



CISAS

COMMUNICATIONS AND INTERNET SERVICES ADJUDICATION SCHEME

A photograph of a woman with long brown hair and glasses, wearing a dark top, talking on a mobile phone. The image is overlaid with a semi-transparent blue filter. The background shows a window with lace curtains and a wooden wall.

The First Report of the
**Communications & Internet Services
Adjudication Scheme**

12 Bloomsbury Square
London WC1A 2LP

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7421 7432
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7404 7051
Email: cicas@arbitrators.org
Website: www.cisas.org.uk

Opening Hours – Monday to Thursday 8.30am to 6.30pm and Fridays 8.30am to 5pm
CISAS is operated independently by the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators

Contents

Welcome to CISAS	2
Message from the Senior Adjudicator	3
Scheme Review	4
CISAS Case Studies	9
Conclusion	14
Recommendations for Good Practice	15
Users Comments	16
CISAS Members (as at 30 th June 2004)	19

A large print version of this report is available upon request and on our website at www.cisas.org.uk



Welcome to the first bi-annual review of CISAS, the Communications & Internet Services Adjudication Scheme.

The concept of CISAS was formed at a meeting between Orange, T-Mobile, Telewest, mm02 and Dispute Resolution Services of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (DRS-CI Arb) in early 2003, when the companies asked DRS-CI Arb to design for them and their consumer and small business customers a dispute resolution procedure, using the strict criteria laid down by OFTEL (now OFCOM) to form that procedure, as the basis of subsequent approval by OFTEL.

Already set to gain approval at that time was an Ombudsman body formed and promoted by OFTEL. The companies did not want to join the Ombudsman, citing, amongst other reasons, high joining costs and high case fees.

During the development of CISAS, which was officially approved by OFTEL in December 2003, mm02 left the group and the companies were joined by ISPA, the Internet Services Providers Association. DRS-CI Arb had been in separate discussions with ISPA about a procedure to resolve disputes between their members and their consumer and small business customers, and it was agreed by all parties that one procedure covering Orange, T-Mobile, Telewest and the members of ISPA would be a fairer and more effective model for the customer.

In gaining approval from OFTEL, CISAS met a rigorous set of criteria which included the need to provide a free, independent and effective service to customers who are unable to resolve complaints directly with their communications company or internet service provider (ISP).

When approving the scheme the then Director General of Telecommunications, David Edmonds, said:

"I am pleased that these communications providers have developed an independent scheme to help consumers resolve disputes. This service will be promoted by the companies to ensure that consumers have access to a free, independent dispute resolution service."

So, from a starting base of four organisations, CISAS developed in its first six months to a membership of 74 companies – 5 from the telecommunications sector and 69 ISP's.

This report will give an overview of the first six months of operation, detailing membership, statistical analysis, case studies, recommendations from the adjudicators and feedback from users.



Gregory Hunt
Manager, CISAS

Message from the Senior Adjudicator



As senior adjudicator for CISAS I have been very pleased at the support and operational systems of DRS-CI Arb in managing CISAS in a speedy and efficient manner. This comes as no real surprise as the DRS-CI Arb staff have developed a professionalism built up over many years in administering a variety of specific consumer and commercial sector schemes.

The adjudicators who have been appointed to the panel engender confidence. All are senior and experienced practitioners who have, from the regular flow of CISAS cases, been able to build up an expertise on both the broad range of issues which affect the telecommunications and internet industries as well as the straightforward

typical complaints from consumers and small businesses.

To ensure a consistency of approach in decision-making the panel has developed a system of feedback, discussion and precedents using real case studies of cases concluded under CISAS. The experience and expertise that now exists within the panel means that cases can be dealt with not only quickly and robustly in terms of the law and procedure, but can be seen to be efficient and effective in understanding the often complex technical matters which relate to a constantly evolving and changing technology.

It was pleasing to have positive feedback from companies who are members of CISAS at a recent forum to discuss the way the scheme is working. A number of useful recommendations and suggestions from both sides were made and it proved the value of using case studies as a means of learning and feedback.

