

Trader Recommendation Platforms

**Consumer law compliance advice for
businesses**

Response to consultation document

12 November 2024

© Crown copyright 2024

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Response to consultation questions	5

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document summarises the main comments made by stakeholders to the Competition and Markets Authority's (CMA) consultation on draft consumer law compliance advice for trader recommendation platforms (TRPs) (Draft Compliance Advice).¹
- 1.2 It also sets out the CMA's response to these comments and, where relevant, the corresponding changes it has made to the final advice. The final version of the advice is available on the [CMA website](#).
- 1.3 Alongside the Compliance Advice, the CMA is publishing a document with [practical tips for consumers using TRPs](#) and a short and accessible document summarising the main content of the [Compliance Advice](#).

Compliance Advice

- 1.4 As part of its role, the CMA produces compliance advice and guidance for businesses to clarify their legal obligations and promote compliance.
- 1.5 The CMA's Compliance Advice for TRPs will help TRPs to understand and comply with their consumer protection law obligations in relation to their consumer-facing practices (eg the services, marketing and webpage content that they direct at consumers).
- 1.6 Given the widespread use of TRPs by people to find traders, including for building, home improvement work and the installation of greener and more efficient home heating solutions, this work closely aligns with the CMA's strategic priorities, set out in our 2024/25 Annual Plan, to ensure that people can be confident they are getting great choices and fair deals in areas of essential spending, and helping to accelerate the transition to a Net Zero economy.

Consultation on Draft Compliance Advice

- 1.7 Between 11 July 2024 and 16 August 2024, we carried out a public consultation on the Draft Compliance Advice. This was published on the CMA website and subsequently publicised to a range of stakeholders, including to

¹ [Compliance advice for trader recommendation platforms - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

consumer users of TRPs, TRPs, consumer organisations, and other consumer protection law enforcement bodies.

- 1.8 We received 34 formal written responses to the public consultation. We thank all respondents for their constructive engagement in this consultation.

Actions following consultation

- 1.9 We have carefully considered all the responses to our consultation, but we do not discuss every point made by respondents in this document or set out every change we have made to the final Compliance Advice. Instead, we focus on what we consider to be the main themes which emerged during the consultation, and a summary of these is set out in section 2 of this document. We also summarise the CMA's response to these points and explain whether, and if so how, we have amended the final advice to reflect any of the comments received.
- 1.10 We are now publishing our final Compliance Advice. We may, of course, review the Compliance Advice from time to time, to ensure that it remains current and relevant to businesses.
- 1.11 The Digital Markets, Competition and Consumer Act 2024 (DMCC Act) received Royal Assent on 24 May 2024², but the provisions relating to consumer protection are yet to come into force. The DMCC Act will give the CMA powers to determine itself whether consumer law has been infringed and the ability to impose monetary penalties and order firms to pay compensation to affected consumers. Whilst the DMCC Act will replace the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (CPRs) with new provisions on unfair commercial practices, those new provisions maintain much of the scope and effect of the CPRs. We do not therefore expect that the DMCC Act coming into force will impact on the substance of the advice.

Next steps

- 1.12 The main purpose of compliance advice is to help businesses understand and comply with their existing obligations under consumer law.
- 1.13 With this in mind, we have worked and will continue working closely with key stakeholders in the sector (including trade bodies and consumer protection

² See the final version of the DMCC Act here: [Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act 2024 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://legislation.gov.uk), which received Royal Assent and became law on 24 May 2024, but is yet to come into force.

associations) to help us in disseminating, and drawing businesses' attention to, our Compliance Advice, as well as in setting out our expectation that businesses will review and, if necessary, make changes to their marketing materials and practices to ensure compliance with consumer law as soon as possible. The Compliance Advice has also been published on the CMA's website.

- 1.14 The CMA will continue to monitor TRPs' compliance with consumer law, as part of its general intelligence-gathering functions (for example, through the receipt of complaints or other intelligence about a trader). Should potential infringements be identified, the CMA or another consumer enforcement body may decide to take action.³
- 1.15 Trading Standards Services also have a key role to play in ensuring TRPs comply with consumer law. We will continue to work closely with those enforcement partners.

