



ticketing mailbox &lt;ticketing@culture.gov.uk&gt;

---

**Citizens Advice's response to the call for evidence on the online secondary ticketing market**2 messages

---

20 November 2015 at 16:58

To: ticketing@culture.gov.uk, "

Dear sirs

Please find attached our submission to the call for evidence as described.

If you have any problems or questions about our evidence please do not hesitate to get in touch

many thanks

Citizens Advice

Internal: ✓ | External: ✗

---

**Charity of the year 2015 - Charity Times**

---

The Citizens Advice service helps people resolve their legal, money and other problems by providing information and advice, and by influencing policymakers.

Notice: this email originates from Citizens Advice, an operating name of The National Association of Citizens Advice Bureaux (Charity Registration Number 279057, VAT number 726 0202 76, Company limited by guarantee, Registered Number 1436945 England, Registered office 3rd Floor North, 200 Aldersgate, London EC1A 4HD). It contains proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is for the intended recipient only. If an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this email, please notify the author by replying to this email. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or reply to this email (other than for the reason stated above).

**Intelligence to the BIS-DCMS review on secondary tickets market.docx**

52K

---

ticketing mailbox <ticketing@culture.gov.uk>

23 November 2015 at 13:11

11/23/2015

Department for Culture Media & Sport Mail - Citizens Advice's response to the call for evidence on the online secondary ticketing market

To: [redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]



**Intelligence to the BIS-DCMS review on secondary tickets market.docx**  
52K

# **Intelligence to the BIS/DCMS led review on the secondary ticket market**

November 2015



# About the Citizens Advice service

The Citizens Advice service provides free, independent, confidential and impartial advice to everyone about their rights and responsibilities. It values diversity, promotes equality and challenges discrimination.

The service aims:

- to provide the advice people need for the problems they face
- to improve the policies and practices that affect people's lives.

Citizens Advice is the membership body for Citizens Advice Bureaux in England and Wales. There are over 300 member bureaux in England and Wales giving advice from about 3,500 locations including high street bureaux, libraries, courts, prisons, GP's surgeries and hospitals.

Citizens Advice and Citizens Advice Scotland jointly run the Citizens Advice Consumer Service (formerly Consumer Direct), which provides consumers and small businesses with advice about problems with goods and services. The Consumer Service database also provides a source of intelligence for Trading Standards Services across Great Britain and national regulators.

# Methodology

To understand the problems faced by consumers within the secondary ticket market we looked at a range of call data from the Citizens Advice Consumer Service helpline. We do not currently have a single product/service code for isolating issues with tickets in our database setup, so for the purposes of this analysis we looked for the keyword "ticket" in several product/service codes which are likely to contain relevant cases. These codes were:

- Other personal goods and services - other
- Professional services - other
- Cinema
- Night Clubs
- Theatre
- Entertainment, catering and accommodation - other
- Sports and hobby equipment - other
- Other recreational goods and services - other
- Broadcasting -other

We also restricted cases to cover only those which were bought online. We did this analysis for the time frame 18 November 2014 - 17 November 2015 so we were using our most current data. Using this time frame also gave us roughly the same amount of time either side of 27 May 2015, when new legislation covering the secondary tickets market was brought into effect, helping a before and after analysis.

This method yielded 1282 cases of which we analysed only those where the trader name was given - 874 cases. This was so we could identify if the case was from a primary or secondary marketplace transaction. From this we found 299 were definitely to do with the secondary ticket market. This evidence submission now just covers the secondary ticket cases we received.

We analysed each case to do with online purchases through the secondary ticket market. Most of the useful information for this report came from the free text portion of the case record. We looked at this and recorded the following information

- was the case from a ticket buyer or a ticket seller?
- could the case be regarded as a scam?
- what was the type of event?
- the main issue of the call
- was the ticket purchased before or after 27 May 2015?

The findings of this analysis are covered below in the next two sections. The first comments on statistics around the case volumes and the second on the key issues we found consumers are having accompanied with case study evidence.

## **Statistics from the Citizens Advice Consumer Service**

### **Volumes of cases**

We found in total that there were 299 cases received about the secondary tickets market between 18 November 2014 and 17 November 2015. Looking at how the new legislation may have affected case volumes, we found that there were 202 cases received before 27 May 2015 and 92 received after. This is a drop of 54 per cent.