The acid test of any scheme is that justice is seen to be done and there is confidence by all the users. Anecdotal comment has been positive. One consumer who initially complained most bitterly on procedural matters and who only achieved one third of his claim wrote,

'Firstly, my apologies for my earlier correspondence which may have caused you pain and concern. I have read your excellent report which you have compiled concerning the dispute. Thank you very much in sorting what was in effect an unresolvable dispute for a layman like myself and a giant.'

Based on the success of the first half year it is hoped that CISAS can develop into an industry wide scheme that has the full confidence, respect and support of operators, consumers and small businesses for the resolution of disputes in the most cost-effective, and speedy way.



Dr. Mair Coombes-Davies
Senior Adjudicator, CISAS

The Numbers

During the first six-month period, 821 enquiries were made to CISAS with regards to disputes with member companies. Of those enquiries, 127 led to the customer making an application for adjudication.

Of the 127 cases progressing to adjudication, 91% (116 cases) dealt with complaints against telecommunications members, with the remaining 9% (11 cases) relating to disputes with ISP's.

One of the advantages CISAS offers users is in terms of ease of access. This was demonstrated by 8% of cases being registered online via the innovative online application form. CISAS also makes available a text phone for the hard of hearing, and large font guidance and application forms for the partially sighted.

It is interesting to note that 10 of the 11 cases registered online were made by customers in dispute with telecommunications members. It was originally envisaged that it would be ISP disputes that would be registered online

Types of Claim

CISAS differs in several ways to conventional consumer and small business dispute resolution schemes that are operated by DRS-CI Arb (for a full list of such schemes please see http://www.arbitrators.org/DRS/con_schem.asp). One major difference is the opportunity for the customer to seek an alternative remedy to their dispute beyond mere financial compensation alone.

Evidence to date with CISAS shows that only half of claims made have consisted of applications for financial compensation alone. Interestingly, in 12% of claims, the customer did not want any money at all, but instead asked for alternatives such as text bundles, the end of their contract or an apology from the company. In 37% of cases the customer asked for money and an additional remedy.

The most common types of claim are:

**Billing
Failure to provide a service
Contract terms and conditions
Poor customer service**

The Amount Claimed

In total, during the first six months, customers applied for a total of £76,445.34 in compensation from the member companies.

This is an average claim of £601.93, or of £688.69 when only taking in to consideration the 111 claims where money was requested.

The Statistics

- 29% of registered cases were settled without progression to an adjudicator
- In 60% of these cases, the customer was successful
- In 65% of the cases where the customer was successful, the customer received financial compensation
- In 20% of cases where the customer was successful, the customer received financial compensation and some other remedy
- In 14% of cases where the customer was successful, the customer received an alternative remedy to financial compensation

The Amounts Awarded

In total, in the 29 cases where the customer has been awarded some form of financial compensation, a total of £9,317.49 has been awarded – this is just 17% of the total amount claimed in those 29 cases (£54,998).

Taking out of the equation one particular case where the adjudicator awarded the customer £4,000, the average amount awarded is therefore £295.42.



Acceptance of Decisions

To date, 70% of successful customers have notified CISAS of their intention to accept the decision.

Where customers have accepted the decision, they have done so on average within ten days from the date they were given notification of the decision by CISAS.

There is no record of any instance of a customer rejecting the decision and taking the matter to court or another alternative.

Keeping to Time

To meet the conditions set down by OFCOM, CISAS must aim to keep to a deadline of six weeks for the completion of cases from the date the customer lodges their application with CISAS. In exceptional cases this target can be extended.

During the first six months of operation, CISAS has an average case time of 6.5 weeks, slightly over target by 2.5 days per case.

There are two main reasons why the extra time has been necessary to date, namely:

Delays in validating applications. Under the terms of CISAS the customer can make an application either upon receipt of a deadlock letter from the companies, or after three months since they started their claim through the company's complaint procedures.

