

No. 158/26

22nd May 2026

Dear Colleagues,

BUSINESS & TRADE SELECT COMMITTEE - RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT REGARDING OFCOM

As you will be aware, the CWU recently gave evidence to the Business and Trade Select Committee regarding the service quality crisis at Royal Mail and Ofcom's failure to properly regulate the wider sector.

The CWU particularly emphasised the lack of regulation for parcel courier companies like Amazon and Evri, who use bogus self-employment models to undercut Royal Mail and hive off profits from our network, inhibiting the growth of the company.

The Committee was not satisfied by either Royal Mail or Ofcom's responses to their investigation into service quality issues and had committed to ongoing scrutiny.

We are therefore pleased to receive the Committee's recommendations on the regulation of postal services as a result of their investigation. Please see the attached document.

The report starkly acknowledges Ofcom's failure to regulate the sector, stating "*we conclude Ofcom is failing as the statutory regulator of the postal service to deliver on the task it has been set by Parliament*".

The Committee has therefore recommended a reset and an improvement plan for Ofcom to ensure they have a regulatory regime fit for the 21st century postal service. This involves Ofcom setting out a concrete plan for how they will improve their regulatory regime in a timely manner.

The Committee have also stated that if the improvement plan fails to deliver meaningful change from Ofcom within six months, they recommend that the Secretary of State takes steps towards changes on Ofcom's duties and powers. They have also specifically recommended that the government take measures to ensure that "*competitors are not able to free-ride on Royal Mail's infrastructure, nor undercut employment conditions through gig economy models.*"

In addition, the Committee has recommended that the government also consider **a network levy on competitors - this is a key demand from the CWU that we have pushed for several years.**

The Committee has also stated that they "*have not heard persuasive evidence to refute the previous Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee's finding that Royal Mail has*

deprioritised delivery of letters” and have recommended that Ofcom undertake an enhanced investigation to identify and root out this practice.

This is a significant step in the right direction towards levelling the playing field for Royal Mail, among a market full of gig-economy competitors with poor pay and conditions. Our members’ evidence has helped secure this set of far-reaching recommendations and forces Ofcom to properly regulate the sector. Royal Mail must now also ensure that they resolve the chaos in workplaces and stamp out the practice of prioritising parcels over letters, lest they face harsher sanctions.

We will now continue campaigning for the government to accept these recommendations and go further to secure the future of our postal service. **Our postal service and our members’ jobs will not survive unless the sector is properly regulated and parcel giants like Amazon are made to pay their fair share.**

Please ensure branches and members have access to this report. We will keep you updated as to any further developments.

Any enquiries relating to the content of this LTB should be referred to the General Secretary’s department dlynch@cwu.org.

Yours sincerely,



Dave Ward
General Secretary



Martin Walsh
Deputy General Secretary (Postal)

Business and Trade Committee

The regulation of postal services

Second Report of Session 2026–27

HC 131

Business and Trade Committee

The Business and Trade Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Business and Trade and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Liam Byrne](#) (Labour; Birmingham Hodge Hill and Solihull North) (Chair)

[Dan Aldridge](#) (Labour; Weston-super-Mare)

[Antonia Bance](#) (Labour; Tipton and Wednesbury)

[Chris Bloore](#) (Labour; Redditch)

[John Cooper](#) (Conservative; Dumfries and Galloway)

[Sarah Edwards](#) (Labour; Tamworth)

[Alison Griffiths](#) (Conservative; Bognor Regis and Littlehampton)

[Leigh Ingham](#) (Labour; Stafford)

[Justin Madders](#) (Labour; Ellesmere Port and Bromborough)

[Charlie Maynard](#) (Liberal Democrat; Witney)

[Mr Joshua Reynolds](#) (Liberal Democrat; Maidenhead)

[Matt Western](#) (Labour; Warwick and Leamington) and [Sonia Kumar](#) (Labour; Dudley) were also Members during the inquiry.