We have to be careful when interpreting this number however, as we found that sometimes people phoned us a long time after the purchase date. The calls reported on were gathered based on the call date and the 'before or after May 2015' analysis was based on the purchase date as this is what would be relevant to the legislation. This means that we would be cautious when interpreting this drop in calls as people who have had problems may not yet have contacted us whereas calls received could date back a long way potentially.

### **Status of the caller**

We found that the cases were mainly from buyers of tickets (88 per cent) rather than sellers (12 per cent). Looking at how this breakdown changed either side of 27 May 2015 it was largely the same with 10 per cent of cases being from ticket sellers before 27 May 2015 and 15 per cent after 27 May 2015. This second statistic is slightly higher but was based on only 92 cases so needs to be treated carefully. However, it may indicate there was a slight rise in calls from sellers after the new legislation came into effect.

### **Scams**

We found that 14 per cent of cases could be regarded as being about scams. Typical signs of a ticket scam which we used to identify them were, the payment being in ukash vouchers or person to person bank transfers and companies selling tickets and then disappearing shortly afterwards without providing the bought tickets.

Looking at this proportion either side of 27 May 2015 we found that the prevalence of cases about scams was higher after introduction of new legislation (20 per cent of cases) than before (11 per cent of cases).

### **Type of event**

The table below shows the top 10 types of events that cases about secondary ticket sales were about. For sporting events, where the name of the event was explicitly mentioned we recorded this as the type of event e.g. Rugby World Cup. The largest category by far was concerts making up 56 per cent of total cases, then where the type of event was unclear (11 per cent of cases), football matches (7 per cent of cases) and festivals, largely music festivals, (4 per cent of cases).

<b>Type of event</b>	<b>Number of cases (Nov 14 - Nov 15)</b>
Concert	167
Unclear	33
Football match	20
Festival	13
Theatre	11
Comedy	9
Unknown sporting event	7
Rugby world cup	6
Rugby match	6
Show	3

We looked at how the type of event differed either side of 27 May 2015 and this is shown below for the top 5 categories. When interpreting these numbers you have to consider seasonal effects may skew certain categories e.g. there may be more festival tickets sold after May as most festivals are over the summer although there are large amounts also sold far in advance.

The most interesting effect is for concert tickets, the largest category. There is a sharp reduction in the number of cases after 27 May 2015, 44 cases compared to 120, a fall of 63 per cent. With concerts you would expect little seasonal variation with concerts happening throughout the year however we see a sharp

reduction in cases. We may be able to link this drop to the effectiveness of the new legislation.

Type of event / before or after 27 May 2015	Number of cases
<b>Concert</b>	<b>164</b>
Pre-May 2015	120
Post-May 2015	44
<b>Unclear</b>	<b>33</b>
Pre-May 2015	19
Post-May 2015	14
<b>Football match</b>	<b>20</b>
Pre-May 2015	12
Post-May 2015	8
<b>Festival</b>	<b>13</b>
Pre-May 2015	3
Post-May 2015	10
<b>Theatre</b>	<b>11</b>
Pre-May 2015	9
Post-May 2015	2

### Main Issue of case

When considering the main issue of the case we have considered the issues faced by buyers and sellers of ticket separately as they had different problems when engaging in the secondary ticket marketplace

The below table shows the top 10 issues for buyers of secondary tickets November 2014 to November 2015. As mentioned before 264 of 299 cases were from buyers (88 per cent). The main issues buyers had were tickets not being received (22 per cent of cases), the cost of the ticket compared to its face value (21 per cent of cases) and issues with getting refunds (16 per cent of cases).



Type of issue	Number of cases
Tickets not received	59
Cost Vs face value	55
Refund issues	43
Misleading information	14
Problems using ticket	13
Selling Practices	12
Change in schedule	11
Fake/counterfeit tickets	11
Hidden fees	9
Duplicate tickets	9

The table below shows the top 5 issues faced by sellers of tickets in the secondary market place. We found that 35 of 299 cases were from sellers of tickets (12 per cent). The main issues faced were problems receiving their payment once the ticket sold and problems around being refunded when the ticket bought was refunded.

Type of issue	Number of cases (Nov 14 to Nov 15)
Receipt of payment	13
Refund issues	6
Cancellation issues	5
Liable for double sale	3
Purchase problems	3

The table below shows what the top issues for sellers were before and after 27 May 2015.

