

# Main developments in the European postal sector (2004-2006)

## **Appendix**

A1 - Note on Methodology

A2 - List of Competition Cases

A3 - Regulatory Data by Country

A4 - Bibliography

Bad Honnef, May 2006



## **Contents**

**A1 – Note on Methodology**

**A2 – List of Competition Cases**

**A3 – Regulatory Data by Country**

**A4 – Bibliography**



## A1 – Note on Methodology

WIK-Consult began the data collection phase of the study by gathering basic information about the sector from postal specific internet sites, reports published by national regulatory authorities (NRAs) and competition authorities, annual reports of universal service providers (USPs), and statistics from the Universal Postal Union (UPU) and EUROSTAT. WIK-Consult also sought information publicly available from competing postal operators (CPOs), associations of consumers, business mailers, and unions related to the postal sector. Desk research also included recent postal studies commissioned by the European Commission.

The heart of the information collection process, however, was a detailed computerised questionnaire posted on a secure internet site established for this survey. More than 1,000 questions were grouped into 24 “question modules”, each containing 10 to 40 (or more, in a few cases) questions dealing with a specific topic. See Table A1. Despite the large number of questions required by the breath of the study, every effort was made to ease the process of completing the questionnaires. The great majority of questions required only selection from among standardised answers (yes/no, look up, or multi-select questions) or entry of simple numerical data.

Table A1 Question modules

	Question module	NRA	USP
101LW	Laws	X	
102RG	Regulations and secondary legislation	X	
211RF	Regulatory framework	X	
212US	Universal service	X	
214RA	Reserved area	X	
215SR	Special rights and legal differences	X	
216AL	Authorisation and licensing	X	
217PR	Price regulation	X	
218SP	Special tariffs	X	
219AS	Transparency of accounts	X	X
220QS	Quality of service	X	X
221CR	Complaints and redress	X	X
231CD	USP collection and delivery		X
232TD	USP technological development		X
233PP	USP price performance		X
234MS	Market structure analysis	X	X
235DS	Demand structure analysis	X	X
301MS	USP market share data	X	X
320UP	USP corporate data		X
321US	USP universal service data		X
322PR	USP universal service prices		X
323VO	USP postal volume data		X
324RV	USP postal revenue and cost data		X
331NR	National regulatory authority data	X	
		16	14

Three types of question modules were employed. The 100-series of question modules requested information on postal laws and regulations. The 200-series of question modules requested information on various feature of postal regulations, operations, and market development. The 300-series of question modules asked for year by year data for the six years from 1998 to 2003. In the 300-series question modules, the respondent was also requested to indicate for each item whether the information provided was available for public disclosure or considered confidential; where data was not provided, the participant was asked to indicate whether the reason was unavailability, commercial sensitivity, administrative burden, or other reason.

Different participants were asked to complete different question modules. The main burden fell on the NRAs and UPS, who were asked to complete 16 and 14 question modules, respectively.

WIK-Consult explained the objectives of the study and details of the internet survey to interested parties in a public workshop in Brussels on December 5, 2005. In this workshop and in a subsequent meeting with representatives of customer and consumer associations,<sup>1</sup> WIK encouraged the broadest possible participation in this survey. All stakeholder groups were contacted. NRAs,<sup>2</sup> and USPs received their access codes by e-mail at the start of the internet survey. National consumer and business associations, and large mailers were asked for interviews. The number of participants in the internet survey and the number of completed responses are shown in Table A2.

Table A2 Number of potential participants in the internet survey and return

Countries	Organisation	Number of participants	Number of answered questionnaires
MS	USP	25	24
	NRA	25	25
EEA	USP	3	2
	NRA	3	2
CC	USP	4	2
	NRA	4	3
<b>Total</b>		64	58

Notes:

The internet survey was open for data entry by respondents from December 21 until March 10, 2006. An initial deadline of January 27, 2006, was extended several times to give respondents more time to complete the question modules. Preliminary results were presented at the second public workshop in Brussels on February 21, 2006. Following this workshop respondents have been asked to provide comments and corrections which were taken into account in the final report.

<sup>1</sup> Meeting of the Postal Users' Group (PUG) on December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> National regulatory authorities and Ministries responsible for the postal sector have been asked to complete the questionnaire collaboratively.

WIK-Consult has sought to evaluate the reliability of data in this report by several methods. First, the questionnaire asked for key information in several different ways in order to provide a basis for the assessing the internal consistency of answers. Second, in certain areas, similar questions have been posed to USPs and NRAs in order to cross-check the information. Third, missing information and inconsistencies have been addressed in numerous talks at different opportunities, telephone interviews and by written communication.

**Table A3**            Number of interviews with business mailers, consumer and customer associations

	<b>Number of interviews</b>	<b>Member states covered</b>
Business Mailers	6	BE, CZ, DE, HU, NL, IS
Consumer Associations	9	AT, CZ, DE (2), DE (EU Con), FI, HU, PL, UK
Direct marketing associations	2	PL, SI
Mail ordering associations	2	DE
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>

Additionally interviews have been carried out, face by face or by phone, with representatives of the Belgian and the Dutch USP, the Belgian NRA (IBPT) and a number of consumer and customer associations (Table A2, after contacting in sum more than 250 mailers or associations). Furthermore, interviews have been carried out with two German licensees (Postcon eG and PIN AG), and four private equity companies (3i, Fortis, Odewald & Cie, Trimoteur B.V.).

As far as possible missing information has been completed by using secondary source data. The most important indicators concerned and the respective secondary sources used are listed in the following table.

**Table A4**            Use of secondary sources

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Secondary source</b>
Market structure information	Reports provided by NRAs (see App. A2)
Postal outlets and street letter boxes	UPU Postal Statistics (last wave: 2004)
Mergers & acquisitions	Annual reports (2000-2005), Press Notices
Financial data of USPs	Annual reports (2000-2005)
Employment data of USPs	Annual reports (2000-2005), UPU Postal Statistics
Volume information of USPs	Annual reports (2000-2005), UPU Postal Statistics
Price information of USPs	Price lists, USP websites



## A2 – List of Competition Cases

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
AT	26 KT 29 (2005) Decision of supreme court of justice of March 2006	Kartellgericht Supreme court of justice	Österreichische Post AG Redmail	<b>Rebate scheme (newspapers and magazines, exclusivity contracts)</b> Österreichische Post AG abused its dominant position in the market for daily delivery of daily newspapers as well as in the market for the delivery of weekly and monthly newspapers by granting the lowest charges for the delivery of newspapers in the years 2002 to 2006 only to publishers which in no one of these years asked for less newspaper deliveries than 90% of the deliveries they had asked for in the year 2001. Supreme court of justice confirmed decision of the Kartellgericht.
BE	COMP 37.859, Decision of 5 Dec 2001 (L61 2.3.2002 p. 32)	European Commission (Art. 82)	Hays/De Post	<b>Rebate scheme (business to business, bundling)</b> This Decision concerns the cancellation by La Poste of the preferential tariff previously granted to the UPEA (insurance companies for business-to-private mail covered by the monopoly and the withdrawal of that act of cancellation only once the UPEA had signed a new business-to-business agreement proposed by La Poste. La Poste thus obliged the UPEA, which wished to retain the benefit of the preferential tariff agreement, to purchase from it the new business-to-business service also. Fine: 2,500,000 Eur
BE				No national competition cases, but disputes with NRA - definition of the universal service area (see decisions of IBPT) - subsidized tariffs for newspaper distribution
CY				No competition cases, but disputes with NRA - Definition of letter, addressed mail or printed matter;
CZ				No competition cases, but disputes with NRA - Definition of letters and addressed direct mail Recently, the European Commission has launched a check at Ceska posta, the Czech Post Office, to find out whether the company is abusing its dominant position, Ceska posta spokesman Ladislav Vancura told CTK today. The check concerns so-called direct mail, or deliveries of advertisements to addresses, including the delivery of magazines to subscribers. (Press notice of 28 April 2006, <a href="http://www.postinsight.pb.com">http://www.postinsight.pb.com</a> and press release of Czech Post of 26 April 2006 ( <a href="http://www.cpost.cz">www.cpost.cz</a> in Czech).
DE	Comp 35.141 Decision of 20 Mar 2001	European Commission (Art. 82)	UPS/DPAG	<b>Rebate scheme (fidelity rebates)</b> Art. 82 EC - Deutsche Post AG has abused its dominant position by granting fidelity rebates and engaging in predatory pricing in the market for business parcel services (by cross-subsidizations from the reserved services market) – Undertakings given by DPAG [Rebate scheme and predatory pricing (mail-order parcel services)]; fine: 24,000,000 Eur

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
DE	B9-55/03 Decision of 14 Feb. 2005	Bundeskartellamt (plus court decision of 13 April 2005 not to suspend the effects of the decision of Bundeskartellamt)	DPAG	<b>Discrimination (downstream access); scope of reserved area</b> The Deutsche Post AG (DPAG) denied competitors holding postal licences in the meaning of § 51 (2) 2 Nr. 5 PostG which bunch postal items originating from various senders, pre-sort and deliver them to the DPAG's mail centers access to certain partial performances under § 28 (1) PostG ("downstream access for bulk mail consolidators") and the granting of rebates for the mentioned internal labours concerning mail below the exclusive licence's price- and weight limits (§ 51 (1) 1 PostG) to the same extent to which it grants this downstream access and the partial performance rebates to bulk senders in the framework of its "partial performance contracts customers" independently from the price- and weight limits of the exclusive licence and to consolidators in the framework of its "partial performance contracts competitors" for the committal of mail above the exclusive licence's price- and weight limits.
DE	Diverse decisions	BNetzA	Licensees/DPAG	<b>Discrimination (TPA)</b> Access to P. O. boxes; access to address change information; redirection of mail delivered by postal competitive operators; consolidation (access to DPAG's infrastructure)
DE	Ongoing complaint (BNetzA (from DG Competition))		Licensees/DPAG	<b>Abuse of market-dominant position (cross-subsidisation)</b> DPAG offers consolidation services by using her subsidiary Inhaus GmbH.
DE	Diverse litigations		Licensees/DPAG	Numerous litigations at courts (different instances) with regard to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• definition of the D licence (which services are distinct from universal service);</li> <li>• Use of term "Post" as branding name by competitors</li> </ul>
DK	No 3/1120-0289-0076 of 29 September 2004 Final decision is pending	Danish Competition Council Appeals Tribunal	Post Danmark/Forbruger-Kontakt	<b>Rebate scheme (loyalty rebates)</b> The Danish Competition Council adopted a decision concerning the alleged abuse by Post Danmark A/S of its dominant position on the market for distribution of unaddressed items and local weeklies (discriminating prices and loyalty rebates). Post Danmark had used discriminating prices towards its own customers and towards the customers of its only competitor, Forbruger-Kontakt. In some incidents Post Danmark has used lower prices towards the customers of its competitor than towards its own customers under somewhat similar conditions. Post Danmark has also used discriminating prices amongst its own customers. Finally, Post Danmark had in its yearly contracts for 2003 with six customers used loyalty rebates schemes (target rebates), whereby the customers obtain higher rebates if their actual yearly number of local weeklies exceeds the target number of local weeklies agreed bilateral between the customer and Post Danmark. These rebates schemes do not reflect the underlying costs of Post Danmark but has been used with the purpose to obtain market shares from the competitor, Forbruger-Kontakt. The decision has been brought before the Danish Appeals Tribunal by Post Danmark

