

**Communication and Internet Services Adjudication Scheme (CISAS)**  
**Report of the Independent Complaints Reviewer**  
**for the period 30 June 2025 to 31 December 2025**

## **1. Introduction**

This report relates to the Communication and Internet Services Adjudication Scheme (CISAS) (“the Scheme”), operated by CEDR (Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution). It deals with complaints made about various providers – primarily of internet and telephone services - that are members of the Scheme.

The report covers the six month period from 30 June 2025 to 31 December 2025.

## **2. Background**

I am a self-employed independent consultant. I work remotely and am not an employee of CEDR. I am not involved in case handling or advice; my role is to act purely as an Independent Complaints Reviewer.

CEDR is a registered charity and non-profit organisation. It provides independent dispute resolution services for consumers who experience problems with a company and who have exhausted the internal complaints procedure.

## **3. My Role**

There are two aspects to my role:

- To review cases that are escalated to me at Stage 3 of the Complaints Procedure. This happens when a user of the Scheme has complained and, having been through CEDR’s internal complaints review process, remains dissatisfied. Under my Terms of Reference and the Complaints Procedure, I can consider complaints about CEDR’s *handling* of the complaint, but *not* about a decision made by an adjudicator, *nor* the process by which that decision was reached or the procedure adopted by the adjudicator.
- To review complaints about the Scheme as a whole and produce a report every six months, based upon my examination and analysis of a random sample of at least 80% of the complaints handled by CEDR, including any cases that were escalated to me.

## **4. Complaints Procedure**

CEDR’s Complaints Procedure explains its scope, along with the two internal stages of review that take place before, if necessary, a complaint is referred to me. It provides clear information about timescales and what can be expected. In brief, if after the Stage 1 response complainants remain dissatisfied they can ask for escalation to Stage 2 of the process, in which a CEDR senior manager will review the complaint. If this does not resolve the matter, it can be referred to me for independent review at Stage 3.

## 5. My Findings

### (1) Statistics

In the course of the half year June 30 to December 31 2025, a total of 5,622 complaints were made through CISAS, compared to 4,227 for H1 2025. A total of 1,079 decisions were issued and 2,311 cases were settled.

During the six month period, CEDR received a total of 30 complaints, the same number as for H1 2025. Two of these complaints were still in progress as at 31 December 2025 (the 30 working day response period having not expired) and therefore are not included in my analysis. These cases will be included in my next report.

### (2) My Review

I reviewed a random sample of 22 cases (i.e. 80% of the total of 28). These are analysed further in section (3) below.

In eight cases, total goodwill payments of £560.00 [£1,145.00<sup>1</sup>] were offered to complainants, an average of around £70.00 [£95.00] per case, the lowest amount being £25.00 [£25.00] and the highest £300.00 [£300.00].

All complaints were acknowledged and addressed within, or well within, the appropriate timescales.

2 cases were escalated to Stage 2 (compared to four cases for H1/2025) and no cases were escalated to me at Stage 3 (compared with two cases for H1/2025).

### (3) Cases

#### In Scope

(i) 5 of the 22 complaints were deemed in scope.

(ii) 4 complaints were partially upheld:

(1) The complaint had originally been rejected as it was thought to be linked to a previous case. It was accepted once the error had been identified. The customer also complained that a number of his questions had not been answered. His complaint was upheld in part in that an error had been made initially but his questions had been answered as far as possible or would be in the course of the adjudication. A goodwill payment of £25.00 was offered.

(2) The complaint alleged service failures in respect of emails and telephone calls. The latter was deemed a service failure as incorrect information had been given, but there was no service failure in respect of the emails as the information given in them was correct. A goodwill payment of £25.00 was offered. [Note: this case has been escalated to Stage 2 and a decision is pending at the time of this report.]

(3) The customer complained of delays in telephone appointments, that reasonable adjustments had not been made and that he was not notified when a final decision was made. Whilst it was not accepted that there were any delays, it was found that reasonable adjustments had not been provided consistently and also that he had not been notified of the adjudicator's final decision. A goodwill payment of £75.00 was offered.

---

<sup>1</sup> Figures in brackets are the numbers for H1 2025 and are included for comparison

- (4) This complaint involved (a) a lack of reasonable adjustments (b) a claim that the settlement process was not fully explained and that the customer was misled and (c) that the customer did not receive a telephone call to complete the complaint form. Element (a) was upheld as the customer had not received any calls from a point of contact, but elements (b) and (c) were not upheld, as the settlement process had been explained fully and a call had been made (though in respect of (b) it was felt that more could have been done to explain options). A goodwill payment of £120.00 was offered.

The complaint was escalated to Stage 2, where the complaint was that (a) the customer would not have accepted the settlement offer had someone called her in line with her request for reasonable adjustments; (b) she had provided proof of a call to CISAS when her request for reasonable adjustments was allegedly refused; and (c) she wished her compensation to be increased from £120.00 to £300.00. Element (a) was not upheld as the matter had been fully explained in a telephone call. As to (b) there was no evidence of a refusal, but there was a service failing as there had been no explanation of having a Case Officer take details of the complaint. In recognition of multiple service failings, the offer of goodwill payment was increased from £120.00 to £300.00.

