. Box 75, Hungary

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr Sándor Tóth**

Hungarian Post Office Limited

Tel: +36 1 487 1203

Fax: +36 1 487 1628

E-mail: [TothSandor@posta.hu](mailto:TothSandor@posta.hu)

Website: [www.posta.hu](http://www.posta.hu)

Postal address: H-1540 Budapest, Hungary

### Contact person in Ministry

**Mr László Berzsenyi**

Ministry of Informatics and Communications

Tel: + 36 1 461-3484

Fax: +36 1 322 2048

E-mail: [laszlo.berzsenyi@ihm.gov.hu](mailto:laszlo.berzsenyi@ihm.gov.hu)

Website: [www.ihm.gov.hu](http://www.ihm.gov.hu)

Postal address: H-1400 Budapest, P.O. Box 87, Hungary

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Mr Gábor Varga**

Hungarian Standardization Institute

Tel: +36 1 456 6992

Fax: +36 1 456 6866

E-mail: [g.varga@mszt.hu](mailto:g.varga@mszt.hu)

Website: [www.mszt.hu](http://www.mszt.hu)

Postal address: H-1450 Budapest 9, P.O. Box 24, Hungary

## IRELAND

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Ms. Jean Bonar**

Analyst

ComReg (Commission for Communications Regulation)

Tel: +353 1 804 9633

Fax: +353 1 804 9680

E-mail: [jean.bonar@comreg.ie](mailto:jean.bonar@comreg.ie)

Website: [www.comreg.ie](http://www.comreg.ie)

Postal address: Abbey Court, Irish Life Centre, Lower Abbey Street, Dublin 1, Ireland

## LATVIA

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Alexandr Cherniakov-Neimark**  
Head of Quality of Service Division  
Public Utilities Commission  
Tel: +709 72 41  
Fax: +709 72 77  
E-mail: [aleksandrs.cernakovs@sprk.gov.lv](mailto:aleksandrs.cernakovs@sprk.gov.lv)  
Website: [www.sprk.gov.lv](http://www.sprk.gov.lv)  
Postal address: Brivibas iela 5, Riga, LV-1010,  
Latvia

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Valdis Avotins**  
Head of Project Division  
Latvia Post  
Tel : +701 87 38  
E-mail: [valdis.avotins@pasts.lv](mailto:valdis.avotins@pasts.lv)  
Website: [www.pasts.lv](http://www.pasts.lv)  
Postal address: Stacijas laukums 1, Riga, LV-1000,  
Latvia

## LITHUANIA

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. A. Basevicius**  
Director of Strategic Department  
Communications Regulatory Authority  
Tel: +370 5 210 56 80  
Fax: +370 5 210 56 85  
E-mail: [abasevicius@rrt.lt](mailto:abasevicius@rrt.lt)

**Ms. Lina Kazalauskaite-Duman**  
Deputy Head of Postal regulatory Section  
Communications Regulatory Authority  
Tel: +370 5 210 56 87  
Fax: +370 5 210 56 85  
E-mail: [lkazlausakaite-duman@rrt.lt](mailto:lkazlausakaite-duman@rrt.lt)  
Website: [www.rrt.lt](http://www.rrt.lt)  
Postal address: Algirdo 27, LT-03219 Vilnius,  
Lithuania

## LUXEMBOURG

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Pierre Schroeder**  
Chef Service Postal  
Institut Luxembourgeois de Régulation  
Tel: +352 45 88 45 70  
Fax: +352 45 88 45 88  
E-mail: [Pierre.schroeder@ilr.lu](mailto:Pierre.schroeder@ilr.lu)  
Website: [www.ilr.lu](http://www.ilr.lu)  
Postal address: L-2922 Luxembourg

## NETHERLANDS

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

#### **Mrs. Mariëlle Remijnse**

Adviser Department of Retail Market

OPTA

Tel: +31 70 315 35 58

Fax: +31 70 315 35 01

E-mail: [m.remijnse@opta.nl](mailto:m.remijnse@opta.nl)

Website: [www.opta.nl](http://www.opta.nl)

Postal address: PO Box 90420, 2509 LK Hague, The Netherlands

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

#### **Mr. Hans Blikman**

Advisor Public Affairs

TPG Post

Tel: +31 70 334 30 17

Fax: +31 70 334 30 16

E-mail: [j.blikman@tpgpost.nl](mailto:j.blikman@tpgpost.nl)

Postal address: Postbus 30250, 2500 GG, The Hague, Netherlands

## NORWAY

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

#### **Mrs. Inger Riis – Johannessen**

Norwegian Post and Telecommunication Authority

Tel: 004722824609

Fax: 004722824690

E-mail: [irj@npt.no](mailto:irj@npt.no)

Website: [www.npt.no](http://www.npt.no)

Postal address: Postboks 447 Sentrum, 0104 Oslo, Norway

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

#### **Mr. Terje Sletholen**

Quality manager

Posten Norge A/S

Tel : 0047231488772

E-mail: [terje.sletholen@posten.no](mailto:terje.sletholen@posten.no)