Type of issue	Number of cases
<b>Tickets not received</b>	<b>59</b>
Pre-May 2015	43
Post-May 2015	16
<b>Cost Vs face value</b>	<b>53</b>
Pre-May 2015	38
Post-May 2015	15
<b>Refund issues</b>	<b>42</b>
Pre-May 2015	30
Post-May 2015	12
<b>Misleading information</b>	<b>14</b>
Pre-May 2015	8
Post-May 2015	6
<b>Problems using ticket</b>	<b>13</b>
Pre-May 2015	7
Post-May 2015	6

For the top 3 issues there have been steep drops in the numbers of cases. As mentioned above, we have to be careful when interpreting these numbers as this date is based on the purchase date of the case (when the ticket was bought) not when the call was received so the pre-May 2015 category could include cases from a year or more ago. Conversely people who have already had a problem may not have yet called but may do so in the future.

For issues faced by sellers the number of cases is too small to do any meaningful before and after 27 May 2015 analysis and so we have not reported this here.

# Discussion of main problems faced and case studies

We now explore the top issues seen further and include case study information to support our findings and claims.

## **Tickets not being received**

The most common issue reported by our clients relating to secondary ticket issues was not receiving the goods they had paid for. There were 59 cases where this was the main issue, 23 of which were scams. These cases are discussed in detail in the scams section below. Of the remaining 36 cases the majority referred instances where consumers did not receive tickets via resale marketplaces in time to go to their event:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in September 2015 and described how they had purchased tickets in December 2014 for a concert in September 2015. The tickets were sold through a secondary ticket website by a private seller. The client received an email stating their order has been received but that the tickets may not be delivered until three days before the event. The client has not received the tickets and has missed the event. They have tried to contact the ticket website but have received no reply.

This is an inherent problem with some secondary ticket marketplaces as they only facilitate a transaction between buyers and sellers and ultimately they have no control over whether sellers dispatch their tickets on time, or indeed at all.

There was also evidence of some problems with couriers or postal services that resulted in tickets not being received by consumers. Again, this was something that was out of the control of secondary ticket sellers, but some did refund consumers. Despite this, some of our clients suffered consequential losses which were not acknowledged:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in August 2015 and described how they had purchased some resale tickets through a large online marketplace in May 2014. They were given a specific delivery date for the tickets which was not honoured. The client then contacted the delivery company who admitted that the tickets had been mislaid. They raised a dispute with the ticket seller who refunded the client. The tickets were eventually delivered two weeks after the event. The client contacted the seller and explained that they had suffered

consequential losses as a result of not being able to attend the event. Not only did they not receive an apology or any compensation, but the trader did not even acknowledge their complaint.

Although cases since the introduction of the new Consumer Rights Act legislation on secondary ticket sales have fallen, there is nothing in the new rules that would impact on cases such as these, other than seasonal trends in the purchase of tickets generally. It is likely that many consumers who purchased tickets after 27 May 2015 have yet to encounter problems with delivery of their tickets as the events are yet to take place.

### **Cost**

There were 55 cases where clients complained about the cost of resale tickets. The majority of people took issue with the price they were charged in comparison to the face value of the ticket. Many only realised the stark contrast between the two once they had actually received the tickets:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in January 2015 and described how they purchased tickets online in August 2014 for Mrs Brown's Boys Live at the First Direct Arena. They paid a total of £218.59 for two tickets. When they received the tickets they discovered that each had a face value of £39.50 each. The client felt they had been grossly overcharged by a reseller or a tout and complained about the business practice of the seller (a large and well known online secondary ticket marketplace). They felt that these sorts of websites should be more closely regulated to avoid consumers being ripped off.

This suggests that many secondary ticket sellers are not providing the face value of the ticket to consumers before they agree to a contract to allow them to make an informed choice. This is something that was addressed in chapter 5 of the Consumer Rights Act 2015 which came into effect on 27 May 2015. Our evidence would suggest that the new legislation has had an impact in this area and has in turn led to a reduction in complaints about the cost of secondary tickets. Of the 55 cases relating to cost, 38 refer to tickets purchased prior to 27 May 2015 with only 15 after that date.

Another common driver of complaints about cost was the fact that many consumers did not realise they were purchasing secondary tickets. Some were directed from primary selling sites to associated secondary selling sites which they found very misleading. Only after they had made the purchase did they discover that the same tickets were available for sale from primary ticket sellers for a much lower price:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in March 2015 and described how they had been online on a large primary ticket retailer's website. When they clicked on an event they were interested in they were redirected to a sister site where they made their purchase. When they received the tickets they discovered that they had paid way more than the face value of the tickets. The client felt this practice was extremely unfair.