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
DK	No. 3/1120-0100-1205 of 24 November 2004 Final decision is pending	Danish Competition Council Appeals tribunal	Post Danmark/Forbruger-Kontakt	<b>Predatory Pricing:</b> The competition authority decided that Post Danmark had not abused its market dominant position by predatory pricing. The analysis showed that it was necessary for the Competition Authority to adjust the calculations made by Post Danmarks of the cost for the undertaking connected to the service of distributing unaddressed items and local weeklies. Following these corrections of the cost calculations, the analysis by the Competition Authority shows, that the average prices in 2003 and the first half of 2004 were not below the relevant cost measure, average incremental costs (AIC), connected to distributing unaddressed items and local weeklies. Moreover, the lowest price offered by Post Danmark to any single customer is at the same level as the AIC. The decision has been brought before the Danish Appeals Tribunal by the competitor, Forbruger-Kontakt.
DK	No. 1120-0289-0076 of 23 February 2005	Danish Competition Council Decision		Approval of new pricing scheme of Post Denmark concerning the future prices for distribution of unaddressed items
DK	No. 3/1120-0289-0106 of 28 November 2005	Danish Competition Council Decision		Allowance of pricing for use of P.O.Boxes
ES	Expte. 417/00 of 2 Apr 2001 Expte. 536/02 of 7 Feb 2003	Tribunal de defensa de la competencia	IFCC (International First Class Courier)/Correos	Unlawfully retaining IFCC's mail and spreading denigratory information on IFCC's activities – Fine of 900,000 Eur
ES	Expte. 542/02 of 20 Jun 2003	Tribunal de defensa de la competencia	Suresa/Correos	<b>Rebate scheme</b> Correos abused its dominant position in the market for the collection, classification, transport and distribution of letters and postcards with destination within the Spanish territory by only granting the rebates designated by law to consolidators if their load of postal items contained a minimum of 10% of mail with local destination. Abuse of dominant position by requiring a minimum of 10% to Suresa of local deliveries rendered to Correos to qualify for the discounts and rebates– Fine of 5,400,109 Eur
ES	C 240/02, judgement of the Court of 11 Mar 2004	European Court of Justice	ASEMPRE/Correos	<b>Definition of self-provision, Services reserved for the provider of universal services</b> Article 7 of Directive 97/67/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 15 December 1997, on the common rules for the development of the internal market of Community postal services and the improvement of quality of service, read in the light of recital 21 thereof, must be interpreted as meaning that it does not permit self-provision to be subject to the following conditions: - the receiver must be the same person as the sender; - the services must not be provided to third parties in the course of commercial or business activity of the service provider; - the services must not be provided by the mailbag system or other similar methods; and - such operations must not disrupt the services reserved to the universal service provider.
ES	Expte. 568/03 of 15 Sep 2004	Tribunal de defensa de la competencia	ASEMPRE (Asociacion Profesional de Empresas de Reparto y Manipulado de Correspondencia – Mail handling and delivery)/Correos	<b>Rebate scheme (exclusivity contract)</b> Exclusivity contracts with large mailers – Fine of 15,000,000 Eur

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
ES	Expte 584/04 of 17 Jun 2005	Tribunal de defensa de la competencia	Prensa/Correos	<b>Rebate scheme / Discrimination of customers (newspapers and magazines)</b> Discrimination of members of the Association of Press Editors (AEDE) in favour of members of Professional Press Association (APP) – fine of 900,000 Eur
FI				No competition cases, but disputes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scope of the universal service</li> <li>- Affordability of prices</li> <li>- Tariff freeze: scope of regulatory authority, does NRA have the power to rule a tariff freeze?</li> </ul>
FR	2002/344/EC of 23 Oct 2001 (L120 7.5.2002 p. 19)	EU Commission (Art. 82/86)	France	<b>Rebate scheme / discrimination</b> French legislation allowed only limited scrutiny of the non-discriminatory nature of the scales of charges and technical conditions applied by La Poste to mail preparation firms. Partial scrutiny is furthermore exercised by a public authority that is insufficiently independent and neutral in relation to La Poste. Discriminatory tariffs and conditions/mail preparation (SNELPD case) – independent national regulatory authority required
FR	04-D-65 of 30 Nov 2004	Conseil de la concurrence	La Poste	<b>Rebate scheme / discrimination</b> Anticompetitive discounts in contracts between the French post office, La Poste, and mail order companies In response to a request by the Minister of Economy, on 10th April 2001 the Conseil de la concurrence issued an opinion, in which it drew La Poste's attention to the anticompetitive nature of certain discounts contained in its sales contracts with major customers. On 1st July 2002, considering that La Poste had failed to heed all its recommendations, the Conseil de la concurrence assumed jurisdiction at its own initiative, with the intention of ruling on this contract situation. On 30th November 2004, it published a substantive decision on the merits of the case. In the decision, the Conseil observed that La Poste altered a part of its sales contracts as early as 1st January 2002. However, the mail order sector, which represents a very substantial volume of activity, continued to benefit from tied reductions and loyalty discounts up until 1st January 2003. In accordance with case law, the Conseil qualified these practices as abuse of a dominant position, prohibited by French and European competition law. (Conseil de la concurrence, Press Release of 1st December 2004) fine: 600,000. € (reduced from 6 Mln. €)

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
FR	05-D-63 of 17 Nov 2005	Conseil de la concurrence	SNELPD/La Poste	<p><b>Rebate scheme / discrimination</b> The Conseil de la concurrence fines the La Poste group for having practiced discriminatory prices in favour of certain mail senders and its subsidiary Datapost. The investigation revealed that La Poste did not offer its TG and TS rates uniformly in all parts of France. Numerous instances of discrimination were observed in the way these prices were offered to customers. They involved La Poste granting discounts on franking to certain mail senders, despite these customers failing to meet the conditions officially required in order to benefit from the preferential rates, namely that their mail should be pre-sorted and sent in minimal quantities (access thresholds).</p> <p>In addition, the case file shows that, between 1995 and 1999, Datapost (a subsidiary of La Poste specialising in mail consolidation) was granted an exclusive discount by its parent company, without being required to provide any guarantees regarding mail volumes. This discrimination gave Datapost a clear competitive advantage over competing mail consolidators. In particular, the subsidiary was able to win contracts with Edfi-Gdf (French electricity and gas supply company) for the Nice Côte d'Azur and Gard-Cévennes regions. (Conseil de la concurrence, Press Release of 17 November 2005) fine: 1,000,000 €</p>
GR				<p>No competition cases, but disputes: - Redefinition of direct mail (resulting in price increases, complaint by FEDMA)</p>
HU				<p>No competition cases, but disputes - Definition of letter mail - Definition of postal services and other transport services - Definition of universal service area - Definition of the sender - Access to postal network</p>
IE				<p>No competition cases, but disputes - Access of bulk mailers to Anpost (complaints, consultation on draft direction to Anpost in order to implement access points meeting the needs of bulk mailers (density of access points for bulk mail services, e.g. access points at delivery offices) - 2005 pricing decision of ComReg; AnPost appealed this decision at court (pricing decision and authority of ComReg to make such decisions). The high court granted leave to challenge the regulator's decision on March 20, 2006.</p>
IT	Decision of 21 Dec 2000 (2001/176/EC); OJ L63 3.3.2001 p. 59)	European Commission (Art. 86)	Riposta/Italy	<p><b>Definition of the reserved area</b> Italy, reserving the day - or time-certain delivery phase of hybrid electronic mail service to the incumbent postal operator, Poste Italiane, had infringed Arts. 86 (1) and 82 EC read in conjunction</p>
IT	C-340/99 of 17/5/2001	ECJ judgment (Art. 82 and Art. 86)	TNT Traco/Poste Italiane SpA'	<p><b>Definition of reserved area</b> Italy which had granted a private law undertaking the exclusive right to operate the universal postal service made the right of any other economic operator to provide an express mail service not forming part of the universal service subject to payment of postal dues equivalent to the postage charge normally payable to the undertaking responsible for the universal service. The proceeds of those dues were allocated to the Poste Italiane, the undertaking with the exclusive right to provide the universal service.</p>

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
IT	Decision of 23/05/2002 (Prov. N. 10763 (A299))	Italian competition authority	International Mail Express/Poste Italiane	<b>Interception of international mail</b> Le Poste Italiane SpA (Poste) abused its dominant position in the Italian letter market by intercepting international mail incoming in high amounts without differentiating between cases of ABA remailing and ordinary cases of cross-border mail. As far as the latter cases were concerned, Poste imposed an excessive price for the delivery of the service effectively provided. Furthermore, in many cases Poste, by detaining the incoming mail in its own international exchange offices, delayed the delivery of the postal items and sometimes even opened the correspondence ending up in some cases with the destruction of the postal items without informing the sender
IT	Decision of April 10, 2006	Italian competition authority		<b>Hybrid mail, abuse of dominant position</b> Poste Italiane has been fined 1.6m euros by the country's antitrust regulator for abusing its dominant market position. Antitrust claimed that Poste Italiane was blocking competition in the deregulated hybrid electronic postal services sector, which includes the mass distribution of bills and bank statements. It did concede, however, that Poste Italiane was not entirely to blame, as it was simply taking advantage of a 1999 law that made it much easier for it to dominate the market. For its part, the postal service insists that it has acted within the law and is considering an appeal to the administrative courts
LV				No competition cases, but disputes - Definition of letter and addressed direct mail - Definition of letter and express mail
LT				
LU				No competition cases, but disputes - Definition of letter mail, addressed direct mail and printed matter
MT				Cross-subsidisation by the USP of the delivery of un-addressed postal items (Ecorys 2005, Country Report Malta)
NL				No competition cases, but disputes - Definition of letters and printed matter (direct mail): District Court in The Hague (March 2004) decided that the restrictive interpretation of the notion 'letters', which was communicated by OPTA in an informal 'opinion', was incorrect. Printed matter = each item is identical to another except for the name and the address of the addressee. (Eccies/Kuijpers 2005) - Access to P.O. boxes - Redirection of mail delivered by postal competitive operators - Access conditions
PT				Denial of access; unfavourable access conditions of competitors compared to customers (Ecorys 2005, Country Report Portugal)
SE	MD 1998: 15 KKV/Posten Sverige AB (1998-11-11)	Swedish Competition Authority Market court decision (court of the last instance in competition law proceedings)	CityMail/Posten Sverige AB	<b>"Swedish zone price case"</b> Abuse of market dominant position in regard to its only significant competitor, CityMail, by introducing pricing that varied depending on the geographical zone of mass mail delivery
SI				No competition cases, but disputes Definition of letters, addressed mail or printed matter

Country	Competition Case	Decided by	Party involved	Main subject
SK				No competition cases, but disputes Definition of letter, addressed mail or printed matter
UK	Completed in Nov. 2003	Postcomm		<b>Mailsort complaint</b> On 11 November 2003, Postcomm closed an investigation into Royal Mail's Mailsort business by asking Royal Mail to communicate more effectively with customers of its Mailsort business service and to work with Postwatch, the consumer body to settle grievances.
UK	Completed in Jan 2005	Postcomm	AMP/Royal Mail	<b>Royal Mail's catalogue and advertising promotion scheme</b> Royal Mail had developed promotion schemes to encourage customers to use mail as part of their marketing activities. The two Royal Mail schemes under investigation were the catalogue customer reactivation and acquisition test, introduced in July 2003 and the Mailsort 31400 incremental advertising promotion, introduced in October 2003. Both schemes gave a discount on "incremental" mailings posted by eligible catalogue and advertising mailers. A competitor alleged that Royal Mail was behaving anti-competitively by encouraging non-Royal Mail customers to switch to Royal Mail. Postcomm concluded that Royal Mail appeared to have contravened two conditions in its licence designed to facilitate competition. As a result Royal Mail established new procedure in which senior management must assess new promotion schemes in the framework of regulatory and competition laws. (Ecorys 2005, Annex II, UK)
UK	Ongoing First decision on Feb 17, 2006 (Issue: unfair commercial advantage)	Postcomm	Express Ltd.; TPG Post UK Ltd., UK Mail Ltd./Royal Mail	<b>Zonal pricing for access</b> In January 2005, a Postcomm investigation has started to deal with complaints of three competitor postal operators (Express Ltd., TPG Post UK Ltd., and UK Mail Ltd.) about Royal Mail's zonal pricing system for downstream access. The complaint focuses on the opinion of the competitors that the offer of zonal pricing on access contravenes one or more Royal Mail's licence conditions as Royal Mail has concluded different arrangements with competitive operators in the UK. (Ecorys 2005, Annex I, UK) On 17 February 2006, Postcomm proposed a £2.16million financial penalty and issued an enforcement order on Royal Mail after investigating the company's offer of zonal pricing on direct access to its downstream facilities. Postcomm concluded that Royal Mail had failed to take adequate steps to ensure it did not gain unfair commercial advantage over its competitors in the fast-growing 'access to the last mile' market.
UK	Ongoing	Postcomm	AMP/Royal Mail	Royal Mail's use of network capacity: Pricing based on capacity (Big Book Service introduced by Royal Mail in July 2005) Because Royal Mail supplies both a regulated and an unregulated market using the same capacity, Postcomm's investigation will look at how Royal Mail allocates capacity between its regulated and unregulated activities, to ensure that it is not obtaining an unfair commercial advantage in the unregulated markets, or unduly discriminating against access users in the regulated market.