Postal address: 0001 Oslo, Norway

## POLAND

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

#### **Mr. Piotr Łukomski**

Chief Expert

URTiP

Tel: +48 22 5349 436

Fax: +48 22 5349 301

E-mail: [p.lukomski@urtip.gov.pl](mailto:p.lukomski@urtip.gov.pl)

Website: [www.urtip.gov.pl](http://www.urtip.gov.pl)

Postal address: ul. Kasprzaka 18/20 p.511, 01-211 Warszawa, Poland

### Contact person in Ministry

#### **Mr. Piotr Dziubak**

Head of Unit

Ministry of Infrastructure

Tel :+ 48 22 630 1033

Fax: +48 22 630 1034

E-mail: [pdziubak@mi.gov.pl](mailto:pdziubak@mi.gov.pl)

Website: [www.mi.gov.pl](http://www.mi.gov.pl)

Postal address: ul. Chałubińskiego 4/6, 00-928 Warszawa, Poland

## PORTUGAL

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

#### Mr. Agostinho Franco

Market Regulation Direction-Postal Services Unit  
Coordinator

ICP – ANACOM

Tel: +351 21 721 24 79

Fax: +351 21 721 10 10

E-mail: [agostinho.franco@anacom.pt](mailto:agostinho.franco@anacom.pt)

Website: [www.anacom.pt](http://www.anacom.pt)

Postal address: Avenida José Malhoa, 12  
1099-017 Lisboa, Portugal

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

#### Mrs. Antónia Rato

Regulatory Affairs Manager  
CTT-Correios de Portugal, AS

Tel : +351 21 322 74 23

Fax : +351 21 322 76 76

E-mail: [antonia.a.rato@ctt.pt](mailto:antonia.a.rato@ctt.pt)

#### Mr. Luis Paulo

Quality Department Manager  
CTT-Correios de Portugal, AS

Tel : +351 21 322 74 51

Fax: +351 21 322 79 91

E-mail: [luis.f.paulo@ctt.pt](mailto:luis.f.paulo@ctt.pt)

Website: [www.ctt.pt](http://www.ctt.pt)

Postal address: Rua de S. José, 20, 1166-001 Lisboa, Portugal

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

Organisation with sector-specific standardization functions

ICP – ANACOM/ONS

E-mail: [ons\\_anacom.elem\\_lig@anacom.pt](mailto:ons_anacom.elem_lig@anacom.pt)

Postal address: Alto do Paimao  
2730 – 216 Barcarena, Portugal

## ROMANIA

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

#### Ms. Mariana Dumitrache

Expert, Standardization Section  
National Regulatory Authority for Communications

Tel: +40 21 307 54 29

Fax: +40 21 307 54 05

E-mail: [mariana.dumitrache@anrc.ro](mailto:mariana.dumitrache@anrc.ro)

Website: [www.anrc.ro](http://www.anrc.ro)

Postal address: Libertatii Blvd.14, Bucharest 5,  
Romania

## SLOVAK REPUBLIC

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Milan Cibula**

Postal Regulation Office  
Ing.

Tel: +421 41 5625256

Fax: +421 41 7234043

E-mail: [standard@posturad.sk](mailto:standard@posturad.sk)

Website: [www.posturad.sk](http://www.posturad.sk)

Postal address: Poštovy regulačný úrad, Ul. 1.maja  
16, 01001 Žilina, Slovak Republic

### Contact person in Ministry

**Mr. Ladislav Mušínsky**

Ministry of Transport, Posts and Telecommunications of the Slovak Republic

Tel: +421 2 59494461

Fax: +421 2 52731458

E-mail: [ladislav.musinsky@telecom.gov.sk](mailto:ladislav.musinsky@telecom.gov.sk)

Website: [www.telecom.gov.sk](http://www.telecom.gov.sk)

Postal address: Ministerstvo dopravy, pôšt a telekomunikácií SR Námestie slobody 6, 81005 Bratislava, Slovak Republic

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Martin Hrobak**

Slovenska pošta, š.p.

Tel: +421 48 4339290

Fax: +421 48 4115225

E-mail: [hrobakm@ustr.slposta.sk](mailto:hrobakm@ustr.slposta.sk)

Website: [www.slposta.sk](http://www.slposta.sk)

Postal address: Slovenská pošta, š.p. Partizánska  
cesta 9, 97599 Banská Bystrica, Slovak Republic

## SLOVENIA

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Igor Hacin**

Specialist II-Postal Market Regulation Sector  
Post and Electronic Communications Agency of the  
Republic of Slovenia

Tel: +386 1 583 63 95

Fax: +386 1 511 11 01

E-mail: [igor.hacin@apek.si](mailto:igor.hacin@apek.si)

Website: [www.apek.si](http://www.apek.si)

Postal address: Stegne 7, P.O. Box 418  
SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

### Contact person in Ministry

**Mrs. Anamarija Jesenko**

Ministry of Economy

Tel: +386 1 478 83 34

Fax: +386 1 478 81 42

E-mail: [anamarija.jesenko@gov.si](mailto:anamarija.jesenko@gov.si)

Website: [www.mg-rs.si](http://www.mg-rs.si)

Ministry for Economics,  
Postal address: Tržaška 21, SI-1000 Ljubljana,  
Slovenia

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mr. Matjaž Andrič**

Director of Logistic Sector

Pošta Slovenije d.o.o.