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Contents

Report	1
Conclusions and recommendations	9
Formal minutes	12
Witnesses	13
Published written evidence	14
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	15

Report

1. On 24 March 2026, the Business and Trade Committee held an evidence session on Royal Mail, the operator of the universal postal service. This was precipitated by a sustained period of markedly poor service. A BBC investigation published on 16 February 2026 reported allegations that parcels, particularly tracked items, were being prioritised over letters in a number of Royal Mail delivery offices. Members of the public also contacted the BBC to report irregular or clustered deliveries, with some stating they had not received letters for extended periods.¹ Many members of the public, current and former postal workers contacted this Committee raising similar concerns.
2. We heard oral evidence from Royal Mail's senior leadership, as well as its owner since April 2025, Daniel Křetínský. We also heard from the postal services regulator Ofcom, as well as the Communication Workers Union (CWU), which at the time was involved in dispute resolution procedures with Royal Mail regarding reform to the Universal Service Obligation and the equalisation of pay and conditions for new entrants to the company. We received written evidence submissions from Unite the Union CMA, representing Royal Mail managers, and Citizens Advice. We are grateful to all those who took time to contribute, particularly frontline workers and postal service users who shared their experiences with us.
3. It is clear that Royal Mail has repeatedly failed to meet both the public's expectations and its regulated targets. Royal Mail has incurred fines for its failure to meet service targets every year since 2022/23.² From April 2025 to January 2026, 74.9% of First Class mail was delivered the next day (18.1 percentage points below the target), and 90.2% of Second Class mail was delivered within three days (8.3 percentage points below the target).³ Citizens Advice told us that, in 2025, 16 million people (29% of UK adults) experienced letter delays over Christmas, a 50% increase since 2024.

1 BBC, [Royal Mail staff tell BBC letters sit undelivered as firm prioritises parcels](#), 16 February 2026; BBC, ['It's carnage': Postal problems go on as mail undelivered](#), 6 February 2026

2 Ofcom, [Post Monitoring Report - Postal services in the financial year 2024-25](#), 3 December 2025; Ofcom, [Decision finding Royal Mail contravened its Quality of Service performance targets in 2023/24 and imposing a financial penalty](#), 13 December 2024; Ofcom, [Decision finding Royal Mail contravened its Quality of Service performance targets in 2022/23 and imposing a financial penalty](#), 13 November 2023

3 [Letter from Royal Mail relating to postal deliveries and the quality of service](#), 2 March 2026

5.7 million people (10% of UK adults) missed vital letters, including those about health appointments, fines and benefit decisions, as a result of letter delays.⁴

4. Ofcom levied a multi-million pound fine on Royal Mail for the third consecutive year in October 2025, and told the business that it must “urgently publish and implement a credible plan that delivers significant and continuous improvement”.⁵ Royal Mail and the CWU agree on the need for reform to the Universal Service Obligation (USO),⁶ but the design and implementation of this reform became the subject of a protracted dispute between the parties. Throughout our evidence-gathering, it was clear that the improvement plan demanded by Ofcom could not be produced until these negotiations had concluded. It appears, according to the CWU’s Dave Ward, that it took the “scrutiny” of the Secretary of State for Business and Trade to bring the parties to a more constructive stage.⁷ On 15 April, the parties announced that agreement had been reached on both USO reform and equalisation of new entrants’ pay, terms and conditions.⁸ Royal Mail subsequently published its improvement plan on 21 April.⁹

5. **CONCLUSION**

Royal Mail’s current level of service is not acceptable. Royal Mail must immediately implement its improvement plan as the first step in restoring public confidence in the universal service provider. In the longer term, reform to the Universal Service Obligation is essential to put the postal service on a sustainable footing. We therefore welcome the agreement reached between Royal Mail and the CWU. Subject to the union balloting its members, we look forward to the parties working together constructively to roll out a reformed Universal Service Obligation.