In the vast majority of cases accepted by CISAS, there has been no deadlock letter, and it has often been the case that the company has claimed, upon receipt of the application, that the application is invalid for any number of reasons as set out in the rules. In the case of one company they have made a policy decision not to produce any deadlock letters and to force consumers through the 12-week route. CISAS is not supportive of this action and is in the process of inviting the company involved for comment.

For this reason CISAS has made an arrangement with the companies that where there is no deadlock letter and it is uncertain as to whether or not the customer has reached the 12-week deadline, CISAS will fax the application form to the company and give the company 24 hours to accept that the application is valid or to claim that the application falls outside of the remit of CISAS. Where it is the latter, CISAS retains the right to disagree with the company and proceed with the application.

This system works well with most companies returning their comments within the 24-hour period. However, a small number of companies do not have a good record of returning their comments within the specified and agreed period and thus delays are caused. CISAS take a hard line on this failure to comply with an agreed procedural rule, and will accept the application at the end of the 24-hour period unless an extension of that period has been agreed. Extensions will only be agreed under exceptional circumstances.

Delays by companies in submitting their defence and /or consumers in submitting their comments on defence. There have been a comparatively large number of cases where either the company or the consumer has been late submitting documentation to CISAS. This has a knock-on effect due to the very tight timescales. In order to address this, the member companies have been informed that CISAS will now take a much harder line on the submission of late defences, which may result in the case being referred to the adjudicator without any defence.

Administration

CISAS has a manager and two dedicated administrators backed up by four other administrators who can be called upon at any time. As well as being given direct contact details for dedicated staff, callers can also come through the various direct lines for DRS-CI Arb or through the main reception of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators. In addition there is an IT support network allowing for submission of applications online and case documentation, including the publication of decisions, through email.

There are several key areas where an improvement can be made in terms of the administration and processes used by member companies. We have already discussed, for example, the need to keep to tighter deadlines on the validation of applications and the submission of defences. Further areas discussed at the recent meeting between CISAS and its members were:

- Members need to improve internal communications. They need to be able to provide customers, and CISAS, with dedicated contact details for individuals within their company who deal with complaints at the various stages of the complaints cycle
- A glossary of terms needs to be developed between CISAS and the member companies to agree the interpretation of certain rules, thus cutting the delays where the company feels that CISAS should not accept an application but CISAS and / or the customer feel that the application is valid. A working party is in the process of being set up to deal with this issue and other administrative and rule related issues
- There continues to be strong evidence that some customer service staff within member companies have not heard of CISAS. Therefore the companies need to ensure that they have a continual programme of staff education, to ensure that staff are aware of CISAS and the role it plays within their dispute resolution processes
- There are complaints from customer that defences are written in complicated legal language. Members have been reminded that the documentation for CISAS was given the Crystal Mark by the Plain English Campaign, and that companies should concentrate upon the need for clarity and simplicity in any of their communications with customer, and especially in the defence under CISAS
- It has been noted that defences are also often very long – sometimes up to 150 pages in length, and it is questioned whether they need to be so lengthy. There are no differences in success rates between companies who consistently produce 5 page defences and those who produce 150 page defences
- The companies have informed CISAS that they have issued in excess of 100 deadlock letters. However, CISAS have received fewer than 10 applications where the deadlock letter was present. As a result, CISAS

have asked the members to provide copies of standard deadlock letters to ensure that they are not accidentally misleading or confusing customer

- There is strong and growing evidence from customers that companies are continuing to use debt collection agents to recover debts that were either the subject of adjudication or had actually been dealt with by CISAS
- There is further evidence from customers that certain companies are failing to pay financial compensation to the customer within the time limits specified within the adjudication. It is a major concern to CISAS that instances of such a failure from the companies are on the increase
- CISAS is now recording instances of debt collection during the adjudication process and failure to pay consumers on time, and will release this information to OFCOM upon request

The 12 case studies below are based upon actual cases referred to CISAS in the six-month period of this report. The customer is referred to as, **C**, and the communication and internet service provider as, **T**.