2. Response to consultation questions

- 2.1 The CMA's consultation on its Draft Compliance Advice for TRPs invited responses to the questions shown in bold below.
- 2.2 We have carefully considered all the responses received as part of the consultation.
- 2.3 The CMA's response to the main issues highlighted is included after each question.
- 2.4 We note that several consultation responses included points relevant to a number of the questions asked. To avoid repetition, we have not repeated every point under every question. Instead, we have described the point under the question to which we think it most closely relates. This is in addition to considering it more generally for all aspects of the Compliance Advice.

Questions on scope

Is the scope of the Draft Compliance Guidance appropriate and clear? If not, what else should this compliance advice address and why? Are there any

³ Subject, in the CMA's case, to its prioritisation principles at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cma-prioritisation-principles>.

additional sector-specific considerations which the Draft Compliance Advice needs to reflect? If so, what are these and why? How can these be addressed?

- 2.5 A significant number of respondents suggested that the scope of the Draft Compliance Advice could be extended and/or be clearer to avoid circumvention and ensure a level playing among the different types of TRPs in the market.
- 2.6 Some respondents argued that the scope of Draft Compliance Advice should be broadened to include: a) services embedded within search engines, in particular the Google Local Service Ads (LSAs) and Google My Business services; b) online marketplaces; c) review platforms; and d) other online forums such as Facebook’s Notice Board.
- 2.7 One respondent submitted that whether a platform should be considered to be recommending traders will be very fact-specific and may involve a finely balanced decision.
- 2.8 Some respondents suggested our definition of TRP needed further clarification; otherwise it could create uncertainty for businesses about whether they fall in scope of the advice, including about whether they are creating implicit impressions about the traders listed or hosted on their platforms.
- 2.9 One respondent noted that not all principles set out in the Draft Compliance Advice (in particular, principles 2 and 4) are appropriate for platforms with a business model which provides traders with a high-level of autonomy (ie ‘independent contractor’ model), as these principles suggest treating independent contractors in the same manner as employees. Another respondent asked for further clarity and consistency around the exclusion from the scope of the Draft Compliance Advice of sites that only display directories of traders and consumer review sites. This respondent argued that the Compliance Advice should apply to TRPs making explicit representations on traders’ reliability and verifications standards.
- 2.10 One respondent questioned whether the Draft Compliance Advice was intended to apply to standards bodies relating to traders that do not fall into the field of green heating, solar products and insulation.⁴ This respondent noted that the principles in the Draft Compliance Advice are not necessarily consistent with the advice for standards bodies, which can create additional

⁴ Paragraph 6 of the Draft Compliance Advice state that it “is not aimed at standards bodies. In the field of green heating, solar products and insulation, the CMA has produced separate good practice principles for ‘standard bodies’.

complexity. Another respondent proposed the inclusion of a clearer definition of 'standard bodies' to avoid the risk that some businesses that are intended to be covered by the Draft Compliance Advice would consider themselves 'standard bodies'.

CMA response

- 2.11 We have carefully considered the suggestions made by respondents in relation to extending the scope of the advice.
- 2.12 We have clarified the definition of TRP to focus on the type of activity which the Compliance Advice applies to, namely operating a website or app that expressly or implicitly recommends traders.
- 2.13 Businesses must assess themselves against the definition and consider whether the Compliance Advice applies to them. We consider that the clarifications we have made will make it easier for businesses to assess whether some or all of their services fall within the scope of the Compliance Advice. It moves the focus from whether the business is categorised, for example, as a search engine, an online marketplace or online review platform, to the services that the business actually offers and the expectations it creates for the customers that use it. We consider that businesses that make implied representations about the traders' trustworthiness and reliability should stay within scope of the Compliance Advice to avoid circumvention. Consumers can be misled by express or implicit representations about traders' quality and reliability. When a business is considering whether it is a TRP, it should interpret the definition broadly and in the round to ensure it stays on the right side of the law. In particular, when assessing whether consumers would consider them to be implicitly recommending traders, they should look at all their marketing and activities and not just focus on certain aspects of their practices without having regard to their context.
- 2.14 In line with the clarification of the definition of TRP, we agree that a blanket exclusion for search engines and social media platforms is not necessary or appropriate, because certain services offered by these businesses could be covered by the Compliance Advice to the extent that they involve expressly or implicitly recommending traders. Ultimately this will involve a case-by-case assessment.
- 2.15 In relation to 'standard bodies', we have defined what we mean by 'standard bodies' and clarified that, to the extent they provide services falling within the definition of a TRP, those services fall within the scope of the Compliance Advice, without prejudice to other obligations these entities may be subject to as 'standard bodies'.

