

# Which? Supercomplaint – Industry briefing

**14<sup>th</sup> January 2016** 

### Legal background

- Super-complaints are made under section 11 of the Enterprise Act 2002
- They can only be made by a 'designated consumer body' which means a body designated as such by Order of the Secretary of State Which?
- The complaint can be served on the CMA or a regulator designated to receive such complaints again by Order of the Secretary of State.
- The process is intended to be a **fast-track system** for designated consumer bodies to bring to the attention of the CMA / Regulators, **market features** that appear to be significantly harming the interests of consumers
- A market feature could be structure of the market and/or the conduct of those in the market;
- PORR must, within 90 days from the day after the complaint is received, publish a response stating how we propose to deal with the complaint, and in particular:
- (a) whether we have decided to take any action, or to take no action, in response to the complaint, and
- (b) if we have decided to take action, what action we propose to take.
- Our response must state our reasons for our proposals.



### **Previous super-complaints**

- Misleading and opaque practices in the grocery market (2015) Which? to CMA
- Travel Money (2011) Consumer Focus to OFT
- Credit and debit surcharges (2010) Which? to OFT
- Supply of beer in UK pubs (2009) Campaign for Real Ale to OFT (no action taken)
- Restrictions on business structures & direct access in the Scottish Legal Profession (2007) Which? to OFT
- Credit Card Interest calculation methods (2007) Which? to OFT
- ISAs (2010) Consumer Focus to FSA
- **Energy billing (2005)** energywatch to Ofgem
- Payment Protection Insurance (2005) Citizens Advice Bureau to OFT
- Northern Ireland Banks (2004) Which? to Competition Commission
- Care home sector (2003) Which? to OFT
- Mail consolidation (2003) Postwatch to OFT (not progressed)
- **Doorstep Selling (2002)** Citizens Advice Bureau
- Private dentistry market (2001) Which? to OFT



### **Process**

Carry out wider enquiries with a view to testing the evidence provided and obtaining any further information we consider necessary in order to form a reasoned view on whether the super-complaint justifies further action.

Exactly how it does this will be determined on a case by case basis but may involve:

- √ internal research
- ✓ public requests for information
- ✓ approaching any relevant businesses or trade associations for information
- ✓ approaching consumer organisations, government departments and/or other public bodies for information, or any other necessary action.
- the super-complainant will be kept informed of progress and may be contacted for clarification of issues or for further information as appropriate.



### Overview of the complaint

Which? has asked ORR to launch an investigation which addresses the following:

- 1. The extent to which TOCs are contributing to a low proportion of passengers securing their rights to compensation for delays (Section 2 evidence of conduct);
- 2. The drivers of TOCs' behaviour, and the pervasiveness of these drivers within the sector (Sections 3, 4, 5 market / regulatory structure & detriment caused);
- 3. Changes that are needed in regulation, and ultimately by TOCs, to ensure that passengers are aware of and are able to secure their rights to compensation (Section 6 -Remedies).



## Key evidence presented

- 1.  $\sum_{ALL\ TOCs}$  (No. of TOC passenger journeys **X** TOC proportion of CaSL trains) =  $\sim$ 47 million (Which? calculation)
- Latest ORR complaints data punctuality/reliability = 27.9%
- 3. ORR research (2014) Passenger compensation and refund rights for delays and cancellations <a href="http://orr.gov.uk/publications/reports/rail-passenger-compensation-and-refund-rights">http://orr.gov.uk/publications/reports/rail-passenger-compensation-and-refund-rights</a>
- Transport Focus research (2013) Understanding rail passengers delays and compensation (updated due 2016) <a href="http://www.transportfocus.org.uk/research/publications/understanding-rail-passengers-delays-and-compensation">http://www.transportfocus.org.uk/research/publications/understanding-rail-passengers-delays-and-compensation</a>
- 5. Which? Train Satisfaction Survey (November 2015) 6,986 members of the public surveyed about train journeys in the last 12 months;
- 6. Which? review of TOC Passenger Charters (November 2015)
- 7. Which? Mystery Shopping Exercise (September 2015) Which? fieldworkers visited 103 manned rail stations in England and Wales (TOC and NR managed stations)
- 8. Regulatory evidence from other sectors air travel and ferries
- 9. Emergence of commercial 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to inform passengers of eligibility for compensation and to assist claims e.g. Delay Repay Sniper, Delay-Repay.com, TrainRefunds.co.uk
- 10. Network Rail breakdown of attributed fault for delays (in year to November 14<sup>th</sup> 2015) & Which? estimates of passenger journeys affected Performance and punctuality (PPM) Network Rail