**Sources:** Ecorys (2005), Websites of competition authorities and national regulatory authorities, European Commission (DG Competition).



## A3 – Regulatory Data by Country

This appendix summarizes the regulatory information developed in this study organized by individual country. Each country report consists of a standard table of answers to questions designed to reveal key features of the regulatory framework and the manner in the Postal Directive has been implemented.

The primary source for this appendix is a survey of National Regulatory Authorities conducted as part of this study. The full text of the survey questionnaire is set out in Appendix B. For each item of information, a reference to the original survey question may be found at the left hand side of each page. In some cases, initial answers by NRAs have been modified to reflect additional comments or follow-up answers by the NRAs or further research by WIK.

The 25 Member States of the European Union are presented first. The next section presents data from the three countries of the European Economic Area: Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein. The third section includes reports from three countries that are candidates to join the European Union: Bulgaria, Croatia, and Romania. A fourth candidate country, Turkey, was invited to participate in this study but did not provide any information.

For brevity, these tables use the following abbreviations:

FSC = fastest standard category (of universal service)

2d FSC = second fastest standard category (of universal service)

GA = general authorisation

NCA = national competition authority

NRA = national regulatory authority

UPU = Universal Postal Union

US = universal service

USO = universal service obligation

USP = universal service provider

VAT = value added tax



## Key to Country Data

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. Percent of EU letter post
2. Date of current postal law
3. Number of amendments since 1997
4. Directive 1997/67 transposed?
5. Directive 2002/39 transposed?
6. Postal Ministry
7. Public postal operator
8. Legal status of USP
9. Percent of USP owned by government
10. Governing body of USP
11. Number of USP directors appt'd by govt
12. Total number of USP directors
13. Term of USP directors (years)
14. Cause for dismissing USP directors
15. Primary responsibility for competition rules?
16. Can NRA enforce competition rules?
17. Do NRA and NCA share information

---

### Universal Service

---

1. Density rules for postal outlets? (A: no minimum standard; B: minimum number of access points; C: maximum distance to inhabitants; D: access point required in municipalities exceeding certain population; E: specific number per community; F: other)
2. Can USP replace post offices with agencies?
3. Can USP close post offices on its own?
4. Standards for minimum density of collection boxes? (see key for postal outlets above)
5. Delivery days per week required by USO?
6. Any regions not getting required delivery frequency?
7. Percent of population not getting required delivery frequency
8. Does USO include delivery of parcels?
9. Collection days per week required by USO?
11. Maximum weight of parcels in domestic USO?
12. Maximum weight of parcels in cross border USO?
13. Domestic postal services in USO? (A: priority mail; B: non-priority or 2d class mail; C: addressed direct mail; D: newspapers & magazines; E: parcels; F: other)
14. Postal law limits transport of dangerous goods?
15. Postal law ensures confidentiality of correspondence?
16. Postal law includes data protection?
17. Postal law prohibits discrimination based on religion, politics, etc.?
18. Postal law ensures users receive detailed, up-to-date information on universal service?

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Is there a reserved area?
2. Does reserved include correspondence?
3. Weight limit for reserved area
4. Price limit for reserved area (multiple of rate for lowest weight FSC item)
5. Same reservation over direct mail?
6. Same reservation for outgoing cross-border mail?
7. Economic study on scope of reservation?

8. Does USP have special VAT treatment
  9. VAT: USP products covered
  10. USP products given UPU customs rules (A: letter post; B: M-bags; C: low value parcels; D: high value parcels; E: express; F: freight)
  11. Does NRA regulate downstream access to USP?
  12. Does NRA regulate PO box access?
  13. Does NRA regulate address database?
  14. Does USP have special right to place collection boxes along public highway
- 

### **Authorisation of Postal Operators**

---

1. Universal services: licence needed?
  2. Scope of licence
  3. Conditions to ensure essential requirements (A: confidentiality; B: dangerous goods; C: data protection; D: environment)
  4. Conditions to ensure universal service (A: univ. serv. obligation; B: service quality; C: user rights; D: comply reserved area; E: univ. serv. fund)
  5. Conditions to ensure other requirements (A: minimum finances; B: technical ability; C: other)
  6. Licence procedure applies to all operators?
  7. Number of licences for US in 2005
  8. Universal service: General Authorisation needed?
  9. Scope of general authorisation?
  10. Conditions to ensure essential requirements (see key above)
  11. Conditions to ensure universal service (see key above)
  12. Conditions to ensure other requirements (see key above)
  13. GA procedure applies to all operators?
  14. Number of GAs for US in 2005
  15. Non-universal service: GA required?
  16. Number of GAs for non-US in 2005
- 

### **Tariff Principles**

---

1. Scope of price regulation
2. NRA determines product costs?
3. NRA determines product volumes?
4. NRA regulates unit costs (productivity)?
5. Scope of uniform tariff rule
6. Delivery as percent of total costs
7. Individual agreements as percent of letter post
8. Are individual agreements geared to cost?
9. Has NRA adopted standard for affordability?
10. Annual cost of postage for non-business mailer (Euro)
11. Scope of ex ante price regulation
12. Scope of price cap price regulation
13. Index used in price cap regulation
14. Scope of ex post price regulation
15. Does NRA ensure terminal dues are cost-based?
16. Does NRA have complete data on special tariffs?
17. Can NRA calculate avoided costs for special tariffs?
18. NRA's definition of "avoided costs"
19. Special tariffs offered for correspondence?

- 
20. Sp. tariffs for corresp: criteria (A: volume; B: mail preparation; C: transport; D = other)
  21. Sp. tariffs for corresp: maximum discount (%)
  22. Sp. tariffs for corresp: based on avoided costs?
  23. Sp. tariffs for corresp: % of all correspondence
  24. Sp. tariffs for corresp: transparent?
  25. Sp. tariffs for corresp: available to consolidators?
  26. Sp. tariffs for corresp: available to private operators?
  27. Sp. tariffs for direct mail: maximum discount (%)
  28. Sp. tariffs for direct mail: % of all direct mail
  29. Sp. tariffs for parcels: maximum discount (%)
  30. Sp. tariffs for parcels: % of all parcels
- 

#### **Accounts of Universal Services Providers (USPs)**

---

1. First year of USP accounts separating reserved and non-reserved services
  2. Is USP legally obliged to separate accounts for each reserved service?
  3. Is annual cost and revenue data for each reserved service provided NRA?
  4. Number of different reserved service accounts
  5. Is USP legally obliged to separate accounts for each non-reserved universal service?
  6. Is annual cost and revenue data for each non-reserved universal service provided NRA?
  7. Number of different non-reserved universal service accounts
  8. Is USP legally obliged to separate accounts for each individual agreement?
  9. Is annual cost and revenue data for each individual agreement provided NRA?
  10. Is USP legally obliged to separate accounts for upstream and downstream costs of products provided under special tariffs?
  11. Is annual cost and revenue data for the upstream and downstream portions of products subject to special tariffs provided NRA?
  12. Has NRA approved USP's cost allocation system?
  13. Year of approval of USP costing system
  14. Can the NRA calculate street carrier costs?
  15. Can the NRA calculate transportation costs?
  16. Can the NRA calculate unassignable costs subject to Art. 14(3)(b)(iii)?
  17. Unassignable costs as percent of total postal costs
  18. Has NRA reviewed quality of USP data?
  19. Date of last data quality review by USP?
  20. Are USP accts reviewed by an independent body?
  21. Independent body that reviews USP accounts
  22. Is a "statement of compliance" published?
  23. Date of most recent statement of compliance
  24. Is a summary of USP's regulatory accounts published?
- 

#### **Quality of Service**

---

1. Domestic services subject to routing time targets? (A: none; B: non-bulk FSC letters; C: non-bulk 2d FSC letters; D: FSC letters; E: 2d FSC letters; F: addressed direct mail; G: newspapers; H: non-bulk parcels (counter parcels); I: all parcels; J: Other)
2. Independent monitoring of quality of service?
3. Is quality of servicing monitoring consistent with CEN standards?
4. If not, when will EN 13850 be implemented?
5. Has quality of service method been audited by NRA?
6. Are performance reports published annually?
7. Are non-USP operators subject to routing time targets?

8. Must non-USP operators measure the quality of at least one service?
  9. Are non-USP operators required to publish quality of service data?
  10. Are domestic routing time targets consistent with cross-border standards in Directive?
  11. Are national service standards set for cross border USO?
- 

### **Complaints and Redress Procedures**

---

1. Postal law prescribes complaint and redress procedures?
  2. Are non-USP operators subject to complaint procedures?
  3. Have complaint procedures be defined for multi-operator cases?
  4. Are complaint and redress procedures transparent?
  5. Who mediates complaints unresolved by USP?
  6. Who mediates complaints unresolved by non-USP operators?
  7. Are results of mediation binding on parties?
  8. Is annual publication of complaint data required by law?
  9. Is complaint data for 2004 published?
  10. Is USP required to publish how complaints are resolved?
  11. Has the way in which complaints been resolved been published in past?
- 

### **National Regulatory Authorities**

---

1. National regulatory authority
2. Begin postal regulation
3. Total staff of NRA in 2005
4. Budget of NRA in 2005 (EUR000)
5. Number of NRA heads
6. Who appoints NRA head(s)?
7. Term of NRA heads
8. Grounds to dismiss NRA head
9. Is NRA an office within Ministry of Post?
10. Is NRA subject to policy guidance by Government?
11. Who approves NRA budget?
12. To whom is NRA decision appealed?
13. NRA enforcement powers (A: fines; B: set new tariffs; C: cancel tariffs; D: require downstream access; E: get USP data; F: require new studies; G: impose accounting system; H: require data from non-USP operators; I: seek judicial enforcement; J: other)

## I. European Union: Austria

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 2.4
2. --
3. 4
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology
7. Österreichische Post AG
8. Plc
9. 100
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. No

---

### Universal Service

---

1. A
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ADE
14. --
15. Yes
16. No
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. --
6. None
7. No

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. US
10. ABCDEF
11. --
12. No
13. --
14. Yes