2.16 We consider that the revised definition of TRP brings into the scope of the Compliance Advice the different type of businesses that must comply with its principles to stay on the right side of consumer law and protect consumers, as well as ensuring a level playing field among those businesses. The Compliance Advice does not require businesses within scope to follow a particular business model, but rather sets out principles which businesses who present themselves (or are likely to be perceived) as TRPs should follow to ensure consumers are not misled and that they are operating on the right side of consumer law. We have clarified that each TRP operates differently based on its size, business model, and the specific services it offers to consumers. Therefore, businesses should carefully evaluate how the principles outlined in this advice apply to their particular platform and operations.

Questions on the Compliance principles

Are the principles identified in the Draft Compliance Advice the right principles? If not, why not?

What other principles would help TRPs comply with consumer protection law and why?

Is the description of the principles sufficiently clear? If not, what needs to be done to improve their clarity?

2.17 There was general support for the principles from respondents. It was broadly agreed that the principles were the correct ones and covered the key issues in the sector.

2.18 In relation to principle 1,⁵ one respondent argued that this principle should require TRPs to be transparent about whether they are providing these services for profit or not, as this may be material information for consumers when deciding whether, and to what extent, they have confidence in the traders being recommended by a particular TRP.

2.19 In relation to principle 2:⁶

- a) a couple of respondents noted that some of the suggested vetting checks (eg identity checks) are not necessarily relevant to determining whether the trader is capable of conducting the required task.

⁵ Principle 1 refers to representations made by TRPs to consumers.

⁶ Principle 2 refers to TRPs vetting practices.

- b) a few respondents commented that some of the vetting checks, including checking the certifications and guarantees claimed by each trader, as well as verifying traders' claims (eg claims about their experience or geographic location), can be difficult and burdensome. In particular, one respondent noted that there is no centralised database which would allow TRPs to verify trader accreditations easily.
- c) one respondent asked for clarity as to whether and how the Compliance Advice applies to existing traders who have already been vetted, noting that the required checks will incur additional cost and time.
- 2.20 More generally, a couple of respondents expressed concerns that the vetting requirements set out in principle 2 were not in line with an 'independent contractor' model and would transfer any risk that exists from traders themselves to the TRPs.
- 2.21 In relation to principle 3,⁷ one respondent questioned what the legal basis was to require a TRP to have a complaints process, not only in relation to traders, but in relation to the platform itself.
- 2.22 In relation to the examples in principle 4,⁸ a small number of respondents commented that it was unclear how frequently a TRP had to repeat vetting checks as part of their ongoing monitoring. One respondent noted that it should be clearer that it is not necessarily the case that all the initial checks need to be repeated
- 2.23 In relation to principle 5,⁹ one respondent proposed that this principle would benefit from making clear that decisions relating to investigations and sanctions should be impartial from commercial or other organisational considerations.
- 2.24 In relation to principles 3 and 5, one respondent suggested that the Compliance Advice should clarify whether TRPs are required to implement these principles under consumer law.
- 2.25 In relation to principle 6,¹⁰ one respondent noted that the DMCC Act imposes obligations in relation to online reviews, on which the CMA is already committed to providing guidance in due course. This respondent recommended that, given the potential for overlapping conflicting guidance,

⁷ Principle 3 refers to TRPs complaints processes.

⁸ Principle 4 refers to TRPs monitoring activities.

⁹ Principle 5 refers to TRPs investigation and sanction procedures.