Case Study One – No overcharging

C was shocked to receive a bill from T which was more than 2,800% larger than his usual monthly bill and was significantly more than the credit limit he understood applied. C wanted the bill reduced to that credit limit because, he said, he was not aware charges would be applied for calls received whilst abroad, nor that whilst abroad, *'outgoing calls would be charged at unreasonable and extortionate rates'*. T maintained that its service agreement with C specifically stated that

- (a) Credit limits may be changed by T
- (b) Some call charges, especially those for international incoming and outgoing calls, may not be debited to the account immediately
- (c) Charges may be varied and a booklet of charges had been given to C.

The adjudicator decided that T had provided services under its standard terms which were clear, easy to understand and fair. The adjudicator did not accept that C was unaware of the varying tariffs, charge levels or that international charges may differ from domestic tariffs. C had used and must now pay for services T had provided in accordance with C's agreement with T.

Case Study Two – Overcharging

T was to provide free calls to a telephone number. C complained when T wrongly charged him for the calls (the number had not been fully added to the rater, and consequently it was recognised as a chargeable number and not a free number). C also complained that T continually produced incorrect invoices and secured payment of the charges by direct debit. C notified T that he wanted to terminate the service agreement. T wanted to recover a cancellation charge for early termination because the charging errors did not constitute a breach of the agreement that gave C the right to treat the agreement as repudiated by T.

The adjudicator found there is a duty upon a supplier of services to a consumer to correctly assess charges which are due. A consumer signing a direct debit agreement must have confidence that the supplier direct debiting his account will do it accurately and will rectify any charging problems quickly. T had not identified

or corrected the charging mistakes until the adjudication and had pursued C for a cancellation charge without proper adjustment for previous overcharging. The adjudicator directed T to pay C's costs in seeking to resolve the charging dispute together with compensation for inconvenience, vexation and stress.

Case Study Three – No ex-directory

C had wanted (for 4 years she maintained, whereas T asserted for about 6 months) her telephone number to be ex-directory not only because she had suffered cold calling by salesmen but also C did not want the risk of her ex-husband or his contacts getting in touch with her. That risk remained when T published the telephone number in two of its directories. T accepting some failure in its service made C a goodwill payment and offered compensation of 10% of the amount C claimed.

The adjudicator preferred T's case noting it was unlikely C would fail to notice a directory listing for four years before complaining when she was so concerned at the risk to her personal security. T's offer of compensation was fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

Case Study Four – Debt Collection

C was contacted by a dealer who was advertising T's services. She agreed to enter into a service agreement but changed her mind after 2 days and returned the phone. C received bills from T. She complained she was not liable for them. After T had placed the rapidly mounting debts in the hands of debt collection agencies to recover, C was refused an overdraft bank balance and store card. C requested that her details be removed from the debt collectors' data base to restore her good credit rating. T agreed to cancel the service agreement, write off any outstanding sums and issue instructions for any bad debt credit entries against C's name to be removed.

The Adjudicator directed T to pay compensation to C and apologise. Also T was to forward to C proof not only that T had instructed the debt collection agencies that any bad debt credit entries entered against C's name were to be removed but also that the entries had been removed as if never entered.

Case Study Five – Unauthorised International Calls

Two weeks before Christmas C, who lived in the UK, had a telephone package which an engineer tried to connect but said he could not and would come back. T had no records to suggest the service had not been properly installed that day. The telephone line had no usage until Boxing Day when international calls were made to Burundi, Ontario, Quebec, Tanzania and Uganda. C knew no one in these countries, he was unaware the phone was working, he did not use it himself nor knew of anyone else using the phone. The calls were picked up by T's high usage report the following day. T being unable to contact C, barred calls.

The adjudicator had grave doubt C either made or authorised the calls and did not consider C was responsible for calls made on a line which C did not know had been installed. The adjudicator decided C was not liable to pay the disputed bill.

Case Study Six – Text Play

Text Play is a range of games which can be accessed via the smartcard on a mobile telephone. C was charged for each text message C sent to the Text Play service. C believed the service was free. It was a considerable surprise to her when she was charged a substantial amount for the use she made of Text Play. The charges were set out in T's booklet of charges, a copy of which was provided to C with her smartcard. C could not recall seeing the booklet.