### Remedies proposed

- 1. New **licence condition** requiring TOCs to raise **PASSENGER AWARENESS** of their compensation rights:
  - Consequently a new regime of monitoring and enforcement monitoring outcomes for passengers & monitoring TOC actions (inputs such as train announcement)
- 2. New licence requirements on the PROCESS for claiming compensation
- 3. ORR monitoring of **complaints data** to clearly identify levels of complaints about delay compensation
- 4. Revision to **Schedule 8** compensation arrangements
- TOC licences to become principal means of implementing & enforcing consumer related requirements on TOCs (replacing roles of franchises and NRCoC in this area)

### Possible outcomes

- Enforcement action by the ORRs competition or consumer team
- Launching a market study into the issue with a potential market investigation reference to the CMA if there is a competition problem
- Regulatory action of some other kind e.g. proposals for a new licence condition
- Robust Industry Self-Regulation (ISR) in lieu of formal regulatory action
- A combination of measures e.g. regulatory / self-regulatory / research / on-going monitoring
- Finding the complaint requires **no action** or is **unfounded**



## What do we mean by Industry Self-Regulation (ISR)?

#### **FOUNDATION**

What is the basis of the initiative? Where do the obligations that the industry are committing to "live" and what is the key document setting out what to expect.

#### SCOPE

Are all TOCs "signatories" to the initiative – is it binding. For self-regulation to be effective it is not optional and not simply a statement of best practice. It involves binding commitments.

#### TRANSPARENCY

Is the initiative publicised by all parties, accessible to passengers and stakeholders and does it enable signatories to be held to account if they fail to deliver.

#### **MEASURABLE STANDARDS**

Can progress against the initiative be measured and tracked. Are there clear standards of performance or commitments to passengers (drafted in non-industry language)

#### **GOVERNANCE**

Has the initiative a clear and sustained governance structure enabling discussion (e.g. independent Chair), review, change control, and external challenge e.g. by the regulator, consumer groups.

#### INDEPENDENT **AUDIT / REVIEW**

Is there a publicised process of independent audit / review to demonstrate parties are compliant with the initiative / commitments to passengers e.g. mystery shopping.

#### REPORTING

Is there regular, formal and transparent reporting of performance at a TOC by TOC level

#### **SANCTIONS**

Is there a process for bringing about behavioural change if non-compliance or poor performance is identified.



### ORR approach to the super-complaint

# Stakeholder engagement

Initial industry briefing session 14th January

121 meetings with TOCs / ATOC w/c 18<sup>th</sup> January w/c 25<sup>th</sup> January

## **Evidence** gathering

Initial information request to TOCs
15th January

Initial data request to TOCs 15th January

Commission additional external research w/c 18<sup>th</sup> January

Open call for evidence for interested 3<sup>rd</sup> parties w/c 18<sup>th</sup> January

## Analysis & response

Review of all evidence to assess against Which? complaint

Further clarification of findings of TOC Information Requests / 121s

Development of public response document

Internal sign-off of response by ORR Board



RESPONSE BY 20<sup>th</sup> MARCH (FRI 18 MARCH)

### Immediate actions & next steps

- Detailed Information Request to being sent to all TOC by cop tomorrow response requested by <u>5pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> January</u>
- Separate Information Request (IR) to open access operators
- Dates and available time slots for 121 meetings will also be circulated tomorrow.
- Responses to ORR website review letter of 17<sup>th</sup> December (<u>due 22<sup>nd</sup> January</u>) will form part of our analysis of the issues raised in the super-complaint
- ➢ Previous TOC communications with Which? will TOCs share letters with ORR?
- TOCs to send ORR copies of online / station / on-board compensation claim forms can we receive copies of these by cop **Monday 18th January**