Tel: +386 2 449 22 31

Fax: +386 2 449 23 71

E-mail: [matjaz.andric@posta.si](mailto:matjaz.andric@posta.si)

Website: [www.posta.si](http://www.posta.si)

Postal address: Pošta Slovenije d.o.o.  
Slomškov trg 10, SI-2500 Maribor

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Mr. Gorazd Opaškar**

Secretary for technical matters

Slovenian Institute for Standardization

Tel: +386 1 478 30 33

Fax: +386 1 478 30 94866

E-mail: [gorazd.oraskar@sist.si](mailto:gorazd.oraskar@sist.si)

Website: [www.sist.si](http://www.sist.si)

Postal address: SIST Šmartinska 140  
SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

## SPAIN

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mrs. Elena Gómis**

Jefa Sección de calidad  
Subdirección Gral Regulación Svicios Postales  
Tel: 00 34915975244  
Fax: 00 349159785559  
E-mail: [egomis@mfom.es](mailto:egomis@mfom.es)  
Postal address: Ministerio de Fomento,  
Paseo de la Castellana,67 despacho a602, 28071  
Madrid, Spain

## SWEDEN

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mr. Mathias Henricson**

Adviser  
Post-och telestyrelsen  
Tel: +46 8 678 56 24  
Fax: +46 8 678 55 07  
E-mail: [mathias.henricson@pts.se](mailto:mathias.henricson@pts.se)  
Website: [www.pts.se](http://www.pts.se)  
Postal address: P.O.Box 5398, 10249 Stockholm,  
Sweden

### Contact person in Universal Service Provider

**Mrs. Ingrid Rydelius**

Posten AB  
Tel:+46 8 781 11 20  
E-mail: [Ingrid.rydelius@posten.se](mailto:Ingrid.rydelius@posten.se)  
Postal address: SE-105 00 Stockholm, Sweden

## UNITED KINGDOM

### Contact person in National Regulatory Authority

**Mrs. Erika Barnes**

Assistant Director  
Postcomm  
Tel: + 44 (0)20 7593 2133  
Fax: + 44 (0)20 7593 2144  
Postal address: Hercules House, Hercules Road,  
SE1 7DB, London, United Kingdom

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Mrs. Karita Thomé**

Swedish Standards Institute (SIS)  
Tel : +46 8 555 520 37  
E-mail: [karita.thome@sis.se](mailto:karita.thome@sis.se)  
Website: [www.sis.se](http://www.sis.se)  
Postal address: 118 80 Stockholm, Sweden

### Contact Person in Consumer or Standardisation body

**Mr Nigel Woods**

Postwatch  
Tel: +44 (0)20 7259 1215  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7730 3149  
E-mail: [nigel.woods@postwatch.co.uk](mailto:nigel.woods@postwatch.co.uk)  
Postal address: 28 Grosvenor Garden  
SW1W0TT, London, United Kingdom

## ANNEX 2: LIST OF INTERESTING WEBSITE LINKS

### Website Links

CERP Member Countries  
International Institutions  
International organisations and associations

#### CERP Member Countries

<b>Countries</b>	<b>NRA</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>USP</b>
Albania	-	<a href="http://www.mtt.gov.al">www.mtt.gov.al</a>	<a href="http://www.mtt.gov.al">www.mtt.gov.al</a>
Andorra	-	<a href="http://www.andorra.be">www.andorra.be</a>	-
Azerbaijan	-	<a href="http://www.mincom.gov.az">www.mincom.gov.az</a>	<a href="http://www.azerpost.rabita.az">www.azerpost.rabita.az</a>
Austria	-	<a href="http://www.bmvit.gv.at">www.bmvit.gv.at</a>	<a href="http://www.post.at">www.post.at</a>
Belarus	-	<a href="http://www.belpak.by">www.belpak.by</a>	<a href="http://www.belpak.by">www.belpak.by</a>
Belgium	<a href="http://www.bipt.be">www.bipt.be</a>	-	<a href="http://www.post.be">www.post.be</a>
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	<a href="http://www.fbihvlada.gov.ba/engleski/index.html">www.fbihvlada.gov.ba/engleski/index.html</a>	<a href="http://www.bhp.ba/en/">www.bhp.ba/en/</a>
Bulgaria	<a href="http://www.crc.bg">www.crc.bg</a>	<a href="http://www.mtc.government.bg">www.mtc.government.bg</a>	<a href="http://www.bgpost.bg">www.bgpost.bg</a>
Croatia	<a href="http://www.mppv.hr">www.mppv.hr</a>	<a href="http://www.mppv.hr">www.mppv.hr</a>	<a href="http://www.posta.hr">www.posta.hr</a>
Cyprus	<a href="http://www.octpr.org.cy">www.octpr.org.cy</a>	<a href="http://www.mcw.gov.cy">www.mcw.gov.cy</a>	<a href="http://www.pio.gov.cy">www.pio.gov.cy</a>

