

Annual Report

For the purposes of compliance with Regulation 11 (and Schedule 5) of The Alternative Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes (Competent Authorities and Information) Regulations 2015 (as amended)

ADR entity name: CEDR

Date of publication on ADR entity's website: 1 May 2017

Time period covered in this report: 1 February 2016 to 31 March 2017

Date submitted to the CAA: 5 May 2017

1. The number of domestic disputes and cross-border disputes the ADR entity has received:

CEDR has received a total of 6000 domestic disputes and no cross-border disputes.

2. The types of complaints to which the domestic disputes and cross-border disputes relate:

EU Regulation 261 / 2004	
Complaint type	Number of Complaints
Cancellation – right to care	0
Cancellation – information	0
Cancellation – compensation	738
Cancellation – refund	9
Cancellation – alternative flight	0
Cancellation – expenses	2
Delay – right to care	0
Delay – information	1
Delay – compensation	4534
Delay – refund	6
Delay – alternative flight	0
Delay – expenses	0
Denied Boarding – selection for	0
Denied Boarding – right to care	0
Denied Boarding – information	0
Denied Boarding – compensation	178

Denied Boarding – refund	1
Denied Boarding – alternative flight	0
Denied Boarding – expenses	0
Diverted	1
Downgraded	10
Article 9(3) – Right to Care for persons with reduced mobility / unaccompanied children	3
Article 11 – persons with reduced mobility or special needs	19
Other	0
Total	5502

EU Regulation 1107 / 2006	
Complaint type	Number of Complaints
Refusal to accept a reservation	0
Refusal to embark a passenger with a reservation	1
Pre-notification not recorded / transmitted	0
Staff attitude and behaviour	9
Information concerning a flight	3
Transport of mobility equipment	0
Seating	0
Seating of accompanying persons in a seat next to the PRM	0
Assistance dogs	1
Moving to the onboard toilet	0
Damaged and lost mobility equipment	0
Other	0
Total	14

Other	
Complaint type	Number of Complaints
Medical issues	0
Missed connections	1
Tickets & fares	3
In-flight facilities and services	6
Delayed / damaged / lost / stolen baggage	133
Cabin baggage	3
Safety	2
Booking problems	4
Complaint process	3
Schedule changes	1
Other	328
Total	484

3. A description of any systematic or significant problems that occur frequently and lead to disputes between consumers and traders of which the ADR entity has become aware due to its operations as an ADR entity:

The wording of traders' conditions of carriage are not always as clear and watertight as they could be, which leads to disputes over their interpretation. Traders' conditions of carriage are also not always made clear to consumers, which leads to disputes over their applicability, particularly when a particular term is to the consumer's detriment.

4. Any recommendations the ADR entity may have as to how the problems referred to in '3' above could be avoided or resolved in future, in order to raise traders' standards and to facilitate the exchange of information and best practices:

Traders' conditions of carriage should be written in plain English and easy for consumers to understand. This may avoid disputes about the interpretation of conditions of carriage from arising.

Traders should ensure that conditions of carriage are made clear to consumers at the point that the contract is entered into. This may avoid disputes regarding the applicability of particular conditions from arising.

5. The number of disputes which the ADR entity has refused to deal with, and percentage share of the grounds on which the ADR entity has declined to consider such disputes:

Total number of disputes which the ADR entity has refused to deal with: **742**

Ground of refusal (as applicable)	% share (of all refused)
Outside scope	10.5%
Not an airline which is contracted to ADR scheme	3.9%
Complainant not waited for sufficient time (as per scheme rules) for airline to respond	57.4%
No attempt to contact airline by complainant	20.1%
Dispute frivolous / vexatious	0
Dispute considered by another ADR body / court	0
Over monetary threshold	0.4%
Deadlock letter / non-reply too long ago	2%
Would impair effective operation of the ADR entity	4.9%

6. The percentage of alternative dispute resolution procedures which were discontinued for operational reasons and, if known, the reasons for the discontinuation:

Reason for discontinuation (as applicable)	% share (of all discontinued)
Complainant out of contact	4%
Complaint withdrawn by complainant	96%
Consumer is believed by the ADR entity to have provided false or fraudulent information or documents (at any stage)	0
The trader has misled the ADR entity with regard to a ground that may or may not exist for refusing to accept or continue with the resolution of a dispute	0
The consumer has been abusive to an ADR official of the ADR entity	0
Both the consumer and the trader agree, including where a conflict of interest has been identified and it is not possible for the reasons referred to in this policy to transfer the ADR procedure to another ADR entity approved by the CAA	0

7. The average time taken to resolve domestic disputes and cross-border disputes:

Domestic disputes took an average of 71.1 calendar days to resolve.

No cross-border disputes were received by CEDR.

8. The rate of compliance, if known, with the outcomes of the alternative dispute resolution procedures:

While there have been some isolated instances of compliance with outcomes not being carried out within the timescale specified in CEDR's Scheme Rules, all outcomes have ultimately been complied with by traders.

CEDR has a process in place whereby a trader that fails to comply with an adjudicator's decision that has been accepted by the consumer has their registration with CEDR suspended. If non-compliance persists, the trader's registration with CEDR is terminated.

9. The co-operation, if any, of the ADR entity within any network of ADR entities which facilitates the resolution of cross-border disputes:

As CEDR does not deal with cross-border disputes, this is not applicable.