6. The recent dispute between Royal Mail and the CWU has been one obstacle to service improvement. However, Royal Mail’s persistent failure to deliver a reliable postal service has exposed deeper structural problems in the sector. Letter volumes have declined rapidly in recent years, falling from 20

4 Citizens Advice ([RML0001](#))

5 Ofcom, [Ofcom fines Royal Mail £21m for missing its 2024/25 delivery targets](#), 15 October 2025

6 The Universal Service Obligation requires Royal Mail (the universal service provider) to deliver letters to every address in the UK, six days a week, at a uniform price, and parcels five days a week. The legal basis for the universal service is the [Postal Services Act 2011](#) and the [Universal Postal Service Order](#). For more information, see House of Commons Library, [Royal Mail and the future of the universal service obligation](#), 9 January 2023.

7 [Q31](#)

8 CWU, [LTB 112/26 – CWU and Royal Mail Group agreement](#), 15 April 2026

9 Royal Mail, [Quality of Service Improvement Plan for the Postal Universal Service](#) [accessed 19 May 2026]

billion a year at their peak in 2004/05 to 6.3 billion in 2026.¹⁰ The average household now receives fewer than four letters a week, down from 14 in 2004/05.¹¹

7. Royal Mail also faces stiff and growing competition, particularly in the parcels sector. While Royal Mail operates a near monopoly over final mile letter deliveries in the UK, it competes with a number of well-known parcel operators, for example Hermes, Yodel and DPD.¹² We heard concerns that competitors such as Amazon benefit without contributing to the cost of operating Royal Mail’s infrastructure. They do this by choosing to use the universal postal service to deliver parcels in areas that are not profitable. The CWU noted that “without the universal network, [competitors] would be forced to bear the costs of delivering to those addresses or pass these on to consumers”. The current arrangement “limits Royal Mail’s commercial freedom in that they are bearing the costs of the large USO network infrastructure, while competitors hive off profits from that same network”.¹³ Royal Mail does charge other parcel operators for access to its network through commercial wholesale parcel agreements.¹⁴ However, the CWU argued that “the pricing structure is nowhere near enough to cover the losses” incurred by maintaining the universal postal service to these areas.¹⁵ Daniel Křetínský also described the “complete absence of a level playing field” with Royal Mail’s competitors on labour standards. He told us that Royal Mail’s labour costs are double those of competitors using “gig economy” models.¹⁶
8. Given these complex and challenging market conditions, the importance of the statutory regulator doing its job cannot be overstated. Under the Postal Services Act 2011, Parliament has tasked Ofcom with both securing the universal postal service and ensuring that it is both “financially sustainable” and “efficient”.¹⁷ Ofcom Group Director for Infrastructure and Connectivity Natalie Black told us that “out of all the players you have seen this afternoon, Ofcom has been the organisation that has grasped the nettle”.¹⁸ The evidence we have heard suggests otherwise.
9. Citizens Advice argued in its evidence that Ofcom has focused on the “financial sustainability” aspect of its statutory remit, while “ignoring the question of most concern to consumers and government: whether Royal

10 [Letter from Royal Mail regarding deliveries](#), 2 March 2026

11 [Letter from Royal Mail regarding deliveries](#), 2 March 2026

12 House of Commons Library, [Postal Services](#), May 2022

13 [Letter from CWU regarding Royal Mail](#), 13 April 2026

14 Royal Mail Wholesale, [Wholesale Parcels Contract](#) [accessed 19 May 2026]

15 [Additional written evidence from CWU on Royal Mail](#), published 19 May 2026

16 [Q61](#)

17 Postal Services Act 2011, [section 29](#)

18 [Q98](#)