- (iii) One complaint was not upheld, where the customer complained that CEDR had repeatedly rejected his application under rules that he considered 'obscure'. Upon investigation, no service failings were identified and the complaint was not upheld.

#### Out of Scope

Eight complaints were deemed wholly out of scope and therefore were not upheld:

- Six of these complaints involved dissatisfaction with an adjudicator's decision, which were clearly out of scope. These included allegations that a complaint had not been properly considered, or because the complainant simply disagreed with the adjudicator's decision.
- The remaining two complaints were found to be out of scope because the complaint: (a) concerned a procedural issue and (b) alleged a settlement offer by a provider was unclear.

#### Partly in Scope

- (i) A total of nine complaints were considered partly in scope:
- (ii) Four complaints were partially upheld:

- (1) This case involved complaints that (a) the provider had made an offer but the customer had not been given the opportunity to accept or reject it and (b) the adjudicator had awarded less than the amount offered by the provider. Element (b) was out of scope and therefore not upheld, but as to (a) it was found that the offer had been accepted automatically contrary to the customer's wishes and so £40.00 was offered as a goodwill payment.
- (2) The customer complained that the provider had not complied with the adjudicator's decision and was also dissatisfied with the way the complaint had been handled. The non-compliance was out of scope but the manner in which it was handled was in scope. It was found that whilst CISAS had been chasing the provider for compliance, it was not within its power to enforce compliance. However, the non-compliance should have been registered on the system earlier and so a goodwill payment of £25.00 was offered.
- (3) The complaint concerned a delay in compliance by the provider. This was out of scope but the complaint was partly in scope as regards any action or inaction by CISAS in following

up compliance. Moreover, the case had been closed prematurely on the assumption that the provider had complied. The provider did in fact comply within the prescribed timeframe but the customer had been given incorrect information in respect of the deadline and he was offered a goodwill payment of £30.00.

- (4) There were three elements to this complaint: (a) the customer claimed that the compliance process was unfair, as she was required to accept compliance and was unable to dispute it; (b) her two calls with CISAS to clarify compliance made the matter more confusing; and (c) the system itself was misleading. Elements (a) and (c) were out of scope and so not upheld, but element (b) was identified as a service failing and a goodwill payment of £40.00 was offered.

(iii) The remaining five complaints were not upheld:

- (1) The customer attempted to add issues to the case after the adjudication had been finalised.
- (2) The customer was blind and complained that he had not been given reasonable adjustments for his disability, claiming that he had received emails rather than telephone calls, also that his access to the system was blocked and that his case had been closed prematurely. Following investigation, it was found that there were no service failings and that the problems had been caused by the customer himself.
- (3) A complaint of non-compliance by a provider and that the provider was being shown 'undue leniency'. The alleged non-compliance was out of scope, but the manner in which CISAS had handled the non-compliance was in scope. However, the provider had complied fully with the adjudicator's decision and so the complaint was not upheld.
- (4) Another complaint of non-compliance by a provider. The customer also alleged that there had been a lack of courtesy and respect by CISAS (he objected to being addressed by his first name). It was found that the alleged lack of courtesy had already been addressed by a sincere apology and had not occurred subsequently. As regards the non-compliance, the correct procedure had been followed and, following the provider's non-compliance, the case had been referred to the adjudicator.
- (5) A complaint that the adjudicator's decision was unfair. This was not upheld. A further complaint that CISAS record-keeping was not accurate was not upheld, as investigations had shown that records were accurate.

## **6. Conclusion**

On this occasion, I have no specific observations arising from my review and in the 22 cases that I have examined I found no evidence of any systemic issues, themes or causes for concern.

The number of complaints involving allegations of a lack of reasonable adjustments in the sample I have reviewed was three (the same as for H1 2025), one of which was not upheld. I do not consider this small number to be significant.

I also note that six of the 22 cases involved complaints about an adjudicator's decision, as compared with eight of the 26 cases reviewed in my H1 2025 report. The percentage for H2 2025 is 27% as compared with 31% for H1 2025.

Once again, I have found that CEDR handled the complaints they received to a good standard, addressing customers' concerns and, in dealing with some of the more difficult complaints, demonstrating patience and forbearance.

Timescale performance was also very good with acknowledgements and responses all either within, or well within, target.

## **7. Recommendations**

I have no recommendations to make.

I conducted my review remotely, but I was provided with all the data and information required for this report and I had open and unrestricted access to the systems and records that I needed. I am obliged to CEDR for facilitating this.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Alan Squires". The signature is written in a cursive style with a clear, legible font.

Alan Squires *LLB(Hons) LLM PGDipAML Solicitor*  
Independent Complaints Reviewer

3 March 2026