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. --
10. --
11. C
12. --
13. Yes
14. --
15. Yes
16. --

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. --
11. Res. servs.
12. None
13. --
14. --
15. --
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Austria

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. --
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. No
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. --
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 0
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2002
- 20. No
- 21. --
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DI
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. --
- 3. --
- 4. No
- 5. No
- 6. Other
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Ministry Of Transport, Innov. And Techn, Department For Postal Affairs
- 2. 1999
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. --
- 6. Min Post
- 7. None
- 8. --
- 9. --
- 10. --
- 11. Min Other
- 12. Court
- 13. EG

## I. European Union: Belgium

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 3.5
2. 1991
3. 5
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Minister for Economy, Energy, Foreign Trade and Science Policy
7. De Post/La Poste
8. Plc
9. 50
10. USP Board
11. 6
12. 10
13. 6 yr
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. --
17. Yes

---

### Universal Service

---

1. F
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 10
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. US
10. ABC
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. BDE
5. C
6. No
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. C
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 0

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. No
10. 15
11. None
12. US
13. see notes
14. Other
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Belgium

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. AC
- 21. --
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. No
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2000
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 115
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 594
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2000
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. Yes
- 17. 7
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2005
- 20. Yes
- 21. Other
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BCGH
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Ombud
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Belgian Institute For Postal Services  
And Telecommunications (BIPT/IBPT)
- 2. 1991
- 3. 9
- 4. 1300
- 5. 4
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 6 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Other
- 12. Court
- 13. AEGHIJ

## I. European Union: Cyprus

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 0.1
2. 2004
3. --
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Communications and Works
7. Cyprus Post
8. Govt dept
9. 100
10. Other
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

---

### Universal Service

---

1. A
2. --
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. No
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No
8. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

9. All postal servs.
10. CDF
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. ABCDE
5. AB
6. Yes
7. 1
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. AB
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 12

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US (md)
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. US (md)
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. --
11. US (md)
12. --
13. no price cap has been implemented so far
14. US (USP)
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. No

## I. European Union: Cyprus

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. AB
- 21. 15
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 15
- 28. --
- 29. 10
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2007
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. No
- 21. --
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. --

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. 2006
- 5. No
- 6. No
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. --
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Other
- 7. Other
- 8. Yes
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Office Of The Commissioner For Electronic Communication And Postal Regulation (OCECPR)
- 2. 2002
- 3. 5
- 4. 239
- 5. 1
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. ACEFGHIJ

## I. European Union: Czech Republic

### Regulatory Framework

1. 1
2. 2000
3. 1
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Informatics
7. Czech Post. S.E.
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. Min Post
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. --

### Universal Service

1. F
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. No
7. 0
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 15
12. 30
13. AEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. No
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. No
6. None
7. No
8. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

9. US
10. G
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. --

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. None
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. 84
11. Non bulk US
12. None
13. --
14. US (USP)
15. Yes
16. --
17. --
18. --
19. --
20. A

## I. European Union: Czech Republic

### Tariff Principles

- 21. --
- 22. --
- 23. --
- 24. --
- 25. --
- 26. --
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

- 1. 2006
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 4
- 8. --
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2006
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

### Quality of Service

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2006
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

### Quality of Service

- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. No

### National Regulatory Authorities

- 1. Czech Telecommunication Office (CTU)
- 2. 2005
- 3. 6
- 4. --
- 5. 5
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. ABCEFG

## I. European Union: Germany

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 19.9
2. 1997
3. 4
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology
7. Deutsche Post AG
8. Plc
9. 42
10. USP Board
11. 2
12. 20
13. --
14. --
15. NRA
16. Yes
17. Yes

---

### Universal Service

---

1. BCD
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 6
6. No
7. 0
8. Yes
9. 6
11. 20
12. 20
13. ACDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. No

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. US
10. --
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. No

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. Corr & DM
3. AC
4. DE
5. ABC
6. Yes
7. 1374
8. No
9. --
10. AC
11. D
12. ABC
13. Yes
14. 500
15. No
16. --

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US (md)
2. No
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Non bulk corr.
6. 50
7. --
8. Yes
9. Yes
10. 50
11. USP corr (md)
12. --
13. General Price Index  
(Gesamtwirtschaftliche  
Preissteigerungsrate)
14. Mkt dom op.
15. --
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Retail Minus

## I. European Union: Germany

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 19. Yes
- 20. ABCD
- 21. 1
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 1
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2002
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. No
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2000
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. Yes
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2002
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DFI
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 7. No
- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Federal Network Agency (BNetzA)
- 2. 1998
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. 3
- 6. Other
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. --
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. ABCDEFGHI

## I. European Union: Denmark

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 1.6
2. 2004
3. --
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport and Energy
7. Post Denmark
8. Plc
9. 75
10. USP Board
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. No

---

### Universal Service

---

1. BC
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 6
6. Yes
7. 0.008
8. Yes
9. 6
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDEF
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. No
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. No
8. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

9. US
10. ABCDE
11. Yes
12. No
13. Yes
14. No

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. No
14. --
15. No
16. --

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. Non bulk corr.
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. No
10. --
11. Res. servs.
12. Non-res US
13. general price index
14. --
15. No
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes
20. B

## I. European Union: Denmark

### Tariff Principles

- 21. 2
- 22. --
- 23. --
- 24. --
- 25. --
- 26. --
- 27. 6
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

- 1. 1997
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 7
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. --
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 1997
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. Yes
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2004
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. Yes

### Quality of Service

- 1. DEGI
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2005
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

### Quality of Service

- 9. No
- 10. --
- 11. Yes

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. No
- 6. NRA
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

### National Regulatory Authorities

- 1. Road Safety And Transport Agency,  
Postal Supervisory Department
- 2. 1995
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. 1
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Other
- 12. No appeal
- 13. BEHJ

## I. European Union: Estonia

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0.1
2. 2001
3. --
4. No
5. No
6. Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications
7. Eesti Post Ltd
8. Plc
9. 100
10. Min Post
11. 7
12. 11
13. 5 yr
14. Discretion
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. No

### Universal Service

1. C
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 0.01
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 10
12. 20
13. AEF
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. No
2. No
3. --
4. --
5. No
6. None
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. US
10. ABCDEF
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. No
2. US
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. Yes
7. 1
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 32

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. 0
8. --
9. No
10. --
11. US
12. None
13. --
14. US (USP)
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Estonia

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. A
- 21. 5
- 22. Unknown
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. No
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. --
- 2. --
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. --
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2004
- 14. No
- 15. Yes
- 16. --
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2005
- 20. No
- 21. --
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Later
- 5. No
- 6. No
- 7. --

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. --
- 9. --
- 10. --
- 11. --

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. --
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. No
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Estonian National Communications Board (enCb)
- 2. 2002
- 3. 5
- 4. 64
- 5. 1
- 6. Min Post
- 7. None
- 8. Discretion
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Court
- 13. DEFGH

## I. European Union: Spain

### Regulatory Framework

1. 5.7
2. 1998
3. --
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Development
7. Post and Telegraphs S.A.
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. PM/Council
11. --
12. --
13. None
14. Other
15. NCA
16. --
17. --

### Universal Service

1. A
2. --
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. No
9. 5
11. 10
12. 10
13. ABE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. No
6. Same
7. --
8. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

9. Res. servs.
10. --
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. --
2. US
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. No
7. --
8. --
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. --

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. Yes
4. No
5. Res. servs.
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. --
11. Res. servs.
12. Non-res US
13. none
14. --
15. --
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. --
20. ABC

## I. European Union: Spain

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 21. --
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Unknown
- 25. Unknown
- 26. Unknown
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2004
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 14
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 9
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2004
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. --
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BHJ
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 9. No
- 10. --
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Viceministry Of Fomento / Subdirection General For Regulation Of Postal Services
- 2. 1998
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. --
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. None
- 8. Discretion
- 9. Yes
- 10. --
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Min Post
- 13. CEFGH

## I. European Union: Finland

### Regulatory Framework

1. 1.7
2. 2001
3. 2
4. Yes
5. --
6. Ministry of Transport and Communications
7. Finland Post Corporation
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 1
12. 7
13. None
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. No
17. No

### Universal Service

1. F
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 0.005
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 10
12. 30
13. ABCEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. No
9. --
10. --
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. US
3. A
4. ABC
5. B
6. Yes
7. 1
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. B
13. Yes
14. --
15. No
16. 0

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. Non bulk corr.
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. No
10. --
11. None
12. None
13. --
14. US
15. --
16. --
17. --
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Finland

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. 15.3
- 22. Unknown
- 23. --
- 24. Unknown
- 25. Unknown
- 26. Other
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. --
- 2. --
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 8
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2006
- 14. --
- 15. --
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. --
- 2. --
- 3. --
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Finnish Communications Regulatory Authority (Ficora)
- 2. 1994
- 3. 9
- 4. --
- 5. 1
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. None
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Court
- 13. ADEFG

## I. European Union: France

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 19.4
2. 2005
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Economy, Finance, & Industry
7. La Poste
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 14
12. 21
13. 5 yr
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

---

### Universal Service

---

1. A
2. --
3. Yes
4. No
5. 6
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 6
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. No

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. US
10. ABC
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. No

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. Other
3. ABCD
4. BCDE
5. ABC
6. Yes
7. --
8. Yes
9. Other
10. ABCD
11. BCDE
12. ABC
13. Yes
14. --
15. No
16. 0

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. Res. servs.
6. --
7. 48
8. Yes
9. No
10. 45
11. Res. servs.
12. Non-res US
13. consumer price index for services
14. --
15. --
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: France

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. AB
- 21. 1
- 22. Yes
- 23. 48
- 24. No
- 25. Yes
- 26. No
- 27. 1
- 28. 100
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2000
- 2. No
- 3. --
- 4. 2
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. 2
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2001
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. Yes
- 17. 6.7
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DGH
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Ombud
- 7. Ombud
- 8. No
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Electronic Communications And Postal Regulatory Authority (arcep)
- 2. 2005
- 3. 8
- 4. --
- 5. 7
- 6. Other
- 7. 6 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. ACDEFGH

## I. European Union: Greece

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 0.6
2. 1998
3. --
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport and Communications
7. Hellenic Post (ELTA)
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. Min Other
11. --
12. 11
13. --
14. --
15. NRA
16. --
17. --

---

### Universal Service

---

1. A
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 7
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. US
10. --
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. --
5. B
6. No
7. 6
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. B
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 301

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. --
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. 106
11. US
12. None
13. Consumer Price Index (is partially taken into account)
14. --
15. No
16. Yes
17. No
18. --

## I. European Union: Greece

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 19. Yes
- 20. ABC
- 21. 0.5
- 22. Unknown
- 23. 13.2
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 0.5
- 28. --
- 29. 7
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2001
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 14
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 18
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2001
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. --
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 7. No
- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. No
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Hellenic Telecommunications And Post Commission (HATTO)
- 2. 1998
- 3. 6
- 4. --
- 5. 9
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 4 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Court
- 13. ADGI

## I. European Union: Hungary

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0.9
2. 2003
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Informatics and Communications
7. Hungarian Post Limited Private Company
8. Plc
9. 100
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. None
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. CDF
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. No
7. 0
8. No
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. All postal servs.
10. --
11. Yes
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABC
4. BCD
5. AB
6. No
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. AB
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 96

### Tariff Principles

1. Res. servs.
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. Res. servs.
6. --
7. 40
8. Yes
9. No
10. 2400
11. None
12. Res. servs.
13. general price index
14. --
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Hungary

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABCD
- 21. --
- 22. Yes
- 23. 10
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. --
- 28. 30
- 29. 3
- 30. 40