Mail is incentivised to operate efficiently.”¹⁹ The CWU told us that “there are serious regulatory failures that Ofcom have not acknowledged”, including the previously mentioned ability of “unregulated competitors” to use Royal Mail’s infrastructure without contributing to its upkeep.²⁰ Unite CMA raised concern that Ofcom “continues to measure Royal Mail against standards designed for a totally different time era”, highlighting the need for quality of service expectations to “evolve with the modern e-commerce world”.²¹ Even Ofcom itself, while defending its record, acknowledged that the postal service is failing: “all the evidence you have heard this afternoon is a symptom of a system that is not working”.²²

10. Ofcom’s subsequent written evidence raised further questions about its effectiveness as a regulator.
11. On 24 March we asked Ofcom to confirm the number of letters (as opposed to simply the percentage) currently being delivered late. They were unable to do so, but committed to provide the figure in writing.²³ However, in her letter of 7 April, Ofcom’s chief executive Dame Melanie Dawes then said that Royal Mail had refused consent to share these figures on the basis that they were “commercially confidential”. According to Ofcom, the regulator is “prohibited in legislation from disclosing the confidential information of stakeholders except in very limited and specific circumstances”.²⁴ We also asked Royal Mail directly for the absolute number of late letters, and while they reiterated the “significant commercial sensitivity” of this information, they were prepared to provide it to the Committee in strict confidence.²⁵

12. **CONCLUSION**

If such a restriction on disclosing information to Parliament exists in legislation, this Committee’s strong view is that this should be amended.

13. We asked Ofcom whether it undertakes unannounced inspections of Royal Mail premises. In her letter, Dame Melanie made clear that no such inspections take place, arguing that “we cannot assess delivery performance based on site inspections”.²⁶ This is despite Royal Mail telling us clearly that its “contingency guidance”—which allows certain items of mail to be prioritised over others—is triggered based on resourcing

19 Citizens Advice ([RML0001](#))

20 [Letter from CWU regarding Royal Mail](#), 13 April 2026

21 Unite the Union (CMA) ([RML0002](#))

22 [Q97](#)

23 [Q97](#)

24 [Letter from Ofcom regarding follow up from Royal Mail evidence session](#), 7 April 2026

25 [Letter from Royal Mail relating to information requested in the letter of 30 April from the Committee](#), 13 May 2026

26 [Letter from Ofcom regarding follow up from Royal Mail evidence session](#), 7 April 2026

challenges that are “specific to the local circumstances”.²⁷ Royal Mail was also unable to provide us with figures on what percentage of letters had been deprioritised as a result of its contingency procedures.²⁸ Nevertheless, Alistair Cochrane acknowledged the risk that the contingency procedures could be applied “miscellaneously”, and as a result Royal Mail carries out around 100 “unannounced self-audits” every week to “make sure that we do not have an endemic problem”.²⁹ Royal Mail appears to be more rigorous in policing itself than its statutory regulator.

14. CONCLUSION

We have not heard persuasive evidence to refute the previous Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee’s finding that Royal Mail has deprioritised delivery of letters.

15. RECOMMENDATION

We urge Ofcom to investigate this as a matter of urgency.

16. Beyond Ofcom’s fundamental failure to provide Parliament with a basic account of Royal Mail’s service, we heard arguments for the way its regulatory approach could be strengthened. Citizens Advice argued that Royal Mail’s freedom to increase prices should be contingent on meeting its regulated quality of services targets. Citizens Advice also noted that more than two thirds of post now sits outside the Universal Service Obligation, with bulk mail covered by Access contracts (which includes many categories of mail of huge importance to customers, including hospital appointments and energy bills) not directly regulated by Ofcom.³⁰ The CWU argued that Ofcom is not using its existing enforcement powers to their full extent, telling us that the Postal Services Act 2011 allows Ofcom to “impose an enforcement notification together with a direction setting out steps to be taken to remedy the breach”.³¹