The Adjudicator decided that the Text Play service charges had been brought to C's attention when she began her contract with T. C was liable for the charges made for the Text Play service which she used. A person who neglects to read contract terms is none the less bound by them.

Case Study Seven – No Service

C complained about T's failure to provide a reasonable level of service for C to make and receive calls to his mobile phone in the Manchester area. This became progressively worse over several months. C was particularly upset when he was stuck in a lift for 2 hours and could not use his mobile phone to call for help. T accepted there were problems with the service and issued an apology, provided compensation and gave an explanation. C was dissatisfied with the explanation because it was implausible.

The Adjudicator decided that T should provide C with a full and detailed explanation for the loss of service.

Case Study Eight – The Deactivated Simcard

C's original SIM card was deactivated by T who said an upgrade phone had been sent to C by a dealer, the dealer having requested an upgrade on the instructions of C. C had never contacted a dealer or agreed to an upgrade. C was concerned to learn from T (which T later denied) that T had released personal information about C to the dealer. C requested T to reactivate his original SIM card. T did not, instead placing a block on C's handset so that it could not be used. When C asked for the dispute to be decided by adjudication, T's customer services department told him that the company was not a member of CISAS and then sent him an illegible form.

The Adjudicator decided that C's personal details were disclosed by T to a dealer, the behaviour of T was unreasonable and a serious failure. The failure was made worse by T attempting to avoid C's right to have his complaint properly dealt with. This was reflected in the level of compensation.

Case Study Nine – Infra Red Link

C upgraded his mobile phone to an alternative mobile which used an infrared modem connection. However, it could not connect to his PDA because unlike the original phone, the alternative would only link to devices using Microsoft operating systems. The PDA of C used the Linux operating system. C complained that T had not explained before he purchased the alternative that it was not compatible with some devices. C asked T to provide a mobile compatible with his PDA he was prepared to pay its cost but not T's £200 upgrade fee. T suggested C was at fault because he did not verify compatibility prior to purchase.

The Adjudicator decided that T had a duty to set out the fact that the alternative's infra red facility would only link with other devices using Microsoft software and their helpline would only assist with Microsoft software problems. T had breached their contract with C as T had promised C that the alternative would provide an infrared linking facility and T would provide expert assistance to ensure it could be used. C should return the alternative phone to T who should provide C with an alternate handset with infra red linking facilities compatible with devices using a Linux operating system free of upgrade charge but subject to monthly communications services charges. If T could not provide such a handset then when C returned the alternative, T was to repay C the cost of the phone and release him from his communications services contract without penalty.

Case Study Ten – Free Phone Charges

T charged C who had used his mobile telephone in the USA to call a USA free phone number. C complained that the calls should be free. T maintained that had C enquired he would have been told that all calls in the USA, even calls to a free phone number, were chargeable and this information was freely available in all T's literature on roaming.

The Adjudicator decided C must pay for all calls made to USA free phone numbers.

Case Study Eleven – Stolen mobile calls

During the night C's home was burgled whilst C lay asleep, her mobile phone was stolen. Between the time it was stolen and the time C notified T of its loss 7 days later, over £1,900 worth of calls had been made from the mobile. T queried the usage by sending a text message for C to contact them C did not receive the text. T did not stop the service. C disputed her liability to pay for these calls.

The Adjudicator decided C was liable to pay the disputed bill.

Case Study Twelve – “Rogue Diallers”

C, who lived in the UK, was charged by T for international calls to islands off the west coast of Africa incurred through internet usage which C maintained were never made by himself or any member of his family. T explained that the calls had been made from the pc of C because he had inadvertently downloaded aggressive dialler software when either visiting a particular website or by opening junk e-mail. The programs could operate without the user being aware by removing T's dial up number, replacing it with their own, then dialling an international number and charging large amounts.

The Adjudicator decided that C was responsible for the security of his computer. Information about recommended software for computer security was available on T's website which T was reviewing to highlight the more established internet pitfalls particularly, “*rogue diallers*”.

