No. 217/26

3rd August 2026

Dear Colleague,

Royal Mail: PFSL Pay Negotiations 2026 – Impasse Reached

Further to LTBs 0144/26 dated 8th May. Despite expressing our optimism that we could reach an Agreement after a couple more meetings with PFSL, unfortunately due to factors beyond our control, negotiations have come to an abrupt halt, and disappointingly management have consistently failed to respond in any meaningful way to our formal pay claim. I do of course understand that members will be frustrated by the lack of progress, especially as all other CWU grades and business units across RMG have already received the pay increase from 1st April 2026. Accordingly, I wish to offer my appreciation to both PFSL members and Reps alike for their patience in this important matter. I also wish to reassure everyone that this matter has been pursued as a priority by the union and we have endeavoured to move matters along in line with our Conference policies.

To put this impasse into perspective, the following is a timeline of prime activities and engagement.

- **3rd March** - Pay claim originally submitted to Neil Chaplain, Managing Director, Engineering as reported in LTB 067/26

- **22nd May** – the last time we met with Neil Chaplain and his team for pay negotiations (the meeting ended without a formal offer being made)

- **26th May** – comprehensive letter from myself to Neil Chaplain elaborating upon the position adopted by our negotiating team in the meeting above, specifically this related to the ongoing cost-of-living crisis and our Conference policies, particularly the issue of pensions and the fact that the majority of our PFSL members do not enjoy the benefits of being in the Collective Plan.

To be clear, the blatant inertia from PFSL management has been challenged at every step along the way and a series of letters have been sent to Neil Chaplain chasing him for a substantial reply to my representations as contained in the letter of 26th May. Over two months have now elapsed since this correspondence and yet PFSL are either unable or unwilling to formally respond.

I am sure our PFSL members, like our negotiating team, will be frustrated by this situation. Frankly, our PFSL members deserve to be treated much better by RMG management and it is unacceptable that four months on from the pay review date management haven't tabled a formal pay offer. This position is unsustainable. I have therefore today sent a further letter in the strongest possible terms to Neil Chaplain pointing out the persistent failures of PFSL in not engaging in a serious negotiation. This correspondence has been copied to Kieran Judd, Chief People Officer, to demonstrate the seriousness of the situation. Unfortunately, due to management's annual leave we are unlikely to recommence pay negotiations until later this month. This means that our members will not receive any arrears of pay (backdated to 1st April 2026) until September's salaries at the earliest, and in all probability, October is more realistic as any Agreement would have to go through our normal democratic process, including a consultative ballot of PFSL members.

Branches and Reps are reminded that we are fully committed to pursuing all Conference policies, particularly those surrounding the Collective Plan as the current pension arrangements across PFSL are derisory and as such our members in PFSL are undoubtedly second-class citizens in respect of pension benefits received from RMG. This area in particular has been exposed in the talks that have taken place thus far, and has featured predominantly within my correspondence to management, as this is a critical area where we obviously need to make progress.

The Postal Executive has been kept abreast of the prevailing situation and is far from impressed by the attitude of PFSL management and I also met with our Senior Reps across the cleaning and engineering functions last Monday 27th July to explain in more detail the obstacles we are encountering to making progress.

In closing, I wish to reiterate that I am grateful for the patience and resilience of our PFSL members, who are being treated very shabbily by management. This is unacceptable to the Postal Executive and if required this matter will be escalated to higher authorities beyond PFSL management. For the avoidance of doubt we are determined to get a fair and equitable outcome for our PFSL members and we won't be accepting a mediocre offer just because of the time that has elapsed – this is a tactic that management deploy on occasion. Therefore, even if it takes more time to get the right outcome, this will be the necessary approach adopted by the Postal Executive.

Further developments will be reported as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

Andy Furey
Assistant Secretary