17. As far back as March 2023, this Committee’s predecessor called on Ofcom to take stronger action. Many of the issues raised in our session, such as allegations that Royal Mail prioritises parcels and the future of the Universal Service Obligation, were also addressed in the previous Committee’s report. In particular, that Committee called on Ofcom to directly take evidence from postal workers across the country on “verbal briefings to deprioritise letter deliveries”.³² However, Ofcom’s subsequent report appeared to indicate

27 [Letter from Royal Mail following evidence session](#), 8 April 2026

28 [Letter from Royal Mail regarding deliveries](#), 2 March 2026

29 [Q78](#)

30 Citizens Advice ([RML0001](#))

31 [Letter from CWU regarding Royal Mail](#), 13 April 2026

32 Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee, [Royal Mail](#), 17 March 2023, para 31

that its investigation of this issue had been limited to “ask[ing] Royal Mail for all organisation-wide policies and procedures relating to prioritisation and any Board papers where changes to such policies and procedures were considered”.³³ Citizens Advice and the CWU both raised this previous recommendation in their evidence to our current inquiry.³⁴

18. CONCLUSION

There are many reasons for Royal Mail’s persistent poor performance and today it is a private company, operating in a market that has changed beyond recognition in the 13 years since privatisation. Ofcom however is directly accountable to Parliament, and through Parliament to the public, for ensuring the nation’s postal service meets the standard expected. Today, we conclude Ofcom is failing as the statutory regulator of the postal service to deliver on the task it has been set by Parliament.

19. CONCLUSION

We are concerned that Ofcom’s regulatory approach has for years now failed to bring about the required step change in Royal Mail’s performance. Three consecutive years of fines and a demand for an “urgent” improvement plan were not enough, as both short-term improvements and long-term USO reform became ensnared in an industrial dispute between Royal Mail and the CWU. It appears to have taken the Secretary of State’s direct intervention to resolve this crisis. We are grateful to the Secretary of State for his action, but he is not the statutory regulator of the postal service.

33 Ofcom, [Decision finding Royal Mail contravened its Quality of Service performance targets in 2022/23 and imposing a financial penalty](#), 9 January 2024, para 4.65

34 [Letter from CWU regarding Royal Mail](#), 13 April 2026; Citizens Advice ([RML0001](#))

20.

CONCLUSION

Beyond the immediate concerns with Royal Mail, we also have growing concerns that Ofcom is not up to the job of regulating a postal market that is growing in competition and complexity. Much of the mail that our constituents rely on, from hospital appointments to energy bills, falls outside the Universal Service Obligation regulated by Ofcom. The public increasingly expects next-day delivery by e-commerce outlets and competitors to Royal Mail make extensive use of its infrastructure without contributing to its costs. It is clear that Ofcom needs to reset its approach to regulating of postal services. The evidence we have heard indicates that the public do not distinguish between mail that is outside the USO and mail that is within it. A common complaint is that important correspondence such as medical appointments is being missed. There should be an assessment of whether this mail should be covered by the USO.

21.

RECOMMENDATION

Ofcom must deliver better regulation of the postal market. It should produce a clear roadmap for achieving this which sets out the statutory and non-statutory tools Ofcom currently has at its disposal, and how it intends to use these to bring about demonstrable improvements in public satisfaction with postal services. This must not be limited to services covered by the Universal Service Obligation, but also include Access mail and services delivered by Royal Mail's competitors. Where Ofcom is of the view that it currently lacks the remit and/or powers to address particular issues in the postal sector, it should clearly set out these gaps to this Committee. This reset should include the ability to provide basic operational performance data to Parliament, including the specific number of letters and parcels delivered outside performance targets. It should also include a far more assertive approach to spot-checking whether and how often parcels are prioritised over letters.

22.

CONCLUSION

We respect Ofcom's operational independence, and in the first instance it should be for the regulator itself to reform its approach. However, Ofcom is ultimately given its remit by Parliament. This remit can be changed.

23.