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2004
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 5
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. Yes
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DEFGI
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. National Communication Authority (NHH)
- 2. 1990
- 3. 16
- 4. 976
- 5. 7
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. PM/Council
- 12. Court
- 13. ADEFGHI

## I. European Union: Ireland

---

### Regulatory Framework

---

1. 0.7
2. 2002
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources
7. An Post
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 12
12. 12
13. None
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. Yes

---

### Universal Service

---

1. C
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 0.02
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ACEF
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. No

---

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. All postal servs.
10. ABCDE
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

---

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. Other
10. ABCD
11. CD
12. --
13. No
14. 29
15. Yes
16. 29

---

### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. Yes
5. None
6. --
7. 0
8. Yes
9. No
10. 25
11. Res. servs.
12. --
13. --
14. US (USP)
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. No
18. Cost Minus
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Ireland

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABCD
- 21. 4.2
- 22. Yes
- 23. 25
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 20.8
- 28. 100
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2002
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 6
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 10
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2005
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Ombud
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Commission For Communications Regulation (ComReg)
- 2. 2002
- 3. 6
- 4. --
- 5. 3
- 6. Min Post
- 7. 4 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. BCEFGIJ

## I. European Union: Italy

### Regulatory Framework

1. 6.7
2. 1999
3. --
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Communications
7. Poste Italiane s.p.a.
8. Plc
9. 100
10. Min Other
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. No

### Universal Service

1. A
2. --
3. --
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. No
6. Same
7. No
8. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

9. All postal servs.
10. --
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. DE
5. --
6. No
7. 211
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 1145

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. Yes
5. None
6. --
7. 0
8. Yes
9. No
10. --
11. US
12. None
13. real inflation rate
14. --
15. --
16. --
17. --
18. --
19. --
20. --

## I. European Union: Italy

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 21. --
- 22. --
- 23. --
- 24. --
- 25. --
- 26. --
- 27. 3.4
- 28. 100
- 29. 25
- 30. 82

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 1999
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. No
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. --
- 15. --
- 16. --
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. --
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. J
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Other
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Ministry Of Communications
- 2. 1999
- 3. 20
- 4. 600
- 5. --
- 6. Other
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. Yes
- 10. --
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. ABCEFGH

## I. European Union: Lithuania

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0
2. 2004
3. --
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport and Communications
7. Lithuanian Post
8. Plc
9. 100
10. Min Post
11. 1
12. 1
13. 4 yr
14. Discretion
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. CD
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 10
12. 20
13. ABCE
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. Res. servs.
10. --
11. --
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. Other
3. ABC
4. CD
5. BC
6. Yes
7. 11
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. BC
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 75

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. --
11. None
12. US
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Lithuania

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. 10
- 22. Other
- 23. --
- 24. Other
- 25. Other
- 26. Other
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2005
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 9
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. 2005
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2005
- 24. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Later
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Communications Regulatory Authority  
Of The Republic Of Lithuania (RRT)
- 2. 2002
- 3. 8
- 4. --
- 5. 7
- 6. Other
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. AEGHI

## I. European Union: Luxembourg

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0.1
2. 2000
3. 1
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Economics
7. P&T Luxembourg
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. PM/Council
11. 8
12. 12
13. 5 yr
14. Cause
15. Min Post
16. No
17. No

### Universal Service

1. A
2. --
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 10
12. 20
13. AEF
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No
8. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

9. US
10. ABCDE
11. Yes
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABC
4. --
5. --
6. No
7. 18
8. --
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 0

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. No
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. 80
8. No
9. No
10. 15
11. Res. servs.
12. --
13. --
14. Non-res US
15. --
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes
20. ABC

## I. European Union: Luxembourg

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 21. 8
- 22. Yes
- 23. 80
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 9
- 28. 10
- 29. 10
- 30. 50

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2001
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 31
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 48
- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2001
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. (ILR)
- 2. 2000
- 3. 2
- 4. --
- 5. 3
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. PM/Council
- 12. Court
- 13. GHI

## I. European Union: Latvia

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0.1
2. 1994
3. 4
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport of the Republic of Latvia
7. Latvijas Pasts
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 6
12. 6
13. 3 yr
14. Cause
15. NRA
16. --
17. No

### Universal Service

1. BD
2. Yes
3. No
4. Yes
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 10
12. 10
13. ABE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. No
6. Same
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. Res. servs.
10. BCDE
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. Other
3. ABC
4. ABD
5. --
6. Yes
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. --

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. --
11. US
12. None
13. consumer price index
14. --
15. --
16. --
17. --
18. --
19. --

## I. European Union: Latvia

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. AB
- 21. 3
- 22. --
- 23. --
- 24. --
- 25. --
- 26. --
- 27. 10
- 28. --
- 29. 3
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2007
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. 1
- 5. Yes
- 6. No
- 7. 2
- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. No
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DE
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Later
- 5. No
- 6. No
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Public Utilities Commission (SPRK)
- 2. 2001
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. 5
- 6. Other
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. BEFGHIJ

## I. European Union: Malta

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0
2. 2002
3. 1
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry for Competitiveness and Communications
7. Maltapost Plc.
8. Plc
9. 65
10. Min Other
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. A
2. --
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 6
11. 20
12. 20
13. ACE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. US
10. ABCDEF
11. Yes
12. No
13. Yes
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABC
4. ABCD
5. C
6. Yes
7. 1
8. No
9. --
10. ABC
11. CD
12. C
13. No
14. --
15. Yes
16. 9

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. Yes
10. --
11. US
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. --
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. No

## I. European Union: Malta

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. --
- 21. --
- 22. --
- 23. --
- 24. --
- 25. --
- 26. --
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2005
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 5
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 5
- 8. --
- 9. --
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2006
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. Yes
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2006
- 24. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BDFHI
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. Other
- 8. Yes
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Malta Communications Authority (MCA)
- 2. 2003
- 3. 2
- 4. 70
- 5. 4
- 6. Min Post
- 7. 3 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Other
- 13. ABCDEFGHI

## I. European Union: Netherlands

### Regulatory Framework

1. 5.9
2. 2000
3. 1
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministerie van Economische Zaken  
(Ministry of Economic Affairs)
7. TNT
8. Plc
9. 19
10. Min Other
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. BCD
2. Yes
3. No
4. Yes
5. 6
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 6
11. 10
12. 20
13. ACEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. --
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 3x
5. No
6. None
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. US
10. --
11. No
12. Yes
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. --

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. Non bulk US
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. No
10. 20
11. None
12. US
13. price cap based on labor wage index
14. --
15. No
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Netherlands

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABD
- 21. 1
- 22. Unknown
- 23. 92
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. --
- 27. 7
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2001
- 2. No
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. 2001
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2003
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BJ
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. No
- 6. Other
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Onafhankelijke Post En Telecom Autoriteit (opta) (OPTA)
- 2. 1997
- 3. 2
- 4. --
- 5. 3
- 6. Other
- 7. 4 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Court
- 13. AEFGL

## I. European Union: Poland

### Regulatory Framework

1. 2
2. 2003
3. 12
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport and Construction
7. State enterprise of public utility Polish Post
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. Min Post
11. 6
12. 6
13. None
14. Discretion
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. No

### Universal Service

1. BF
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 10
12. 20
13. ABCEF
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. All postal servs.
10. ACDE
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. Other
3. AC
4. BCD
5. BC
6. No
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. AC
11. BCD
12. BC
13. No
14. 105
15. Yes
16. 105

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. Yes
10. --
11. None
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Poland

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. 2
- 22. Unknown
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Unknown
- 26. Unknown
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2004
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 7
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DE
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. The President Of The Office Of Electronic Communications (UKE)
- 2. 2002
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. 1
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. PM/Council
- 12. Court
- 13. AEFGHI

## I. European Union: Portugal

### Regulatory Framework

1. 1.3
2. 1999
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications
7. CTT - Correios de Portugal, S.A.
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. --
12. 5
13. 3 yr
14. Discretion
15. NRA
16. --
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. F
2. --
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. 0
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. All postal servs.
10. --
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. --
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. DE
5. B
6. No
7. 5
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. B
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 41

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Letter post
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. Yes
10. 2.4
11. Res. servs.
12. None
13. Consumer Price Index (CPI).
14. Non-res US
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Other
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Portugal

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABD
- 21. 0.5
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 2
- 28. --
- 29. 6
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 1999
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 16
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 39
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. Yes
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 1998
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. Yes
- 17. 25
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2004
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2003
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DEGI
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. None
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Icp - National Communications Authority. (ANACOM)
- 2. 1981
- 3. 12
- 4. 2233
- 5. 3
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Court
- 13. ACDEFGH

## I. European Union: Sweden

### Regulatory Framework

1. 3.3
2. 1993
3. 4
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications
7. Posten AB
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 7
12. 10
13. 1 yr
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. A
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 0.026
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. No
15. Yes
16. No
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. No
9. --
10. ABC
11. No
12. Yes
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. Letter post
3. A
4. ABC
5. A
6. Yes
7. 36
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. A
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. 0

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. Non bulk US
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. No
10. 30
11. None
12. Non-bulk LP
13. Consumer price index
14. US (USP)
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Sweden

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. 14
- 22. Yes
- 23. 73
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 15
- 28. 100
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. --
- 2. No
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. --
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Other
- 7. Other
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. National Post & Telecom Agency (PTS)
- 2. 1994
- 3. 8
- 4. 959
- 5. 9
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 1 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Court
- 13. CEFGHI

## I. European Union: Slovenia

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0.4
2. 2004
3. 4
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of the Economy
7. Post of Slovenia
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. --
12. --
13. None
14. --
15. NCA
16. No
17. No

### Universal Service

1. B
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. No
7. 0
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABDE
14. No
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. No
6. None
7. No
8. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

9. --
10. ABCDE
11. Yes
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. Other
10. ABC
11. DE
12. --
13. Yes
14. 13
15. No
16. 0

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. Yes
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. Yes
10. --
11. US
12. None
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes
20. ABC

## I. European Union: Slovenia

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 21. 0.5
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2006
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 6
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. 23
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA firm
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2006
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DEH
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. None
- 7. None
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Post And Electronic Communications Agency Of Republic Of Slovenia (APEK)
- 2. 2002
- 3. 5
- 4. 520
- 5. 1
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. PM/Council
- 12. Court
- 13. ABDEFGH

## I. European Union: Slovakia

### Regulatory Framework

1. 0.3
2. 2003
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport, Posts and Telecommunications<sup>1</sup>
7. Slovak Post
8. Plc
9. 100
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. NRA
16. --
17. No

### Universal Service

1. CD
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 0.1
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 15
12. 20
13. ABCEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. Same
7. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. US
10. ACDE
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. No
7. --
8. Yes
9. Correspondence
10. ACD
11. BCD
12. --
13. Yes
14. 18
15. Yes
16. 18

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. 0
8. --
9. Yes
10. 220
11. US
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Retail Minus
19. Yes

## I. European Union: Slovakia

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. --
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 10
- 28. 98
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2003
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 12
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 93
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. 2003
- 14. Yes
- 15. Yes
- 16. Yes
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2005
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BCIJ
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. --
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Postal Regulatory Office
- 2. 2002
- 3. 18
- 4. 244
- 5. 1
- 6. --
- 7. 6 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Court
- 13. ABCEFGHI

## I. European Union: United Kingdom

### Regulatory Framework

1. 22.1
2. 2000
3. --
4. Yes
5. No
6. Department of Trade and Industry
7. Royal Mail Group Plc
8. Plc
9. 100
10. Min Post
11. 12
12. 12
13. 3 yr
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. F
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 6
6. Yes
7. --
8. Yes
9. 6
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. No

