

Two-Yearly Report

For the purposes of compliance with Regulation 11 (and Schedule 6) 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: 15 May 2026

Time period covered in this report: 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2026

Date submitted to the CAA: 15 May 2026

1. The number of disputes received by the ADR entity and the types of complaints to which the disputes related:

EU Regulation 261 / 2004	
Complaint type	Number of Complaints
Cancellation – right to care	956
Cancellation – information	6
Cancellation – compensation	7217
Cancellation – refund	97
Cancellation – alternative flight	18
Cancellation – expenses	16
Delay – right to care	657
Delay – information	6
Delay – compensation	5914
Delay – refund	1
Delay – alternative flight	1
Delay – expenses	3
Denied Boarding – selection for	0
Denied Boarding – right to care	271
Denied Boarding – information	0
Denied Boarding – compensation	2299
Denied Boarding – refund	3
Denied Boarding – alternative flight	1
Denied Boarding – expenses	2
Diverted	0
Downgraded	88
Article 9(3) – Right to Care for persons with reduced mobility / unaccompanied children	0
Article 11 – persons with reduced mobility or special needs	173
Other	356
Total	18085

EU Regulation 1107 / 2006	
Complaint type	Number of Complaints
Refusal to accept a reservation	0

Refusal to embark a passenger with a reservation	0
Pre-notification not recorded / transmitted	0
Staff attitude and behaviour	8
Information concerning a flight	0
Transport of mobility equipment	0
Seating	136
Seating of accompanying persons in a seat next to the PRM	0
Assistance dogs	0
Moving to the onboard toilet	0
Damaged and lost mobility equipment	0
Assistance through airport; onto aircraft; disembarkation	71
Facilities for PRMs, including toilets	3
Other	0
Total	218

Other	
Complaint type	Number of Complaints
Medical issues	0
Missed connections	0
Tickets & fares	1
In-flight facilities and services	35
Delayed / damaged / lost / stolen baggage	1782
Cabin baggage	292
Safety	0
Booking problems	26
Complaint process	0
Schedule changes	0
Other	126
Total	2262

2. The percentage share of alternative dispute resolution procedures which were discontinued before an outcome was reached:

Reason for discontinuation (as applicable)	% share (of all discontinued)
Complainant out of contact	63%
Complaint withdrawn by complainant	37%
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

3. The average time taken to resolve the disputes which the ADR entity has received:

Disputes took an average of 23 calendar days to resolve.

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

All outcomes that were accepted by consumers have been complied with by traders.

5. Any recommendations the ADR entity may have as to how any systematic or significant problems that occur frequently and lead to disputes between consumers and traders could be avoided or resolved in future:

There is a need for clearer information and better support for consumers when problems arise. This includes both where an entitlement to a remedy exists and also when it does not, so that consumers have all of the relevant information at their disposal.

Swift responses to disruption, both to minimise the level of inconvenience caused to passengers, and to ensure that timely redress is provided without the need for passengers to reach out to ADR, are the best ways to avoid problems arising and to resolve them quicker when they do.

6. Where the ADR entity is a member of any network of ADR entities which facilitates the resolution of cross-border disputes, an assessment of the effectiveness of its co-operation in that network:

Since 2018, CEDR has been a member of the Travel_Net group of European ADR entities facilitating the sharing of cross-border disputes and of best practice on dispute resolution in the aviation and travel sector. The latest meeting was in Barcelona in June 2025, with the next due to take place in Brussels in October 2026. It is a very effective forum within which knowledge and experience can be shared.

7. Where the ADR entity provides training to its ADR officials, details of the training it provides:

- Regular meetings of ADR officials to discuss issues and new developments in the law and in the cases referred to the scheme;
- Practice directions on a range of subjects;
- Updates on new case law in the UK and European courts;
- CEDR operates a secure online portal in order for its ADR Officials to access:
 - A library of relevant law and guidance
 - Practice directions
 - Discussion topics for the sharing of best practice among ADR Officials
 - Training videos on using CEDR's case management system

8. An assessment of the effectiveness of an alternative dispute resolution procedure offered by the ADR entity and of possible ways of improving its performance:

CEDR continues to deliver a highly effective alternative dispute resolution service, as attested to in the latest audit of ADR provision in the aviation sector. Our legally qualified adjudicators issue well-reasoned written decisions based on a thorough assessment of the facts of each case against the relevant legal standards. The service resolves disputes quickly and efficiently, with cases concluded in an average of 23 calendar days, an improvement on the 26-day average reported in the last Biennial

Report, and substantially faster than the 90-day timeframe required under the ADR Regulations.

As with any ADR process, there is always scope for further improvement. Maintaining a reasonable balance between the independence of adjudicators to reach their own decisions and consistency of outcome is something that requires constant focus.