This is again an issue that has been addressed in the Consumer Rights Act that requires secondary ticket sellers to make it clear to consumers in what capacity they are operating before they agree to a contract. The reduction in cases since 27 May is again evidence that trader practice in this area may have improved. Despite this, there is clearly a lack of knowledge amongst consumers as to how the ticketing market works and the differences between primary and secondary retailers or market places.

### **Cancellation/Refunds**

There were 60 cases in total where callers to the Consumer Service complained about problems with cancelling tickets purchased through secondary vendors or with obtaining refunds. In 11 cases our clients specifically complained about being unable to cancel their purchase or rearrange the tickets for another day. In many cases this was the result of an innocent mistake by the client, such as selecting the wrong date or type of ticket, or an incorrect number of tickets:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in December 2014 and described how they had ordered tickets for a One Direction concert via a large online secondary ticket marketplace. They mistakenly ordered four tickets when they only wanted two. They contacted the trader straight away, but they are refusing to cancel the additional tickets.

However, some consumers were unable to cancel their purchase even after a mistake by the seller.

A client contacted the Consumer Service in March 2015 and described how they had purchased a ticket from an online secondary seller to send their friend. They then received an email from the vendor stating the tickets had already been sold to someone else and that they would find them alternative tickets. The client was advised that they would be charged £15 if they wanted to cancel the purchase. They stated they did not want to cancel, however, the trader replied by email stating they had charged the client £15 to cancel their order, as well as an additional unknown charge of £23.72.

Some of the issues seen in cases where our clients encountered problems obtaining a refund were similar to cancellation with many people complaining that the seller refused to provide redress when they made a mistake in their purchase or were unable to attend events. For the majority of ticket sellers we looked at they quite clearly state in their terms and conditions that purchases are non refundable (unless the event is cancelled or postponed) but there is a certainly a lack of awareness by consumers as to their rights in relation to ticket purchases, in particular the fact that these types of contracts are not covered under the distance selling regulations in the Consumer Contracts Regulations.

There were, however, significant problems for some consumers who were entitled to a refund due to cancellation or rescheduling of events. Some of our clients complained about the length of time it took them to obtain a refund following cancelled events, despite the ticket seller stating that they would receive it within 14 days of the event date. Some people also had problems getting hold of ticket sellers when they were due a refund:

A client emailed the Consumer Service in July 2015 and described how they had purchased tickets to see the Foo Fighters in June, but the event was cancelled due to the lead singer breaking his leg. The secondary ticket retailer through whom they purchased the tickets informed the client that they would refund them within 10 days. No refund materialised so the client tried contacting them via email and phone, but to no avail. They also left messages on twitter and discovered that numerous other people had encountered this problem.

Some of our clients who were successful in obtaining a refund for cancelled or postponed events complained that they were only refunded the face value of the ticket. They did not get back the handling fees, delivery charges and ticket protection fees (that were sometimes added through a pre ticked box) which amounted for a significant percentage of the overall cost in some instances:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in June 2015 and described how they had purchased tickets in February 2015 to see Fleetwood Mac. The concert was then cancelled due to illness of one of the band members. The ticket seller contacted the client and stated they would refund the cost of the ticket minus the 15 per cent the client paid in fees and handling charges. The client complained but the trader merely pointed them to the terms and conditions. The client felt this was unfair as they paid £285 for the tickets so have lost over £40.

As is the trend with all secondary ticket cases, there were significantly less calls relating to refunds and cancellation after 27 May 2015 compared to before.

There is nothing in the new legislation that impacts on the cancellation or refund of secondary tickets.

### **Misleading information**

We looked at 14 cases where our clients had complained about misleading information provided by secondary ticket sellers. Almost all of these instances referred to people who had not been given the correct information about where their seats were located or whether they had a restricted view or not:

In August 2015 a client contacted the Consumer Service and described how they had purchased some tickets for a football match from an online secondary ticket site. They ordered two adult tickets, but when they arrived they discovered they had one adult and one junior ticket that were in separate parts of the stadium. The client contacted the trader for a refund but they did not respond to them.

The new regulations introduced in May 2015 state that secondary ticket vendors must provide accurate information to consumers about where their seat or ticket is located in a venue or standing area. Despite the relatively low number of cases in this category, our evidence would suggest that the introduction of the new legislation has had little impact on the practices of secondary ticket sellers or marketplaces, as 6 cases were for tickets purchased after 27 May 2015, compared to 8 before. The disparity between these numbers is far less than the figures for other issues raised in this document.