<b>Countries</b>	<b>NRA</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>USP</b>
Czech Republic	<a href="http://www.micr.cz">www.micr.cz</a>	<a href="http://www.micr.cz">www.micr.cz</a>	<a href="http://www.cpost.cz">www.cpost.cz</a>
Denmark	<a href="http://www.posttilsyn.dk">www.posttilsyn.dk</a>	<a href="http://www.trm.dk">www.trm.dk</a>	<a href="http://www.post.dk">www.post.dk</a>
Estonia	<a href="http://www.sa.ee">www.sa.ee</a>	<a href="http://www.mkm.ee/eng/">www.mkm.ee/eng/</a>	<a href="http://www.post.ee">www.post.ee</a>
Finland	<a href="http://www.ficora.fi">www.ficora.fi</a>	<a href="http://www.mintc.fi">www.mintc.fi</a>	<a href="http://www.posti.fi">www.posti.fi</a>
France	<a href="http://www.industrie.gouv.fr">www.industrie.gouv.fr</a>	<a href="http://www.industrie.gouv.fr">www.industrie.gouv.fr</a>	<a href="http://www.laposte.fr">www.laposte.fr</a>
Germany	<a href="http://www.regtp.de">www.regtp.de</a>	<a href="http://www.bmwa.bund.de">www.bmwa.bund.de</a>	<a href="http://www.dpwn.de">www.dpwn.de</a>
Greece	-	<a href="http://www.yme.gr">www.yme.gr</a>	<a href="http://www.elta-net.gr">www.elta-net.gr</a>
Hungary	<a href="http://www.hif.hu">www.hif.hu</a>	<a href="http://www.ihm.gov.hu">www.ihm.gov.hu</a>	<a href="http://www.posta.hu">www.posta.hu</a>
Iceland	<a href="http://www.pta.is">www.pta.is</a>	<a href="http://eng.samgonguraduneyti.is/ministry/">http://eng.samgonguraduneyti.is/ministry/</a>	<a href="http://www.postur.is">www.postur.is</a>
Ireland	<a href="http://www.comreg.ie">www.comreg.ie</a>	<a href="http://www.dcmnr.gov.ie/Home/Communications/">www.dcmnr.gov.ie/Home/Communications/</a>	<a href="http://www.anpost.ie">www.anpost.ie</a>
Italy	-	<a href="http://www.comunicazioni.it">www.comunicazioni.it</a>	<a href="http://www.poste.it">www.poste.it</a>
Latvia	<a href="http://www.sprk.gov.lv">www.sprk.gov.lv</a>	<a href="http://www.sam.gov.lv">www.sam.gov.lv</a>	<a href="http://www.pasts.lv">www.pasts.lv</a>
Liechtenstein	-	<a href="http://www.llv.li">www.llv.li</a>	<a href="http://www.post.li">www.post.li</a>
Lithuania	<a href="http://www.rrt.lt">www.rrt.lt</a>	<a href="http://www.transp.lt">www.transp.lt</a>	<a href="http://www.post.lt">www.post.lt</a>
Luxembourg	<a href="http://www.ilr.lu">http://www.ilr.lu</a>	-	<a href="http://www.ept.lu">www.ept.lu</a>



<b>Countries</b>	<b>NRA</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>USP</b>
Macedonia, the former Yugoslav Re- public of	-	<a href="http://www.dtk.gov.mk">www.dtk.gov.mk</a>	<a href="http://www.mp.com.mk">www.mp.com.mk</a>
Malta	<a href="http://www.mca.org.mt">www.mca.org.mt</a>	-	<a href="http://www.maltapost.com">www.maltapost.com</a>
Moldova	-	<a href="http://mci.gov.md">http://mci.gov.md</a>	<a href="http://mci.gov.md">http://mci.gov.md</a>
Monaco	-	<a href="http://www.gouv.mc">www.gouv.mc</a>	<a href="http://www.gouv.mc">www.gouv.mc</a>
Netherlands	<a href="http://www.opta.nl">www.opta.nl</a>	<a href="http://www.minez.nl">www.minez.nl</a>	<a href="http://www.tpgpost.nl">www.tpgpost.nl</a>
Norway	<a href="http://www.npt.no">www.npt.no</a>	<a href="http://www.odin.dep.no/sd">www.odin.dep.no/sd</a>	<a href="http://www.posten.no">www.posten.no</a>
Poland	<a href="http://www.urtip.gov.pl">www.urtip.gov.pl</a>	<a href="http://www.mi.gov.pl">www.mi.gov.pl</a>	<a href="http://www.poczta-polska.pl">www.poczta-polska.pl</a>
Portugal	<a href="http://www.anacom.pt">www.anacom.pt</a>	<a href="http://www.moptc.pt">http://www.moptc.pt</a>	<a href="http://www.ctt.pt">www.ctt.pt</a>
Romania	<a href="http://www.anrc.ro">www.anrc.ro</a>	<a href="http://www.mcti.ro">www.mcti.ro</a>	<a href="http://www.posta-romana.ro">www.posta-romana.ro</a>
Russian Federation	-	<a href="http://www.russianpost.ru">www.russianpost.ru</a>	<a href="http://www.russianpost.ru">www.russianpost.ru</a>
San Marino	-	<a href="http://www.omniway.sm">www.omniway.sm</a>	<a href="http://www.omniway.sm">www.omniway.sm</a>
Serbia and Montenegro	-	<a href="http://www.gov.yu">www.gov.yu</a>	<a href="http://www.posta.co.yu">www.posta.co.yu</a> <a href="http://www.posta.cg.yu/cg/index.php">www.posta.cg.yu/cg/index.php</a>
Slovakia	<a href="http://www.posturad.sk">www.posturad.sk</a>	<a href="http://www.telecom.gov.sk">www.telecom.gov.sk</a>	<a href="http://www.slposta.sk">www.slposta.sk</a>
Slovenia	<a href="http://www.appek.si">www.appek.si</a>	<a href="http://www.mg-rs.si">www.mg-rs.si</a>	<a href="http://www.posta.si">www.posta.si</a>
Spain	<a href="http://www.mfom.es">www.mfom.es</a>	<a href="http://www.mfom.es">www.mfom.es</a>	<a href="http://www.correos.es">www.correos.es</a>
Sweden	<a href="http://www.pts.se">www.pts.se</a>	<a href="http://www.regeringen.se">www.regeringen.se</a>	<a href="http://www.posten.se">www.posten.se</a>