The first six months has been an exciting time for CISAS. We have seen membership numbers continue to grow, and we have seen strong evidence of great customer satisfaction with the process, administration and outcome of the service offered by CISAS.

However, now is not the time to rest on our laurels, but to build on the successes of the first six months and continue to strive to offer a more comprehensive service into the next six-month period and beyond.

CISAS continues to work with OFCOM, consumer groups, ISPA, ICSTIS, EURIM, the various government departments and member and non-member companies. If you have any comments on the content of this report or how our services can be improved, or would like further information on using CISAS or becoming a member of CISAS, please do not hesitate to contact us at:

CISAS
12 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2LP

Telephone: + 44 (0) 20 7421 7432

Facsimile: +44 (0) 20 7404 7051

Email: cisas@arbitrators.org

Website: www.cisas.org.uk

In order to enable the sector to learn from developments to date, the **CISAS independent adjudicators have four recommendations for good practice**, which they, and CISAS, would like to see implemented in due course. These are:

- 1. Members should ensure that once a dispute is referred to CISAS for adjudication, no steps are threatened or taken to enforce payment for sums in dispute against a customer until the adjudication process is complete**
- 2. The contract / service agreement containing the signature of the customer and all the relevant terms and conditions should always be included in the documents provided to CISAS if not by the customer then by the company. Where signed contracts are not entered in to, relevant contracts or terms of use agreed by the customer should be presented**
- 3. The company should ensure that the cost of chargeable services, such as Text Play and some calls to free phone numbers and so on, are communicated to the customer by text message (or other appropriate means) on at least the first occasion the customer uses the service**
- 4. The company should give the customer the option at the time the contract is made of having calls barred immediately if the usage exceeds a given amount.**

The Public

"I would like to thank you...for the excellent professional job that you have undertaken to help me settle this claim. [The Company] caused me a lot of stress and worry in the way that they treated me and I am glad the matter is over. Thank you".

Ms A – Essex

"Thank you for all your great help in the above matter and the excellent service you provide. I am really happy that this matter has been resolved once again thank you very much".

Mrs B – Kent

"Thank you for your letter of [date] containing the adjudicator's report to my dispute with [Company]. Having studied the report I can confirm that I am satisfied with the findings and accept the decision. I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks and gratitude for the help and assistance your organisation has provided in resolving this matter".

Mr C – Hertfordshire

"I would like to thank your company's service in helping me with my dispute against [Company]. I would be delighted in accepting the decision made by the adjudicator".

Mr D – West Yorkshire

"I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your help and prompt response and action throughout".

Mr E – Powys

"Thank you so very much for your support and help".

Mr F – Essex

"[You] have managed to achieve a response from [Company] that in a little over a week has resulted in the resolution of my complaint. Something I was unable to achieve alone in 9 months. [Company] are now providing me with a caller ID service which is what I wanted. I write therefore to inform you that I wish to pursue this complaint no further and to thank you for your help".

Mr G - Surrey

The Companies

The Internet Service Providers Association

CISAS is delivering an effective dispute resolution service, approved by OFCOM and in line with the requirements of the Communications Act (2003). ISPA is pleased that the scheme enables us to offer a more efficient service to our members and their customers. **Nicholas Lansman - ISPA, Secretary General**

Telewest

We are happy to support the first CISAS report, and are pleased that the scheme has moved from inception to full implementation so successfully. On the rare occasions that our own complaint procedure fails to satisfy our customers, the scheme provides a clear and independent process for dispute resolution. In doing so it offers useful feedback through which we can quality-check our own internal processes and decisions. We therefore look forward to the continuing development of the CISAS scheme which, through mutual learning, will help us provide better services to our customers. **Grahame Fowler - Head of Group Compliance, Telewest Broadband**

Orange

Orange is committed to providing the best possible customer service. Even before the creation of CISAS, Orange always voluntarily offered an independent dispute resolution scheme to our customers. However, in light of changes in the regulatory environment CISAS was formed - with Orange as one of its founding members.