One reason why traders may be unable to provide accurate information about the type or location of tickets purchased through secondary ticket sites is that they appear to agree to sales of tickets for events without actually being in possession of the tickets, or when those types of tickets have already sold out:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in January 2015 and described how they had purchased three tickets for a concert from a large online secondary ticket retailer. They selected the seats they were happy with and completed the purchase but the confirmation email stated they had been allocated standing tickets. The seller stated they were allowed to do this if they could no longer provide the original tickets. The client agreed that this would be fine if they were still given seated tickets but pointed out that they were less than 5 feet tall, therefore standing tickets would be completely inappropriate. The seller refused to cancel or refund the client and they are reluctant to try and sell them on again as this will just generate more fees for the company.

### **Problems for sellers**

Sellers of tickets on the secondary market largely had problems with receiving their money once the tickets had been sold and getting a refund for a sold ticket when the event was cancelled.

Sellers had problems receiving their money for a variety of reasons. Sellers were often told by secondary ticket websites that they would be paid either after they had sent the tickets on to the buyer or after the event had happened. This did not always happen however and sellers found it difficult to then contact the website

A client went on traders website on 02 July 2015 to a 3rd party but through trader. Trader stated that they would pay client after she had sent the ticket. Client was meant to get £350. Trader stated it would come on 13 July 2015 but client hasn't received payment. Client has no contact details of trader, Client hasn't received a response from trader. The case was received 13 July 2015.

In one particular case we saw a seller did not receive the money for his ticket as he was told the tickets were not sold but the secondary ticket website did deduct their commission from his account. This case involved particularly valuable tickets and so the detriment was quite large. The trader did eventually refund the seller and offered them some compensation.

A client bought some tickets to see a comedian. The comedian decided to retire. Client decided to sell the tickets via Trader. The tickets never got sold. Client did not think anymore of it. Trader then took £900 out of his account. Client contacted Trader. Trader has offered a full refund and a £200 voucher. Client wants the £3,000 trader claimed to have sold the tickets for when £900 was taken.

With refunds there were two separate types of issues seen. The first was that secondary ticket websites were not being clear to sellers what they have to do in order to get a refund i.e. when an event did not go ahead. In two cases sellers were told one thing only to later being told another when they enquired why they had not received their refund.



Caller is calling from CAB on behalf of a client, she is the consumer. Consumer bought tickets to see Fleetwood Mac at the O2 arena in Manchester on 12 May 2015. Consumer ended up selling the tickets through a secondary ticket website at the end of May to a buyer. The concert was cancelled on the day it was due to go ahead.

Consumer contacted the website who said they wouldn't need the tickets back but wait for further info. The buyer was then she would need to give the tickets back and contacted the website to send them back. The website sent them to consumer's address whilst consumer was working offshore so missed the deadline for when they had to be back. Buyer of these tickets have been refunded twice.

This case also shows discrepancies between how buyers and sellers of tickets are treated by secondary ticket websites. It appears the buyer of the resold tickets received better service than the ticket seller.

The second type of issue faced was about disproportionate amounts being refunded to ticket sellers compared to the buyer. The case study below also shows that secondary ticket platforms are not always following their own terms and conditions.

A client bought tickets and then was unable to attend. Client sold ticket via secondary ticket platform. The full event was not able to take place. Platform has refunded buyer 60% and Client 40% due to main part of event not happening. Platform's T&Cs state if event goes ahead, even partially and entry is gained and not stopped platform will pay client in full.

## **Scams**

In total we looked at 42 of secondary ticket cases that were scams. The vast majority of these were perpetrated by private sellers via online platforms such as gumtree, Facebook and Ebay. It was typical for individuals to offer high value tickets, usually festival or popular concert tickets, for sale online. Consumers would then agree to the purchase and send payment via bank transfer. They then never received the tickets, or the ones that they received were counterfeit:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in June 2015 and described how they had seen a seller on Facebook advertising a physical ticket (not an e-ticket) for Secret Garden Party music festival. The client messaged the seller and agreed to

pay £210 for the ticket. They transferred the money but did not receive the ticket. The seller then asked for more money stating that the account details they provided previously were old. The client refused to pay any more money and the seller has now blocked their number.

