



Annual ACTIVITY REPORT TO Ofcom FOR THE PERIOD 1st NOV 2018 - 31st OCT 2019

Pursuant to The Alternative Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes (Competent
Authorities and Information) Regulations 2015 (As amended).

INDEX

Contents

1. Introduction 3

2. Complaints dealt with/Membership..... 4

3. Statistics 4

4. Average length of ADR procedure 5

5. ADR procedures which were discontinued for operational reasons 5

6. Compliance with ADR outcome percentages 5

7. Co-operation with other ADR entities in relation to cross-border disputes 5

Schedules:

- 1. Problems encountered -
- 2. Reasons for refusing complaints – statistics in excel

1 Introduction

Consumer Dispute Resolution Limited ("CDRL"), operates six approved ADR schemes:

- 1.1.1 RetailADR;
- 1.1.2 AviationADR;
- 1.1.3 UtilitiesADR; and
- 1.1.4 CommsADR;
- 1.1.5 Consumer Arbitration
- 1.1.6 Data Arbitration

1.2 In November 2017, CommsADR was approved by Ofcom under the ADR Regulations to handle matters considered 'out of scope' for the purposes of section 52 of the Communications Act 2003 or section 52 of the Postal Services Act 2011 and of the relevant regulatory conditions that apply to businesses providing telecommunications and postal services. CommsADR was launched to plug an 'ADR gap' within the sector, affording the prospect of free redress where it had not been previously available.

1.3 CommsADR provides ADR in respect of unresolved disputes between consumers or businesses and their service providers in respect to the following:

- Couriers and postal services
- Video on demand services
- Mobile handsets
- Broadband routers
- Premium rate services
- Phone Pay Services
- Mobile Phone Apps
- Cable and satellite television services
- The location of telegraph poles
- The location of mobile phone masts
- Cable and wiring inside your property
- Non-micro business billing disputes
- Commercial decisions made by communications companies about whether to provide a product or service, and the terms under which they may be provided.

2. Complaints dealt with/Membership

- 2.1 CDRL deals with complaints in relation to subscribing and non-subscribing companies.
- 2.2 In relation to complaints received about non-subscribing companies, CommsADR deals with such complaints where the non-subscriber agrees to engage with CommsADR and abide by its scheme rules in relation to the particular complaint.
- 2.3 Since the launch of CommsADR in November 2017, 137 companies have subscribed to the scheme. Many of these have been afforded subscription via their membership to the association body 'ISPA' and a further 109 brands are regulated by the Phone-paid Services Authority.

3. Statistics

- 3.1 Schedule 2 contains raw data in relation to domestic and cross border complaints. CommsADR has set its systems to record the following data:

3.1.1 Complaint types:

- Couriers and postal services
- Video on demand services
- Mobile handsets
- Broadband routers
- Premium rate services
- Phone Pay Services
- Mobile Phone Apps
- Cable and satellite television services
- The location of telegraph poles
- The location of mobile phone masts
- Cable and wiring inside your property
- Non-micro business billing disputes
- Commercial decisions made by communications companies about whether to provide a product or service, and the terms under which they may be provided.
- Service issues- this includes customer service issues, issues with staff (being rude etc..), issues with the provision of services (including trade and energy provider home services complaints).
- Other

3.2 Stats Overview:

Stats overview (complaints 'accepted'): CommsADR received 77 disputes during the reporting period. A dispute is defined as a request by a claimant wishing to seek redress due to an impasse with a communications company. Of these 33 fell within scope of CommsADR remit under its approval by Ofcom and the extension of the work it carries out in the phone-paid service industry.

CommsADR launched in the phone paid services industry as of 1 August 2018, due to the recognition by the industry that ADR is beneficial. CommsADR believes this will assist the industry and the PSA in reducing consumer detriment.

Complaint Type	Nov 2018 - Oct 2019
Courier & Postal Services	10
Video On Demand	3
Mobile Handsets	4
Broadband Routers	0
Premium rate services	5
Phone Pay Services	0
Mobile Phone Apps	21
Cable & satallite Tv Services	18
Location of Telegraph poles	0
Location of Mobile phone masts	0
Cable & wiring inside your property	0
Non micro business billing	0
Commercial Decisions	0
Service Issues	0
Other	16

Total **77**

4. Average length of ADR procedure

4.1 65 days

5. ADR procedures which were discontinued for operational reasons

CDRL has no data to report here.

6. Compliance with ADR outcome percentages:

Member compliance – 98%

Non-member compliance – (n/a as we have no non member case engagement by companies)

Complainant compliance (where they accepted determination) – 95 %

7. Co-operation with other ADR entities in relation to cross-border disputes

CommsADR has not had any opportunity to co-operate with any other ADR entity in relation to cross-border disputes

SCHEDULE 1

Problems encountered

	SYSTEMATIC OR SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS OCCURRING FREQUENTLY	HOW CAN THIS PROBLEM BE AVOIDED OR RESOLVED IN THE FUTURE
1	We continue to identify that consumers fail to complain to the service provider first before either coming to CommsADR or, the appropriate ADR scheme. It is noted consumers seem to be unaware of their requirements to afford companies an opportunity to resolve their complaint in the first instance or that a company has eight weeks before they can escalate to an ADR provider resulting in a significant number of cases referred prematurely to ADR.	Promotion of best complaint practice to consumers. In relation to the EU ODR platform this needs to filter complaints where the consumer has bypassed the service provider at the start of the complaint form.
2	The PSA make no reference to the use of ADR in its Code, therefore many cases sent to it go without consideration of dispute resolution given as the regulatory body it only accepts breaches in the code, leaving some consumers at a detriment and unable to seek redress	For the PSA to refer to the use of signposting to ADR in the Code when dealing with handling complaints and for the PSA to work closer with the ADR bodies in this sector to identify trends that affect Consumers within the industry.
3	We continue to see service providers failing to engage with ADR due to concerns about the costs being levied against them for the regulated redress requirements therefore consider a lack of budget for redress outside of regulation, resulting in consumer detriment.	Whilst a high number of service providers have engaged with CommsADR there are still brands that will not engage. To make ADR fully successful it should be made mandatory. CommsADR hopes that its work in the phone paid services industry will help to promote further the benefits of redress in this industry given it the first time companies have sought to engage in an ADR process. The feedback from this aspect of the communications industry is that the costs of ADR is disproportionate to the cost of the dispute which had deterred companies from engagement previously, but the sector is now afforded a operational and cost efficient solution via CommsADR.

SCHEDULE 2

Complaint statistics

Complaints							
Year	Disputes Submitted	Number of complaints accepted	How many accepted complaints were subsequently withdrawn by	How many accepted complaints were subsequently withdrawn by traders?	In how many cases was an outcome produced?	Average number of days taken to issue a final decision	
2019	77	33	4	0	16	89	
Refusal							
Year	Total Complaints refused by ADR Body to handle	No prior attempt was made to contact trader	Complaint was frivolous/vexatious	Dispute was previously considered by ADR body or court	The value of the claim fell below an applicable threshold	The complaint was not submitted on time	Dealing with the Complaint would impair the effective operation of the ADR body
2019	44	5	1	0	0	2	0

nb: 0 complaints fell inside regulatory scope, therefore outside of our jurisdiction and signposted to OS:C or Cisas
36 complaints where rejected due to non member refusal to engage