RECOMMENDATION

If the improvement plan we have recommended fails to deliver meaningful change within six months of this Report, the Secretary of State should consult on statutory changes to Ofcom's duties and/or powers, to ensure it is fit for the 21st-century postal market. As a first step, the Secretary of State should present a proposal to this Committee for levelling the playing field between Royal Mail and its competitors. This should ensure that competitors are not able to free-ride on Royal Mail's infrastructure, nor undercut employment conditions through gig economy models. Ministers should consider a wide range of options, including a levy on competitors to reflect the benefit they enjoy from the use of the network, or minimum standards for other operators to adhere to, from both a consumer and worker perspective.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. Royal Mail's current level of service is not acceptable. Royal Mail must immediately implement its improvement plan as the first step in restoring public confidence in the universal service provider. In the longer term, reform to the Universal Service Obligation is essential to put the postal service on a sustainable footing. We therefore welcome the agreement reached between Royal Mail and the CWU. Subject to the union balloting its members, we look forward to the parties working together constructively to roll out a reformed Universal Service Obligation. (Conclusion, Paragraph 5)
2. If such a restriction on disclosing information to Parliament exists in legislation, this Committee's strong view is that this should be amended. (Conclusion, Paragraph 12)
3. We have not heard persuasive evidence to refute the previous Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee's finding that Royal Mail has deprioritised delivery of letters. (Conclusion, Paragraph 14)
4. We urge Ofcom to investigate this as a matter of urgency. (Recommendation, Paragraph 15)
5. There are many reasons for Royal Mail's persistent poor performance and today it is a private company, operating in a market that has changed beyond recognition in the 13 years since privatisation. Ofcom however is directly accountable to Parliament, and through Parliament to the public, for ensuring the nation's postal service meets the standard expected. Today, we conclude Ofcom is failing as the statutory regulator of the postal service to deliver on the task it has been set by Parliament. (Conclusion, Paragraph 18)
6. We are concerned that Ofcom's regulatory approach has for years now failed to bring about the required step change in Royal Mail's performance. Three consecutive years of fines and a demand for an "urgent" improvement plan were not enough, as both short-term improvements and long-term USO reform became ensnared in an industrial dispute between Royal Mail and the CWU. It appears to have taken the Secretary of State's direct

intervention to resolve this crisis. We are grateful to the Secretary of State for his action, but he is not the statutory regulator of the postal service. (Conclusion, Paragraph 19)

- 7.** Beyond the immediate concerns with Royal Mail, we also have growing concerns that Ofcom is not up to the job of regulating a postal market that is growing in competition and complexity. Much of the mail that our constituents rely on, from hospital appointments to energy bills, falls outside the Universal Service Obligation regulated by Ofcom. The public increasingly expects next-day delivery by e-commerce outlets and competitors to Royal Mail make extensive use of its infrastructure without contributing to its costs. It is clear that Ofcom needs to reset its approach to regulating of postal services. The evidence we have heard indicates that the public do not distinguish between mail that is outside the USO and mail that is within it. A common complaint is that important correspondence such as medical appointments is being missed. There should be an assessment of whether this mail should be covered by the USO. (Conclusion, Paragraph 20)
- 8.** Ofcom must deliver better regulation of the postal market. It should produce a clear roadmap for achieving this which sets out the statutory and non-statutory tools Ofcom currently has at its disposal, and how it intends to use these to bring about demonstrable improvements in public satisfaction with postal services. This must not be limited to services covered by the Universal Service Obligation, but also include Access mail and services delivered by Royal Mail's competitors. Where Ofcom is of the view that it currently lacks the remit and/or powers to address particular issues in the postal sector, it should clearly set out these gaps to this Committee. This reset should include the ability to provide basic operational performance data to Parliament, including the specific number of letters and parcels delivered outside performance targets. It should also include a far more assertive approach to spot-checking whether and how often parcels are prioritised over letters. (Recommendation, Paragraph 21)
- 9.** We respect Ofcom's operational independence, and in the first instance it should be for the regulator itself to reform its approach. However, Ofcom is ultimately given its remit by Parliament. This remit can be changed. (Conclusion, Paragraph 22)
- 10.** If the improvement plan we have recommended fails to deliver meaningful change within six months of this Report, the Secretary of State should consult on statutory changes to Ofcom's duties and/or powers, to ensure it is fit for the 21st-century postal market. As a first step, the Secretary of State should present a proposal to this Committee for levelling the playing field between Royal Mail and its competitors. This should ensure that competitors are not able to free-ride on Royal Mail's infrastructure, nor undercut employment conditions through gig economy models. Ministers