<b>Countries</b>	<b>NRA</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>USP</b>
Switzerland	<a href="http://www.postreg.admin.ch">www.postreg.admin.ch</a>	<a href="http://www.uvek.admin.ch">www.uvek.admin.ch</a>	<a href="http://www.post.ch">www.post.ch</a>
Turkey	<a href="http://www.ptt.gov.tr">www.ptt.gov.tr</a>	<a href="http://www.ptt.gov.tr">www.ptt.gov.tr</a>	<a href="http://www.ptt.gov.tr">www.ptt.gov.tr</a>
Ukraine	-	<a href="http://www.stc.gov.ua">www.stc.gov.ua</a>	<a href="http://www.ukrposhta.com">www.ukrposhta.com</a>
United Kingdom	<a href="http://www.psc.gov.uk">www.psc.gov.uk</a>	<a href="http://www.dti.gov.uk/postalservices">www.dti.gov.uk/postalservices</a>	<a href="http://www.royalmail.com">www.royalmail.com</a>
Vatican City State (Holy See)	-	<a href="http://www.vatican.va">www.vatican.va</a>	-

### **International Institutions**

#### **European Commission**

Directorate-General Competition	<a href="http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/competition/index_en.htm">http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/competition/index_en.htm</a>
Directorate-General Internal Market	<a href="http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/internal_market/post/index.htm">http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/internal_market/post/index.htm</a>
Eurostat	<a href="http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat">http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat</a>

<b>Universal Postal Union</b>	UPU	<a href="http://www.upu.int">http://www.upu.int</a>
-------------------------------	-----	---

## International organisations and associations

**Association for the Co-ordination of Consumer Representation in the Standardisation**

ANEC

<http://www.anec.org>

**European Consumers' Organisation**

BEUC

<http://www.beuc.org>

**European Committee for Standardisation**

CEN

<http://www.cenorm.be>

CEN/TC 331

<http://www.nen.nl/cen331>

**European Committee on Postal Regulations**

CERP

<http://www.cept-cerp.org>

**European Express Association**

EEA

<http://www.euroexpress.org>

**Federation of European Direct and Interactive Marketing**

FEDMA

<http://www.fedma.org>

**International Post Corporation**

IPC

<http://www.ipc.be>

**PostEurop**

PostEurop

<http://www.posteurop.org>

## Annex 3: STATISTICS

### ***Format of the questionnaire:***

#### **The questionnaire is divided into 6 parts:**

*Section A* asks questions about the **current situation** concerning the implementation of the standard in your country.

*Section B* asks questions concerning the **method used for implementing** the standard in your country.

*Section C* asks questions concerning **your attitude toward the implementation of the standard**, and your **intentions/views for future improvement**.

*Section D* asks questions concerning the **positive and negative elements experienced** in implementing the standard which you found useful and would like to share with others

*Section E* asks **general questions** about standardisation

*Section F* asks for **contact persons**

All questions focus on the **6 Quality of Service Standards under review by this Project Team** which are as follows:

- **EN 13850** Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece priority mail and first class mail
- **EN 14012** Measurement of complaints and redress procedures
- **EN 14137** Measurement of the loss of registered mail and other types of postal services using track and trace system
- **EN 14508** Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for single piece non-priority mail and second class mail
- **EN 14534** Measurement of the transit time of end-to-end services for bulk mail
- **TS 14773** Measurement of loss and substantial delay of priority and first class mail using a survey of test letters