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. --
8. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

9. All postal servs.
10. AB
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. Yes

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. Other
3. AC
4. BC
5. ABC
6. Yes
7. 10
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. ABC
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. --

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Non bulk US
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. Yes
10. --
11. None
12. US
13. Retail Price Index
14. Mkt dom op.
15. No
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Cost Minus
19. Yes
20. ABCD

## I. European Union: United Kingdom

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 21. 7
- 22. Yes
- 23. 40
- 24. Yes
- 25. No
- 26. No
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. 9
- 30. 50

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2001
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 32
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 5
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. Yes
- 19. 2005
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DEFH
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No
- 8. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Other
- 7. Other
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Postal Services Commission  
(postcomm) (Postcomm)
- 2. 2000
- 3. 57
- 4. 13162
- 5. 7
- 6. Min Post
- 7. 3 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Min Other
- 12. Court
- 13. ABCDEFGI

## II. European Economic Area: Iceland

### Regulatory Framework

1. --
2. 2002
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport and Communications
7. Iceland Post
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 7
12. 7
13. 1 yr
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. D
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 0.14
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. --

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. Yes
9. Letter post
10. ABCDE
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. Yes
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. A
6. Yes
7. 1
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. A
12. A
13. Yes
14. --
15. Yes
16. --

### Tariff Principles

1. Res. servs.
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. Res. servs.
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. No
10. --
11. Res. servs.
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. Yes
17. No
18. Cost Minus
19. Yes

## II. European Economic Area: Iceland

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. AB
- 21. 2.5
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 2.5
- 28. 90
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. --
- 2. --
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Post- And Telecom Administration
- 2. 1998
- 3. 1
- 4. --
- 5. 1
- 6. Min Post
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Min Other
- 12. --
- 13. ABEFGHI

## II. European Economic Area: Liechtenstein

Regulatory Framework	Reserved Area and Special Rights
1. --	9. --
2. 1998	10. --
3. --	11. --
4. Yes	12. --
5. Yes	13. --
6. --	14. --
7. --	
8. --	<b>Authorisation of Postal Operators</b>
9. --	1. --
10. --	2. --
11. --	3. --
12. --	4. --
13. --	5. --
14. --	6. --
15. --	7. --
16. --	8. --
17. --	9. --
	10. --
<b>Universal Service</b>	11. --
1. --	12. --
2. --	13. --
3. --	14. --
4. --	15. --
5. --	16. --
6. --	
7. --	<b>Tariff Principles</b>
8. --	1. --
9. --	2. --
11. --	3. --
12. --	4. --
13. --	5. --
14. --	6. --
15. --	7. --
16. --	8. --
17. --	9. --
18. --	10. --
	11. --
<b>Reserved Area and Special Rights</b>	12. --
1. --	13. --
2. --	14. --
3. --	15. --
4. --	16. --
5. --	17. --
6. --	18. --
7. --	19. --
8. --	20. --

## II. European Economic Area: Liechtenstein

Tariff Principles	Quality of Service
21. --	9. --
22. --	10. --
23. --	11. --
24. --	
25. --	<b>Complaints and Redress Procedures</b>
26. --	1. --
27. --	2. --
28. --	3. --
29. --	4. --
30. --	5. --
	6. --
<b>Accounts of Universal Services Providers</b>	7. --
1. --	8. --
2. --	9. --
3. --	10. --
4. --	11. --
5. --	
6. --	<b>National Regulatory Authorities</b>
7. --	1. --
8. --	2. --
9. --	3. --
10. --	4. --
11. --	5. --
12. --	6. --
13. --	7. --
14. --	8. --
15. --	9. --
16. --	10. --
17. --	11. --
18. --	12. --
19. --	13. --
20. --	
21. --	
22. --	
23. --	
24. --	
<b>Quality of Service</b>	
1. --	
2. --	
3. --	
4. --	
5. --	
6. --	
7. --	
8. --	

## II. European Economic Area: Norway

### Regulatory Framework

1. --
2. 1996
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Transport and Communications
7. Norway Post
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 6
12. 10
13. 2 yr
14. Discretion
15. NCA
16. No
17. Yes

### Universal Service

1. AE
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 6
6. Yes
7. 0.046
8. Charge
9. 6
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. No
18. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. Yes
6. None
7. Yes

### Reserved Area and Special Rights

8. No
9. --
10. ABCD
11. No
12. No
13. No
14. No

### Authorisation of Postal Operators

1. No
2. --
3. --
4. --
5. --
6. --
7. 2
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. --
13. --
14. --
15. No
16. 0

### Tariff Principles

1. US
2. Yes
3. No
4. No
5. Res. servs.
6. --
7. --
8. --
9. No
10. 200
11. Res. servs.
12. None
13. --
14. US (USP)
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

## II. European Economic Area: Norway

---

### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABCD
- 21. 19
- 22. Yes
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Yes
- 26. Yes
- 27. 10
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 1998
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 3
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. --
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. NRA
- 22. Yes
- 23. 2004
- 24. Yes

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 1. DEFGH
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. None
- 7. None
- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. The Norwegian Post And Telecommunication Authority (PT)
- 2. 1997
- 3. 5
- 4. 599
- 5. 1
- 6. Min Post
- 7. None
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Min Post
- 12. Other
- 13. ABCEFGH

### III. EU Candidate Countries: Bulgaria

---

#### Regulatory Framework

---

1. --
2. 2000
3. --
4. Yes
5. No
6. STATE AGENCY OF IT AND COMMUNICATIONS
7. BULGARIAN POSTS PLC
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. Min Other
11. 5
12. 5
13. 1 yr
14. Cause
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. Yes

---

#### Universal Service

---

1. D
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. Yes
7. --
8. Charge
9. 5
11. 10
12. 30
13. CE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. --
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

#### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 350 g
4. 5x
5. No
6. Same
7. No

---

#### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. Yes
9. Other
10. ABCDE
11. No
12. --
13. No
14. Yes

---

#### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. ABCD
5. ABC
6. Yes
7. --
8. No
9. Other
10. ABD
11. CD
12. ABC
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. --

---

#### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. US
6. --
7. 80
8. No
9. Yes
10. --
11. US
12. None
13. --
14. Other
15. --
16. Yes
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

### III. EU Candidate Countries: Bulgaria

---

#### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. ABC
- 21. 0.5
- 22. Unknown
- 23. 80
- 24. Yes
- 25. Other
- 26. No
- 27. 0.5
- 28. 90
- 29. 3
- 30. 40

---

#### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2002
- 2. No
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. --
- 7. --
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. --
- 14. --
- 15. --
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. No
- 21. --
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. No

---

#### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BH
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. --
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. Yes

---

#### Quality of Service

---

- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

#### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. No
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. No
- 11. No

---

#### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Communications Regulation Commission (CRC)
- 2. 2002
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. 5
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Cause
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Court
- 13. ADEFGHI

### III. EU Candidate Countries: Croatia

---

#### Regulatory Framework

---

1. --
2. 2003
3. 2
4. No
5. No
6. Ministry of Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development
7. Croatian Post Inc.
8. Plc
9. 100
10. USP Board
11. 0
12. 4
13. --
14. --
15. NCA
16. Yes
17. No

---

#### Universal Service

---

1. DF
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. No
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 25
8. No
9. 5
11. 20
12. 20
13. ABCDEF
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

#### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 100 g
4. 3x
5. Yes
6. None
7. No

---

#### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. No
9. --
10. ABCE
11. Yes
12. No
13. No
14. No

---

#### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABC
4. ABCD
5. ABC
6. No
7. --
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. ABC
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 15

---

#### Tariff Principles

---

1. Res. servs.
2. --
3. No
4. No
5. US (md)
6. --
7. --
8. No
9. No
10. 2
11. Res. servs.
12. None
13. --
14. --
15. --
16. No
17. No
18. --
19. Yes

### III. EU Candidate Countries: Croatia

---

#### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. A
- 21. 3
- 22. --
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. --
- 26. --
- 27. --
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

#### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2006
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 34
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 32
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. No
- 13. 2007
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. 2007
- 20. No
- 21. --
- 22. No
- 23. 2007
- 24. No

---

#### Quality of Service

---

- 1. BCFGH
- 2. No
- 3. No
- 4. Later
- 5. No
- 6. No
- 7. No

---

#### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

#### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. Other
- 7. Other
- 8. Yes
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

#### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. Postal Services Council
- 2. 2004
- 3. 5
- 4. 267
- 5. 5
- 6. Other
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Other
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. Other
- 12. Court
- 13. BEFGHJ

### III. EU Candidate Countries: Romania

---

#### Regulatory Framework

---

1. --
2. 2002
3. 2
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Ministry of Communication and Information Technology
7. Romanian Post
8. State enterp.
9. 100
10. Min Post
11. 7
12. 7
13. 2 yr
14. Discretion
15. NCA
16. No
17. No

---

#### Universal Service

---

1. C
2. --
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. 5
6. Yes
7. 2
8. Yes
9. 5
11. 10
12. 20
13. ABDE
14. Yes
15. Yes
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes

---

#### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. 50 g
4. 2.5x
5. No
6. None
7. No

---

#### Reserved Area and Special Rights

---

8. No
9. --
10. --
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. Yes

---

#### Authorisation of Postal Operators

---

1. Yes
2. US
3. ABCD
4. ABCDE
5. B
6. Yes
7. 1
8. No
9. --
10. --
11. --
12. B
13. --
14. --
15. Yes
16. 189

---

#### Tariff Principles

---

1. US
2. Yes
3. No
4. --
5. US
6. --
7. --
8. Yes
9. No
10. --
11. US
12. None
13. --
14. US (USP)
15. Yes
16. --
17. --
18. --
19. Yes

### III. EU Candidate Countries: Romania

---

#### Tariff Principles

---

- 20. AB
- 21. 6
- 22. Unknown
- 23. --
- 24. Yes
- 25. Unknown
- 26. Unknown
- 27. 2
- 28. --
- 29. --
- 30. --

---

#### Accounts of Universal Services Providers

---

- 1. 2004
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 25
- 5. Yes
- 6. Yes
- 7. 22
- 8. No
- 9. --
- 10. No
- 11. --
- 12. Yes
- 13. --
- 14. No
- 15. No
- 16. No
- 17. --
- 18. No
- 19. --
- 20. Yes
- 21. USP firm
- 22. No
- 23. --
- 24. Yes

---

#### Quality of Service

---

- 1. D
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. 2005
- 5. No
- 6. Yes
- 7. No

---

#### Quality of Service

---

- 8. No
- 9. No
- 10. Yes
- 11. Yes

---

#### Complaints and Redress Procedures

---

- 1. Yes
- 2. Yes
- 3. Yes
- 4. Yes
- 5. Yes
- 6. NRA
- 7. NRA
- 8. Yes
- 9. Yes
- 10. Yes
- 11. No

---

#### National Regulatory Authorities

---

- 1. National Regulatory Authority For Communications (ANRC)
- 2. 2002
- 3. --
- 4. --
- 5. 1
- 6. PM/Council
- 7. 5 yr
- 8. Discretion
- 9. No
- 10. No
- 11. PM/Council
- 12. Court
- 13. ABCDEFGHI

## A4 – Bibliography

### References

The references are sorted by EU and country-specific sources. Sources which could not be attributed to EU or specific countries are compiled in the section “Miscellaneous” at the end of the references. Additional to the sources cited we made extensive use of annual reports published by USPs and national postal legislation (postal laws and secondary legislation).

#### EU

BEUC (2006), Postal Services – Public Consultation – BEUC’s Comments, 08.02.2006.