should consider a wide range of options, including a levy on competitors to reflect the benefit they enjoy from the use of the network, or minimum standards for other operators to adhere to, from both a consumer and worker perspective. (Recommendation, Paragraph 23)

Formal minutes

Tuesday 19 May 2026

Members present:

Liam Byrne, in the Chair

Dan Aldridge

John Cooper

Justin Madders

Charlie Maynard

Mr Joshua Reynolds

The regulation of postal services

Draft Report (*The regulation of postal services*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 23, read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Second Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134

Adjournment

Adjourned till Tuesday 9 June at 2.00pm.

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Tuesday 24 March 2026

Dave Ward, General Secretary, Communication Workers Union; **Martin Walsh**, Deputy General Secretary (Postal), Communication Workers Union
[Q1-34](#)

Daniel Křetínský, Chairman, EP Holding; **Alistair Cochrane**, Chief Executive Officer, Royal Mail; **Ricky McAulay**, UK Operations Director, Royal Mail
[Q35-92](#)

Natalie Black, Group Director for Infrastructure and Connectivity, Ofcom; **Fergal Farragher**, Director, Infrastructure and Connectivity, Ofcom; **Ian Strawhorne**, Director, Enforcement, Ofcom
[Q93-127](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

RML numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Citizens Advice | RML0001 |
| 2 | Unite the Union (CMA) | RML0002 |

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Session 2024–26

Number	Title	Reference
17th	Pre-appointment hearing with the Government's preferred candidate for the Chair of the Competition and Markets Authority	HC 1723
16th	Post Office Horizon scandal: Justice for sub-postmasters	HC 1589
15th	Small business strategy	HC 1057
14th	Toward a new doctrine for economic security: Government Response	HC 1666
13th	Priorities of the Business and Trade Committee for 2026	HC 1411
12th	UK-India Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)	HC 996
11th	Toward a new doctrine for economic security	HC 835
10th	US Economic Prosperity Deal	HC 1306
9th	Draft Legislative Reform (Disclosure of Adult Social Care Data) Order 2025	HC 1140
8th	Export led growth: Trade with the Asia-Pacific region	HC 1048
7th	Industrial Strategy	HC 727
6th	How to strengthen UK-EU relations: Policy Priorities for the Summit	HC 908
5th	How to strengthen UK-EU relations	HC – 814
4th	Post Office Horizon scandal redress: Unfinished business: Government response	HC 778

Number	Title	Reference
3rd	Make Work Pay: Employment Rights Bill	HC 370
2nd	Priorities of the Business and Trade Committee	HC 423
1st	Post Office and Horizon scandal redress: Unfinished business	HC 341
7th Special	UK-India Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA): Government Response	HC 1832
6th Special	US Economic Prosperity Deal: Government Response	HC 1545
5th Special	Export led growth: Trade with the Asia-Pacific Region: Government Response	HC 1324
4th Special	Industrial Strategy: Government Response	HC 1305
3rd Special	How to strengthen UK-EU relations: Policy Priorities for the Summit: Government Response	HC 1267
2nd Special	Post Office Horizon scandal redress: Unfinished business: Government response	HC 969
1st Special	Make Work Pay: Employment Rights Bill: Government response	HC 932