<b>Status / Current situation - please ✓ appropriate answer (s)</b>	<b>EN 13850</b>	<b>EN 14508</b>	<b>EN 14012</b>	<b>EN 14137</b>	<b>EN 14534</b>	<b>TS 14773</b>
<i>A.1 Have you already implemented one of the following CEN QoS standards? If so please tick the box.</i>						
1) Yes	18	7	8	3	5	0
2) No, but we intend to implement it	2	3	8	8	5	6
3) No, we do not intend to implement it	0	8	1	8	8	10
4) other, <i>please comment</i> .....	2	0	3	1	2	0
<b>A. 2. Do you consider the standard you have implemented to be:</b>	<b>EN 13850</b>	<b>EN 14508</b>	<b>EN 14012</b>	<b>EN 14137</b>	<b>EN 14534</b>	<b>TS 14773</b>
1) Fully compliant with the CEN standard	9	5	5	3	1	0
2) Partly compliant with the CEN standard; minor changes are needed to adopt the current standard	10	3	4	2	2	3
3) Partly compliant with the CEN standard; significant changes are needed to adopt the current standard	0	0	1	0	2	0
<b>A.3 How is <u>compliance</u> with the standard <u>audited</u>?</b>	<b>EN 13850</b>	<b>EN 14508</b>	<b>EN 14012</b>	<b>EN 14137</b>	<b>EN 14534</b>	<b>TS 14773</b>
1) by research company	5	1	1	0	0	0
2) by consulting company	5	2	1	1	1	1
3) it is not audited	4	3	6	1	3	2
4) by NRA	6	4	1	2	1	0
5) by governmental body	0	1	0	0	1	0
6) other, <i>please indicate</i> .....	1	0	0	0	0	0

<b>A.4 What is the legal status of the standard?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) Implementation is voluntary	3	4	3	6	7	4
2) Implementation is voluntary, but the issue covered by the standard is regulated	6	3	8	3	4	3
3) Implementation is mandatory	12	3	4	2	0	1
4) The service covered by the standard does not exist in my country	0	6	1	1	1	1
→ if the answer is 2) or 3) please state the national law/regulation that covers the issue or that establishes the obligation to implement the standard						
EN 13850 .....						
EN 14508 .....						
EN 14137 .....						
EN 14534 .....						
TS 14773 .....						
<b>A.5 Who is responsible for the measurement of the standard?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) NRA, according to regulation A.4	7	1	1	0	0	0
2) NRA, by practice	1	2	0	1	1	2
3) USP, according to regulation A.4	5	3	3	2	1	1
4) USP, by practice	4	3	3	1	2	0
5) Other (please state for each standard) .....						
<b>A.6 To whom are the results of measurement reported?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) To NRA, according to regulation A.4	13	3	6	1	2	2
2) To NRA, by practice	3	1	1	2	1	2
3) Other (please state) .....	6	1	4	0	3	0
.....						
<b>A.7 Is there any obligation concerning publication of the results?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) yes	12	4	5	1	1	1
2) no, but the results are published	3	1	1	0	1	0
3) no → please skip to A.10	3	3	4	3	4	2

<b>A.8 How often is the results published?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) once a year	12	2	5	0	2	1
2) twice a year	1	0	0	0	0	0
3) every 3 months	2	1	1	0	0	0
4) every month	1	1	1	0	1	1
5) more often, <i>please indicate</i> .....	1	0	0	0	1	0
.....						
.....						
<b>A.9 Where are the results published?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) NRA website	6	2	2	0	0	0
2) USP website	4	1	2	1	1	1
3) NRA bulletin / annual report	5	1	1	0	0	0
4) USP bulletin / annual report	7	1	1	1	2	1
5) Other, <i>please indicate</i> .....	3	1	1	0	2	1
.....						
<b>A.10 Who conducts measurement in accordance with the standard?</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
<b>1) NRA, external company</b>	4	1				
<b>2) NRA, internal resource</b>	3	1	1	1	1	1
3) USP, external company	10	3	1	1	2	1
4) USP, internal resource	4	2	5	1	1	1
5) other, <i>please indicate</i> .....	1	1	0	0	0	0
.....						

The method of implementation - please ✓ appropriate answer (s)	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
<b>B.1</b> When did you start to implement it (please indicate the year and month)? <i>YYYY-MM</i>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>B.2</b> To implement the standard:						
1) Did you have to adapt a previous measurement standard?	7	3	0	0	1	0
2) Was it the first measurement?	5	1	2	1	1	1
3) Other, <i>please comment</i> .....	0	0	1	1	0	0
<b>B.3</b> <i>What were the needs to implement it? Please tick the boxes.</i>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) National regulatory requirement	13	3	3	0	0	0
2) NRA's need to follow the USP activity	6	2	2	1	0	1
3) USP's request	2	2	1	0	1	0
4) Consumer's needs	7	2	1	0	1	0
5) Others:	3	2	2	2	1	1
.....						
.....						
.....						