There were also a number of scams reported to us that were operated through large secondary ticket vendors or marketplaces. These scams were similar to the private sale scams highlighted above, however, we have no evidence to suggest that resale companies are complicit in fraudulent activity. It is more likely that they are simply not carrying out adequate checks into the validity of the tickets they agree to resell. Despite this, it led some of our clients to believe that the company themselves were a scam, especially when they refused to provide a refund:

In November 2015 a client rang the Consumer Service and described how they had purchased tickets for a football match on the website of a large secondary ticket marketplace. When the client received the tickets they discovered that they were fake. They contacted the trader to cancel their purchase and obtain a refund but they were refused. The client now believes the company and the website are fraudulent.

There were a handful of examples of smaller scam companies whose sole intention was to defraud people. It was common for them to accept payment for resale tickets only for these not to materialise. The consumer then found it impossible to contact the company:

A client contacted the Consumer Service in May 2015 and described how they had ordered concert tickets through a ticket exchange website in November 2014. They were charged in Euros and received receipt of payment, but by May the following year they had heard nothing from the company. They called them repeatedly on the number provided but the phone is never answered. Client wanted advice on how to proceed.

### **Other issues and concerns**

When analysing the cases for this report we also came upon evidence of other issues with the secondary tickets market which do not fit neatly into the structure of this report. We therefore present them here.

We have found several cases where through their experiences consumers have suspected that secondary ticket vendors are sourcing large amounts of tickets for sale in the secondary market at the same time or even before tickets on the

primary market are being sold. In the example below an event quickly sold out on the primary market website so the consumer was directed to the company's secondary ticket website where large amounts of tickets were instantly available. In particular the speed by which this happened aroused the consumers suspicion.

A client tried to buy some concert tickets through a large primary tickets vendor. Client states that within minutes there were no tickets left. The vendor linked Client to a secondary ticket service. Client bought tickets from the secondary ticket vendor @ £60.50 + processing fee of £35. Client feels that it's strange that so many people within about 120 seconds managed to buy tickets and then put them to sale straight away after on the secondary platform. The Client feels that something strange is happening on the site. Client feels that the process of purchase which is timed forces people to make quick decisions to enter into a contract.

I am writing regarding the practice of concert & event ticket selling from a primary ticket vendor. Like many other frustrated ticket buyers I attempt to buy tickets via them only to be informed that there are none available. This happens from the minute that they go on sale. However the vendor then provide you with a link to their secondary / resale ticket sales website where you can buy the same tickets at extremely inflated prices. These are from supposedly people who have bought tickets that can no longer attend or in most cases looking to make a profit.

This constantly happens for many large events when the capacity can be from 10,000 ticket upwards. I understand that popular events will sell out but when there are thousands of tickets on the secondary ticket website from the minute they go on sale it feels like they have been brought from the primary vendor and the resold for their profit on the other sites. This can easily be a personal conspiracy theory on how their system works but I like many others feel that the system should be investigated and regulated to be fair for the genuine concert goer who wants to pay the advertised fee.

## Annex 1– Coding systems used by the Citizens Advice Consumer Service

Since April 2012 Citizens Advice has run the Consumer Service (previously Consumer Direct) providing advice to consumers in England, Wales and Scotland by phone and email. In 2012/13 the service dealt with 880,000 enquiries. Any member of the public can call in relation to pre-shopping advice, information on consumer rights, advice on specific problems, and referral or signposting to other organisations.

The data captured about an enquiry includes:

- the details of the trader and the consumer,
- the type of goods or service,
- the type of trading practice,
- the purchase and payment method,
- the payment amount, and brief case notes.

However, it is important to note that only one topic can be coded in each area, meaning that the call handlers must decide which they think is the most important element of the call even if an enquiry is complex. No information is captured about the client profile.

Cases are also coded according to type of case:

- Trader complaints are cases that involve a specific incident between a consumer and one or more trader. These may obviously be complaints or may simply be questions about an incident. In either case these are recorded as Trader Complaints. All Trader Complaints which seem to the call handler to show a civil or criminal breach of consumer protection legislation are automatically shared with the relevant Trading Standards Service.
- An enquiry is a request for information/advice about a consumer matter but where the request is not seeking advice on a specific incident.
- Feedback case types are used to record complaints and compliments related to the Consumer Service, partners involved in handling a Consumer Service case or other complaints about consumer services which the customer thinks the Consumer Service should deal with.
- Out of scope contacts are contacts that are not about consumer matters