Brussels European Council (16-17 Oct 2003), Presidency Conclusions.

Brussels European Council (22-23 Mar 2005), Presidency Conclusions.

CEN TC 331 Postal services (2005), Report of the questionnaire on the future of postal standardization.

CEN (2005), Synthesis report on answer received to a questionnaire on the future of postal standardisation, report updated the 13<sup>th</sup> October 2005.

CERP Project Team (2005), Implementation of CEN quality of service standards.

Commission Decision 2002/344/EC of 23 October 2001, OJ L 120, 7 May 2002.

Commission Decision 2004/139/EC in Case No COMP/C/38.170 — REIMS II Renotification (OJ L 56, 24.2.2004).

Commission Decision in Case No. COMP/M.4022 – Belgian State/CVC/Post Danmark/De Post-La Poste (OJ C 288, 19.11.2005).

Commission Decision of 28 November 2005 on the application of Article 86(2) of the EC Treaty to State aid in the form of public service compensation granted to certain undertakings entrusted with the operation of services of general economic interest (OJ L312, 29.11.2005).

Commission Directive 2005/81/EC of 28 November 2005 amending Directive 80/723/EEC on the transparency of financial relations between Member States and public undertakings as well as on financial transparency within certain undertakings (OJ L312, 29.11.2005).

Commission Notice on cooperation within the Network of Competition Authorities (OJ C101, 27.04.2004).

Commission Notice on the co-operation between the Commission and the courts of the EU Member States in the application of Articles 81 and 82 EC (OJ C101, 27.04.2004).

Commission of the European Communities (1992), Green Paper on the development of the single market in postal services, COM(91) 476 final (adopted 11.6.1992).

Commission of the European Communities (2000), Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Directive amending Directive 97/67/EC with regard to the further opening to competition of Community postal services, COM(2000) 319 final (30.05.2000).

- Commission of the European Communities (2002a), A methodological note for the horizontal evaluation of services of general economic interest, COM(2002) 331 final.
- Commission of the European Communities (2002b), Application of the Postal Directive (97/67/EC Directive), COM(2002) 632 final.
- Commission of the European Communities (2003a), Green Paper on Services of General Interest, COM(2003) 270 final (21.5.2003).
- Commission of the European Communities (2003b), Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 77/388/EEC as regards value added tax on services provided in the postal sector, COM(2003) 234 final (5.5. 2003)
- Commission of the European Communities (2004a), White Paper on Services of General Interest, COM(2004) 374 final (12.5.2004).
- Commission of the European Communities (2004b), Green Paper on public private partnerships and Community law on public contracts and concessions, COM(2004) 327 final (30.4.2004).
- Commission of the European Communities (2004c), Press Release IP/04/593 of 4 May 2004.
- Commission of the European Communities (2004d), Amended proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 77/388/EEC as regards value added tax on services provided in the postal sector, COM(2004) 468 final (8.7.2004).
- Commission of the European Communities (2004e), Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on Services in the Internal Market, COM(2004) 2 final/3 (5.3.2004)
- Commission of the European Communities (2005a), Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the application of the Postal Directive (Directive 97/67/EC as amended by Directive 2002/39/EC), COM(2005) 102 (2005) final and SEC(2005) 388 (Annex to the Application Report).
- Commission of the European Communities (2005b), Press Release IP/05/937 of 15 July 2005.
- Commission of the European Communities (2005c), Communication on public-private partnerships and Community law on public procurement and concessions, COM(2005) 569 final (15.11.2005).
- Commission of the European Communities (2005d) on European values in the globalised world COM(2005) 525 final (20.10.2005).
- Commission of the European Communities (2006a), Press Release IP/06/225 of 24 February 2006.
- Commission of the European Communities (2006b) Press Release IP/06/484 of 10 April 2006.
- Commission of the European Communities (2006c), Amended proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on services in the internal market, COM(2006) 160 final (4.4.2006).
- Commission Recommendation of 11 February 2003 on relevant product and service markets within the electronic communications sector susceptible to ex ante regulation in accordance with Directive 2002/21/EC. OJ L114, 8 May 2003.
- Community framework for state aid in the form of public service compensation (OJ C297, 29.11.2005).

- Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 of 16 December 2002 on the implementation of the rules on competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the Treaty (OJ L1, 04.01.2003).
- Court of Justice judgment of 24 July 2003 in Case C-280/00 Altmark Trans GmbH (OJ C226, 20.9.2003).
- Directive 97/67/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 1997 on common rules for the development of the internal market of Community postal services and the improvement of quality of service (OJ L15, 21.2.1998) amended by Directive 2002/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 June 2002 amending Directive 97/67/EC with regard to further opening to competition of Community postal services (OJ L176, 5.7.2002).
- Directive 2004/17/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on coordinating the procurement procedures of entities operating in the water, energy, transport and postal services sectors (OJ L134, 30.4.2004).
- Directive 2004/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts (OJ L134, 30.4.2004).
- Ecorys (2005), Development of competition in the European postal sector, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- EMOTA (2005), Online distance sells continue to grow, Press Release of 17 May 2005, background information.
- Eurobarometer 58 (2002), Consumers' opinion on services of general interest, European Commission, DG Health and Consumer Protection.
- Eurobarometer (2003), European consumers and services of general interest – Qualitative study in the 15 Member States and the 10 countries acceding the European Union in 2004, European Commission, DG Health and Consumer Protection.
- Eurobaromètre Flash 150 (2003), La qualité des services, DG Health and Consumer Protection.
- European Court of Justice (2006), First Chamber; Opinion of Advocate General M. Poiares Maduro, Opinion joined cases C-282/04 and C-283/04, 6.04.2006.
- European Parliament, Committee on Transport and Tourism, Markus Ferber (rapporteur), Report on the application of the Postal Directive of 05. December 2005 (A6-0390/2005).
- FFPI (Free & Fair Post Initiative), Price comparisons, diverse Press Releases, [www.freefairpost.com](http://www.freefairpost.com).
- IPC (2002a), Improving the quality of international mail, full year results 2001.
- IPC (2002b), UNEX Lite Pre-Accession, Quality of service monitoring, full year results 2001.
- IPC (2003a), Improving the quality of international mail, full year results 2002.
- IPC (2003b), UNEX Lite Pre-Accession, Quality of service monitoring, full year results 2002.
- IPC (2004a), Improving the quality of international mail, full year results 2003.
- IPC (2004b), UNEX Lite Pre-Accession, Quality of service monitoring, full year results 2003.
- IPC (2005a), Improving the quality of international mail, full year results 2004.

- IPC (2005b), UNEX Lite Pre-Accession, Quality of service monitoring, full year results 2004.
- IPC (2006), Improving the quality of international mail, 2005 year results.
- Lisbon European Council (23-24 Mar 2000), Presidency Conclusions.
- NERA Economic Consulting (2004), The Economics of postal services, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- OECD (2005), "The economic impact of trade facilitation", OECD Trade Policy Working Paper No. 21, TD/TC/WP(2005)12/FINAL (Oct. 12, 2005, available from [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)).
- Oxford Economic Forecasting (2004), The economic impact of express industry of express carriers in Europe, study on behalf of European Express Association (EEA).
- PLS Ramboll (2002), Employment trends in the EU postal sector, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- PostEurop (2006), Position Paper: The WIK Study on "The evolution of the regulatory model for European postal services", (22 March 2006), available on the website [www.posteurop.org](http://www.posteurop.org)
- Special Eurobarometer 219 (2005), Services of general interest, European Commission, DG Health and Consumer Protection.
- Special Eurobarometer: 226 (2005), Prices and quality of services of general interest, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- Walsh, T. (2006), The European mail manifesto: growth, partnership, and innovation in a changing industry, Postal Users Group (PUG), forthcoming.
- WIK-Consult (2003a), Survey on some main aspects of postal networks in EU Adhesion Candidate Countries, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- WIK-Consult (2003b), Quality of service objectives, performance and measurement in relation to Community universal postal service, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- WIK-Consult (2004), Main developments in the European postal sector, European Commission, DG Internal Market.
- WIK-Consult (2005b), The evolution of the regulatory model for European postal services, European Commission, DG Internal Market.

## **AT**

Österreichische Post (13.10.2005), [www.post.at](http://www.post.at), Press Notice.

Redmail (17.03.2006), OHG-Urteil: Verleger und Redmail setzen sich gegen Post AG durch [Decision of Supreme Court of Justice: Publisher and Redmail stand up against Post AG] Press Notice, [www.redmail.at](http://www.redmail.at).

## **BE**

Service de mediation (2004), Rapport Annuel 2004.

## **DE**

- Bundesnetzagentur (BNetzA) (2003a), Sechste Marktuntersuchung für den Bereich der lizenzierten Postsendungen [6<sup>th</sup> Market Survey on licensed postal services].
- BNetzA (2003b), Tätigkeitsbericht 2002/2003 [Activity report 2002/2003].
- BNetzA (2004a), Siebte Marktuntersuchung für den Bereich der lizenzierten Postsendungen [7<sup>th</sup> Market Survey on licensed postal services].
- BNetzA (2004b), Jahresbericht 2004 [Annual report 2004].
- BNetzA (2005a), Achte Marktuntersuchung für den Bereich der lizenzierten Postsendungen [8<sup>th</sup> Market Survey on licensed postal services].
- BNetzA (2005b), Tätigkeitsbericht 2004/2005 [Activity report 2004/2005].
- BNetzA (2005c), Jahresbericht 2005 [Annual report 2005].
- Bundeskartellamt (2005), Decision B9-55-03 of 11 February 2005.
- Deutsche Post (2005a), Postforum November 2005.
- Deutsche Post (2005b), Direkt Marketing Monitor, Studie 17.
- Deutsche Post (2005c), Investors' factbook, No. 3, June 2005, [www.dpwn.com/investorrelations](http://www.dpwn.com/investorrelations).
- Deutsche Post (2005/03/17), Press Notice, [www.dpwn.de](http://www.dpwn.de).
- Deutsche Post (2005/10/12), Press Notice, [www.dpwn.de](http://www.dpwn.de).
- Deutsche Post (2006/02/13), Press Notice, [www.dpwn.de](http://www.dpwn.de).
- Deutsche Post (2006), Standard Presentation Investor Relations, February 2006., [www.dpwn.com/investorrelations](http://www.dpwn.com/investorrelations)
- Eglseer, Axel (2005), Presentation, Deutscher Versandhandelskongress, Wiesbaden, 27.10.2005.
- Hamburger Abendblatt (2006/01/23), Konkurrenz rollt Briefmarkt auf [Competition targets letter market].
- Handelsblatt (2005/08/31), Paketdienst GLS startet Großangriff auf die Post [Parcel service provider GLS attacks Deutsche Post].
- Handelsblatt (2005/10/20), Post steckt Milliarden ins Vertriebsnetz [Deutsche Post invests one billion Euro in distribution network].
- Handelsblatt (2006/02/20), UPS zieht weltweites Paket-Shop-Netz auf [UPS builds up worldwide parcel shop network].
- Handelsblatt (2006/03/23), Post senkt die Preise [Deutsche Post cuts prices].
- Handelsblatt (2006/04/05), Post senkt Päckchen-Preise deutlich [Deutsche Post reduces prices for small packages].
- Hermes Logistics GmbH (2005/12/12), Hermes und TNT vereinbaren strategische Allianz" [Hermes and TNT agree strategic alliance], Press Release.

Monopolkommission (2003), Telekommunikation und Post 2003: Wettbewerbsintensivierung in der Telekommunikation – Zementierung des Postmonopols (Sondergutachten). [Telecommunications and postal services 2003: Emerging competition in telecommunications – cementation of postal monopoly].