B.4 What steps did you go through to implement it? Can you describe the process and give the time schedule?	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
<b>EN 13850</b> - Step 1:..... Date:..... - Step 2 :..... Date:..... - Step 3 :..... Date:..... - Step 4:..... Date:..... - Step 5 :..... Date:..... - Step 6 :..... Date:.....	<b>EN 14508</b> - Step 1:..... Date:..... - Step 2 :..... Date:..... - Step 3 :..... Date:..... - Step 4:..... Date:..... - Step 5 :..... Date:..... - Step 6 :..... Date:.....					
<b>EN 14012</b> - Step 1:..... Date:..... - Step 2 :..... Date:..... - Step 3 :..... Date:..... - Step 4:..... Date:..... - Step 5 :..... Date:..... - Step 6 :..... Date:.....	<b>EN 14137</b> - Step 1:..... Date:..... - Step 2 :..... Date:..... - Step 3 :..... Date:..... - Step 4:..... Date:..... - Step 5 :..... Date:..... - Step 6 :..... Date:.....					
<b>EN 14534</b> - Step 1:..... Date:..... - Step 2 :..... Date:..... - Step 3 :..... Date:..... - Step 4:..... Date:..... - Step 5 :..... Date:..... - Step 6 :..... Date:.....	<b>TS 14773</b> - Step 1:..... Date:..... - Step 2 :..... Date:..... - Step 3 :..... Date:..... - Step 4:..... Date:..... - Step 5 :..... Date:..... - Step 6 :..... Date:.....					

<b>B.5 Can you estimate the cost of the implementation and follow-up of this standard? Please split up the cost into the following categories [please calculate in EURO].</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) Internal costs (labour, information technology, training, etc.)	1) €	1) €	1) €	1) €	1) €	1) €
2) External costs (consultants, auditors, hardware and software, etc.):	2) €	2) €	2) €	2) €	2) €	2) €
3) Others (impact on quality of service targets, non quantifying elements, etc.): .....	3) €	3) €	3) €	3) €	3) €	3) €
<b>B.6 Who bears the costs? Please tick the box.</b>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) <i>NRA</i>	1).....%	1).....%	1).....%	1).....%	1).....%	1).....%
2) <i>USP</i>	2).....%	2).....%	2).....%	2).....%	2).....%	2).....%
3) <i>Others:</i> .....	3).....%	3).....%	3).....%	3).....%	3).....%	3).....%
<i>Split by NRA, USP and others in proportion (%)</i>						
<b>B.7 Can you list the problems (human resources, reluctance of actors financially, technically, etc.) you faced to implement it, by order of importance? And how you solved them?</b>						
<b>EN 13850</b>			<b>EN 14508</b>			
- Problem 1:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 1:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 2:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 2:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 3:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 3:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 4:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 4:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 5:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 5:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 6:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 6:..... Solution:.....			
<b>EN 14012</b>			<b>EN 14137</b>			
- Problem 1:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 1:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 2:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 2:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 3:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 3:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 4:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 4:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 5:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 5:..... Solution:.....			
- Problem 6:..... Solution:.....			- Problem 6:..... Solution:.....			

**B.7 Can you list the problems (human resources, reluctance of actors financially, technically, etc.) you faced to implement it, by order of importance? And how you solved them?**

<p><b>EN 14534</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Problem 1:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 2:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 3:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 4:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 5:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 6:..... Solution:.....</li> </ul>	<p><b>TS 14773</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Problem 1:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 2:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 3:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 4:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 5:..... Solution:.....</li> <li>- Problem 6:..... Solution:.....</li> </ul>
---	---

**B.8 What lessons did you learn from the implementation of CEN QoS standards?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**B.9 What advice would you give to other people wanting to implement CEN QoS standards?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

<b>Future improvement/ Attitude / Intention - please ✓ appropriate answer (s)</b>	<b>EN 13850</b>	<b>EN 14508</b>	<b>EN 14012</b>	<b>EN 14137</b>	<b>EN 14534</b>	<b>TS 14773</b>
<i>What is your Organisation's <u>attitude/view</u> towards implementing the standard?</i>						
1) We are happy to implement the standard in the manner specified.	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
2) It is the only possible harmonised method for measuring quality of service across the whole of Europe	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
3) We do not see any advantages in implementing the standard, but we accept the decision to implement it	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Comments: ..... .....						
<i>Does your Organisation <u>plan</u> to extend the standard to <u>multiple operators</u>?</i>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) Yes, the standard has already been extended	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2) Yes, there are plans to extend the standard	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
3) No, we do not plan to extend the standard to multiple operators	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
Comments: ..... .....						
<i>Do you <u>plan</u> to establish new regulations/laws imposing <u>mandatory application</u> of the standard in your country?</i>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) Yes, new regulations have already imposed mandatory application	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
2) Yes, it is planned to establish new regulations to impose mandatory application	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
3) No, there are no plans to establish mandatory application	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
Comments: ..... .....						

<i>Do you plan to improve the Quality of Service covered by the standard? If yes, please provide details of your plans?</i>	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
1) Yes, there are plans to improve Quality of Service in the field	13	5	10	6	4	4
2) No, there are no plans to improve Quality of Service in the field	4	1	3	2	3	2
3) Other, please comment .....	4	0	3	2	0	0
Details of the plans: ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... ..... .....						