We are pleased that in its first six months of operation the scheme has continued to deliver independent, impartial and effective dispute resolution to our customers in the unlikely event that we have been unable to resolve a customer complaint internally. Orange recognises that this first CISAS report makes a number of recommendations as to how the administration of CISAS can be developed and we look forward to working with the CISAS management team over the coming months to address these issues.

T-Mobile

T-Mobile is happy with the administration of CISAS, which has been conducted in a highly professional manner. However the first 6 months of operation has highlighted some issues concerning the interpretation of CISAS Rules. T-Mobile considers that the Rules need to be generally reviewed against the first 6 months experience of the operation of CISAS.

As to CISAS itself, the first 6 months operation has highlighted an inequitable imbalance in its fairness between the customer making the complaint and the individual member company. Such imbalance flows from provisions that win or lose the company pays the costs (approximately £360) coupled with the fact that the customer can reject the decision if they lose. T-Mobile has experienced an element of "claims for the sake of it" forcing T-Mobile into making compromise offers in circumstances where T-Mobile would not ordinarily consider an offer of payment to be suitable.

Faced with a vexatious claim does the company pay £360 to the adjudicator feeling confident of a successful decision which will no doubt be ultimately rejected by the complainant or offer a lesser sum to the vexatious claimant in an effort to keep costs down? T-Mobile considers that unless the inequitable imbalance in CISAS's fundamental rules regarding costs and enforceability of adjudicators decisions is addressed there is a danger of customers utilising CISAS to force individual companies to meet spurious claims for compensation.

It is apparent that customers have the misconception that CISAS is an enforcement process or sub-department of OFCOM. They see it as a body to complain to who will act on their behalf as opposed to an independent body impartial to the views of the customer and company.

Wanadoo

CISAS has developed into an effective dispute resolution service. Within the first 6 months of operation, it has proven itself capable of both being compliant with current regulation and being an effective and equitable dispute resolution scheme.

The efficient operation of the scheme provides an excellent service to the industry as it helps to highlight any areas which require improvement within our customer complaint handling procedures and also highlights operational areas of concern which may need to be addressed by the communication service providers.

One of the main areas of concern for the industry as highlighted by the first 6 months of operation of CISAS is the imbalance created by the fact the customer making a complaint will bear no cost to submit a complaint and can reject the decision, forcing providers to pay the high administrative costs with no guarantee that the matter will be settled. Wanadoo would appreciate this concern is addressed allowing industry to invest in better customer services and limiting frivolous and vexatious claims by some customers.



CISAS Members (as at 30th June 2004)

Communications Companies

3g Comms	Kingston Communications (Hull)	T-Mobile (UK) Limited
Blue Ridge Telecom	Orange Personal Communications Limited	Telewest Limited

Internet Service Providers

2pm Technologies	Accentuk	Adweb
Altohighway	AOL	Atlas Internet
Audanet.com	Avecho	Boltblue
Brightview	Broadband Billing	Bulldog
Business Serve	CallnetUK	Capitek plc
Care4free	Clara.Net	Community Internet
Davidbowie.co.uk	Dialstart	Directonline.net
Domain Names GB	Eclipse	Ecomnet.net
Epulse.net	Exponential-e	Fastnet
Freenetname	Global Internet	GreenNet
Hedgehog Broadband	HomeChoice	ic24
Idzero.co.uk	Infinnet.co.uk	Jings
Legend Internet	Madasafish	Mailbox Internet
Ministryofsound.net	MWFree (Micro Warehouse)	Myisp.co.uk
Myriad Vision	NASCR	NDCNet
NetKonect	Netway2000	NewNet
PlugIn.co.uk	Plus.net	Rabbit Broadband
Research Machines	RICS	Scotland Online
Supanet	Surfaid	Telewest / Blueyonder
Tellnet	Thehornets.net	Tory.org
Totalise	Totalserve	Vianetworks
Video Networks Limited	Vision ISP	Waitrose.com
West Dorset Internet	Yahoo! UK	Wanadoo
Zen Internet		