Monopolkommission (2005), Wettbewerbsentwicklung bei der Post 2005: Beharren auf alten Privilegien (Sondergutachten). [Competition development in the postal market 2005: Insisting on historical privileges].

Oberlandesgericht Düsseldorf (2005), Court decision VI-Kart 3/05.

Pin Group AG (2005), Gesellschaftsvertrag vom 19.10.2005.

PIN Group AG (2006), Schick es grün [Mail it green].

Posttip (2006/03/07), PIN Group übernimmt Net-DBS und Annen-Post [PIN Group takes over Net-DBS and Annen-Post], Press Notice, [www.posttip.de](http://www.posttip.de).

Verband deutscher Zeitschriftenverleger (2004), [www.vdz.de](http://www.vdz.de).

WIK (2004), „Post-Universaldienst: Kundenzufriedenheit und Beschwerdemanagement“ [Postal universal service: customer satisfaction and complaints management], unpublished study on behalf of vzbv (Federation of German Consumer Organisations), November 2004.

WIK-Consult (2005a), Zur Konsolidierungsdiskussion im deutschen Postmarkt: Möglichkeiten und Entgelte für Netzzugang, [Contribution to the discussion on consolidation services in the German postal market: Possibilities and Tariffs for Third Party Access], study on behalf of BIEK (Bundesverband Internationaler Express- und Kurierdienstleister e.V.).

Zumwinkel, Dr. K. (2005), Presentation Shareholders Meeting DPWN, 18.05.2005.

## **DK**

Birch, M. (2006), Danish Ministry of Transport and Energy, “Privatisation of Post Danmark A/S”, presented at the IEA conference 2006 in Vienna.

## **EE**

Sideamet (2004), Yearbook 2004.

## **FI**

Postal Statistics (2005)

## **FR**

Que choisir (2003), Menaces sur la poste, magazine No. 403, avril 2003.

## **IE**

Amarách Consulting (2005), ComReg Residential Postal Survey 2005.

Commission for Communications Regulation ComReg (2004), Annual Report 2004.

ComReg (2005a), Postal Strategy Statement (2005-2007), Consultation Paper (2 August 2005).

ComReg (2005b), The universal postal service – A working definition, Response to Consultation (15 November 2005).

Millward Brown IMS (2005), Business Postal Services Survey on behalf of ComReg, December 2005.

## IT

Altroconsumo (2003): Poste: promosse con riserva, No. 157, Febbraio 2003, p. 12-15.

Wirtschaftsblatt (2006/03/09), Post geht österreichischen Weg [Post follows the Austrian way].

## LV

Public Utilities Commission (2004), Annual report 2004.

## MT

Malta Communications Authority (2005), Postal Services and Customer Perception Survey.

## NL

Consumentenbond (2005), Consumentengids.

Ministry of Economic Affairs (2004a), Postal memorandum.

Ministry of Economic Affairs (2004b), Supplemental information to the Postal Services Policy Memorandum.

TPG, www.tpgpost.com, (European Mail Network and TPG Post/Cendris).

TPG (2004), Analyst Presentation Mail Strategy, 07.12.2004.

TNS Nipo Consult (2004), Betekenis en belang van postdienstverlening: Kwantitatieve Consultatie van de Nederlandse Bevolking. [Meaning and importance of the postal services: Quantitative Consultation of the Dutch Population].

TNT (2005), Analyst Presentation, 06.12.2005.

TNT (2006), Analyst Presentation, 27.02.2006.

## NO

Norway Post (2006/02/15), Press Notice, www.posten.no.

## SE

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication (2005), Postmarknad i förändring [The Changing Postal Market] TEMO (2005): Undersökning av befolkningens Post- och Kassavanor 2005, 23 februari 2005, Stockholm.

Posten AB (25.4.2006), The paperless society hasn't arrived yet, Press Release, www.posten.se (English version).

Posten AB (2006), Brevvanor - en rapport om svenska folkets vanor och attityder till fysisk och elektronisk information [A report on experiences and attitude of Swedish people with

regard to the use of physical and electronic information], [www.posten.se](http://www.posten.se) (Swedish version).

Post & Telestyrelsen (PTS) (1999), Implementing a price regulation in a deregulated letter mail market -The Swedish experience in brief.

PTS (2002), The liberalised Swedish postal market.

PTS (2003), Befolkningen post- och kassavanor.

PTS (2004a), Service och konkurrens 2004.

PTS (2004b), Den Svenska postmarknaden.

PTS (2005), Service och konkurrens 2005.

PTS (2006), Service och konkurrens 2006.

SOU 2004:52, English Summary.

TEMO (2005): Undersökning av befolkningens Post- och Kassavanor 2005, 23 februari 2005, Stockholm.

TEMO (2006): Undersökning av befolkningens Post- och Kassavanor 2006, 13 februari 2006, Stockholm.

## **UK**

Cain, J. (2005), Postcomm, Presentation, Königswinter Workshop, 09.11.2005.

DMIS (2004), Consumer direct mail trends 2004.

DX Services (2006), Uniquely position to deliver - Annual Report and Accounts 2005.

Frontier Economics (2002), The Impact of Liberalisation on Efficiency: a Survey (study for Postcomm).

LECG (2005), 2005 Business Customer Survey (study for Postcomm).

NERA Economic Consulting (2002), The costs to business from postal delays: A report to Postwatch.

Postcomm (2002), Promoting effective competition in UK postal services: A decision document (May 2002).

Postcomm (2003a), "Review of Royal Mail Group PLC's price and service quality regulation: second price control, quality service targets and compensation – Licence modification and decision document" (March 2003).

Postcomm (2003b), Third annual report on the network of Post Offices 2002-2003.

Postcomm (2004a), The UK letters market 2000-2003: A market report.

Postcomm (2004b), Royal Mail service quality, March 2004.

Postcomm (2004c), Promoting effective competition in UK Postal Services through downstream access. Observations on the agreement between Royal Mail and UK Mail Ltd on access to Royal Mail's delivery network, March 2004.

- Postcomm (2004d), The UK's universal postal service – Decision document, June 2004.
- Postcomm (2004e), Competitive Market Review – Proposals for Consultation, September 2004.
- Postcomm (2005a), Tackling barriers to entry in postal services: Final decisions and recommendations. (Mar. 2005)
- Postcomm (2005b), Competitive market review – Proposals for tackling barriers to entry in postal services (November 2005).
- Postcomm (2005c), Fifth Annual Report on the network of Post Offices 2004-2005.
- Postcomm (2005d), Draft Business Plan 2006, December 2005.
- Postcomm (2005e), Decision document on the universal service for bulk mailers.
- Postcomm (2005f), Royal Mail Price and Service Quality Review Final Proposal for Consultation.
- Postcomm (2005g), Licences under the Postal Services Act 2000: Licensing framework in a fully open market (Aug. 2005).
- Postcomm (2005h), Protecting the integrity of mail – A Code of Practice (Aug. 2005).
- Postcomm (2005i), Postal Code of Practice for common operational procedures (Aug. 2005).
- Postcomm (2006a), Royal Mail's Price and Service Quality Review 2006-2010, Licence Modifications Proposals, March 2006.
- Postcomm (2006b), Postal Market Factsheet.
- Postwatch (2005): Annual Report and Accounts 2004-2005.
- Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (2004), Monitoring developments in the postal market – market survey (study for Postcomm).
- Royal Mail (2005), Presentation interim report 2005-06, 17.11.2005, [www.royalmailgroup.com/aboutus](http://www.royalmailgroup.com/aboutus).
- TPG (2003), Response 'Access - effective competition to Royal Mail?' in: Postcomm (2003), Responses to Postcomm's 'Notice of a proposed direction to Royal Mail on downstream access by UK Mail, to Royal Mail's postal facilities', August 2003.

### **Miscellaneous**

- 3i (2006/02/13), Press Release.
- ABN AMRO (2003): Postal Services – TPG and DPWN.
- AFX Europe (2005/01/17), "Royal Mail wants to enter German letter delivery market".
- Australia (2004), Postal Services Legislation Amendment Act 2004, No. 69.
- de Bijl, P., E. van Damme, and P. Larouche (2003), Towards a liberalised postal market (Tilburg Law and Economics Center, Netherlands) (study for TNT).
- Diakova, E. (2005), Remote Shopping: Role of Mail, Catalogs and the Internet.
- Elkelä, K. (2004), Paper or electronic? Desired and undesired reception channels for direct marketing, Finland Post Corporation.

- EVCA [European Private Equity & Venture Capital Association] (2006), Barometer, January 2006.
- Finger, M., I. Alyanak, and P. Rossel (2005), The universal postal service in the communications era: Adapting to changing markets and customer behaviour (École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne) (study for Deutsche Post and TNT).
- Fortis (2005), Annual review 2004, [www.fortis.com](http://www.fortis.com).
- Hearn, J. and Devereux, V. (2004), "Evolution of the Tariff Structure throughout Europe", Presentation held at the 12th Conference on Postal and Delivery Economics, Cork, June 2004.
- Jonsson, P (2004). Regulatory Challenges in the Liberalized Postal Market, paper presented at the Center for Research in Regulated Industries, 12th Conference on Postal and Delivery Economics, Cork, Ireland, 2-5 June 2004.
- Nader, F. (2004), Mail Trends, Pitney Bowes research for the manuscript, 'Electronic Substitution for Mail: Models and Results; Myth and Reality', Background Paper No. 2.
- Nader, F. (2005), Forecasts, Pitney Bowes research for the manuscript, 'Electronic substitution for Mail: Models and Results; Myth and Reality', Background Paper No. 3.
- Nader, F., Jimenez, L. (2005), Substitution patterns, Background Paper No. 5, 07.04.2005.
- Nikali, H. (1995), Replacement of letter mail by electronic communications to the year 2010, in Commercialization of postal and delivery services: national and international perspective, Crew, M.A., Kleindorfer, P.R. (editors).
- Szeto, C., Jimenez, L. (2005), Consumer Preferences for Communication Media, Background Paper No. 4, 07.04.2005.
- Thuiswinkel (2005/12/16), Continued growth for distance selling expected in 2005, Press Release, Brussels.
- TNT (2004), Market statistics, [group.tnt.com/investorrelations/sectorstatistics/marketstatistics](http://group.tnt.com/investorrelations/sectorstatistics/marketstatistics).
- Transport Intelligence (2005/11/29), Press Notice, website: [www.transportintelligence.com](http://www.transportintelligence.com).
- Triomteur Holding (2005/05/28), Press Release.
- United Nations (2003), World urbanization prospects: The 2003 revision (data annex), United Nations population division.
- Universal Postal Union, Postal statistics.
- U.S. Postal Service, Cost and Revenue Analysis (2004)
- U.S. Postal Service (2005): The Household Diary Study, Mail Use and Attitudes in FY 2004, United States Postal Service, April 2005, Washington D. C.
- Walsh, T. (2004): Payment Channel Strategies for Accession Posts: Perspectives, Challenges, Opportunities; Presentation held at the BvDP Conference on Postal Strategies in the new Europe of 25, Vienna, May 2004.
- WestLB (2005), Europäische Postunternehmen – Herausforderungen und Chancen der Postbranche [European postal operators – challenges and opportunities in the postal sector], December 2005.

- WIK-Consult (2005b), Zur Konsolidierungsdiskussion im deutschen Postmarkt: Möglichkeiten und Entgelt für den Netzzugang, [Contribution to the discussion on consolidation services in the German postal market: Possibilities and Tariffs for Third Party Access], Study on behalf of BIEK (Association for international express and courier services).