Positive elements experienced in the implementation standards - please ✓ appropriate answer (s)	EN 13850	EN 14508	EN 14012	EN 14137	EN 14534	TS 14773
<i>D.1 Are you fully satisfied with the standard and does it fulfil its purpose?</i>						
1) Fully	11	4	6	2	1	1
2) Partly	6	3	4	3	4	4
Why? .....						

*D.2 Can you list the three advantages and disadvantages of the implementation of this standard, by order of importance?*

<p><b>ADVANTAGES of EN 13850</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>	<p><b>DISADVANTAGES of EN 13850</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>
<p><b>ADVANTAGES of EN 14508</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>	<p><b>DISADVANTAGES of EN 14508</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>
<p><b>ADVANTAGES of EN 14012</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>	<p><b>DISADVANTAGES of EN 14012</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>
<p><b>ADVANTAGES of EN 14137</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>	<p><b>DISADVANTAGES of EN 14137</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>
<p><b>ADVANTAGES of EN 14534</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>	<p><b>DISADVANTAGES of EN 14534</b></p> <p>1) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>2) .....</p> <p>..</p> <p>3) .....</p> <p>..</p>

<b>ADVANTAGES of TS 14773</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGES of TS 14773</b>
1) .....	1) .....
2) ..	2) ..
3) ..	3) ..
..	..
..	..



**E. General information**

**E.1. Would you consider that the development of the standards, which are under review by this Project Team, has contributed to the improvement of the Quality of Service offered by Postal Service Providers throughout Europe?** Please state which standard(s) and why, in the order of their significance, contributed most in this area. If you answer in the negative please state your reasons.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**E.2. Do you agree that the work of this Project Team will provide the solutions required for those countries that have yet to implement many of the standards which are under review?** Would you like to suggest another solution for sharing this information on a European scale?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**E.3. Has the National Standards Body translated any/all of the Standards which are under review by this project team into your local language? If not, which standard(s) remain to be translated?**

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**E.4. Other topics not covered by the questionnaire concerning the standard implementation? Please state**

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

<b>F. Contact persons</b>			
<b>1. The contact person in the NRA who deals with standardisation?</b>		<b>2. The contact person in the Ministry who deals with standardisation?</b>	
Organisation:		Organisation:	
Contact person:		Contact person:	
Title:		Title:	
Phone:		Phone:	
Fax:		Fax:	
E-mail:		E-mail:	
Website address:		Website address:	
Postal address:		Postal address:	
Can CERP members contact this person should they want supplementary information? <i>please ✓ appropriate answer</i>		Can CERP members contact this person should they want supplementary information? <i>please ✓ appropriate answer</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	
<b>3. The contact person in the designated USP who deals with standardisation?</b>		<b>4. Other relevant contact persons who deal with standardisation (Standardisation body, Consumer Body, Other operators)?</b>	
Organisation:		Organisation:	
Contact person:		Contact person:	
Title:		Title:	
Phone:		Phone:	
Fax:		Fax:	
E-mail:		E-mail:	
Website address:		Website address:	
Postal address:		Postal address:	
Can CERP members contact this person should they want supplementary information? <i>please ✓ appropriate answer</i>		Can CERP members contact this person should they want supplementary information? <i>please ✓ appropriate answer</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	

## ANNEX 4



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Internal Market and Services DG

Services

Postal services

21.03.05 1366

Brussels,

Markt/E4/JR/DS/HM D(2005) - 2346

### **To all Members of the Postal Directive Committee**

Dear members,

I am pleased to inform you that the references of the different CEN postal EN standards have been published in the Official Journal of the European Union (C 30/3 of February 5, 2005 – see doc attached).

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the excellent work of the TC 331 since its creation in 1996, and to reiterate the importance of standardisation for the postal sector.

The results achieved through close coordination and consultation with all stakeholders, are a successful example of a consensual approach within the postal industry to find solutions on issues of common interest. These standards will nurture greater interoperability between postal value chain players, and facilitate improved quality of service by giving adequate tools for measurement.


I wish to draw your attention on the implementation of standard EN 13850 which becomes mandatory. Member States have to ensure that the performance levels are measured according to this standard for domestic mail from January 2004, and for cross border mail from January 2005, and the results published once a year as required by the Directive.

As you know, following a mandate from the Commission, the TC 331 is currently working on the adaptation of the standard to the enlarged Union, and results are expected towards mid 2006. The Commission will take into account this fact in its assessment of the application of the standards by new Member States.

Finally, we envisage the first data provided by the new UNEX system will allow for a first assessment of quality of service at the EU 25 level.

I am confident that these developments serve to stimulate effective quality of service measurement – and I wish to thank you for your ongoing support in the standardisation process.

Yours faithfully,

  
Jörg REINBOTHE  
Head of Unit

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11. Office: C100 04/062. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 296 38 29. Fax: (32-2) 296 83 92.

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/internal\\_market/](http://europa.eu.int/comm/internal_market/)  
E-mail: [Hughes.DE-LA-MOTTE@cec.eu.int](mailto:Hughes.DE-LA-MOTTE@cec.eu.int)