¹⁰ Principle 6 refers to TRPs collection, moderation and publication of consumer online reviews.

the Compliance Advice does not make recommendations regarding online reviews pending the entry into force of the relevant provisions of the DMCC Act.

- 2.26 A couple of respondents noted that principle 6 should take account of proportionality given the different sizes of TRPs and resources available to comply with this principle, including effectively moderating online reviews. One respondent proposed that principle 6 should guard against the risk of TRPs bypassing the requirements on proprietary reviews by instead displaying reviews from other platforms.
- 2.27 A few respondents suggested that the Compliance Advice could set out additional principles:
- a) one new principle about TRPs' obligation to co-operate, in a timely manner, with a law enforcement agency in relation to the investigation of any offence or misconduct of traders that are, or were, listed on their platform, including when that agency makes a lawful request for information;¹¹ and
 - b) another principle about ensuring levels of financial protection for consumers using a TRP, including when traders take out deposits.

CMA's response

- 2.28 The Compliance Advice is intended to promote a level playing field, in which all TRPs, regardless of whether their operations are for profit or not, comply with consumer law. In either case TRPs providing services to consumers must comply with consumer law. However, we have clarified that TRPs should clearly state when and how commercial relationships have affected the traders presented to consumers and ensure all advertising is clearly identifiable (eg preferencing those traders who pay greater commission).
- 2.29 In relation to principle 2, we note that some checks - such as the identity of the trader - are not necessarily indicative of a trader's ability to perform the contracted task. However, these and other vetting checks set out in the Compliance Advice are important to protect consumers from people they will engage with and who, as traders, will, in many instances, have access to their house. These checks are also important to ensure that consumers have the

¹¹ A few respondents noted that this obligation could and should be incorporated as part of principle 5.

necessary information to contact and take action against the trader if things go wrong.

- 2.30 We have amended principle 2 to clarify that TRPs are only required to check the certifications, registrations and affiliations claimed by each trader, when such certifications, registrations and affiliations are required by law and/or when conducting a task without such certifications relate to activities which pose a safety risk for consumers.
- 2.31 We have also clarified that TRPs should have the necessary processes in place to ensure that the claims that traders make on their platform (eg claims about membership of a professional trading body, experience, geographic location) are not misleading. This gives TRPs flexibility about the procedures they adopt to achieve this objective, which must be appropriate.
- 2.32 We added that, for traders that are already on a TRP, the TRP should have regard to principle 2 when conducting future checks as part of the ongoing monitoring required in principle 5 of the Compliance Advice.
- 2.33 As mentioned above, the Compliance Advice, including principle 2, does not require businesses to change their business model, but rather ensures that TRPs meet consumers' expectations and stay on the right side of consumer law, in view of the fact that they are expressly or implicitly recommending traders and their representations to consumers about the service they provide.
- 2.34 In relation to principle 3, the CPRs prohibit unfair practices which affect a wide range of decisions taken by consumers and can apply to commercial practices after a consumer receives a service, including, in particular, as regards how and when consumers are able to exercise their rights if they encounter a problem after using a TRP. Incorrect or inadequate information about how to complain, and the way in which complaints are handled, may discourage or prevent consumers from exercising their rights and thereby affect their economic decision-making. Omitting information or providing information that is misleading, about how consumers can complain may breach the CPRs. In addition, failing to have in place proper complaints handling or customer service systems may breach the requirements of professional diligence and appreciably impair consumers' ability to make informed decisions. As a result, this may also breach the CPRs.¹²

¹² We have also amended the drafting of paragraph 46(d) of the Draft Compliance Advice to avoid any misinterpretation that we were suggesting that TRPs should allow complaints to be made about a trader's work not booked with the assistance of a TRP, or arranged through another TRP.

- 2.35 In relation to the question raised about principle 4, we do not consider that it is appropriate to be prescriptive about how frequently TRPs should revisit and refresh their initial vetting checks. TRPs should use reasonable judgement to decide when it is necessary to repeat vetting checks and what vetting checks need to be repeated, applying a risk-based approach.
- 2.36 In relation to principle 5, we have expanded it to cover the suggestions made by some respondents about the need for TRPs' investigation processes and sanctions to be conducted and determined in an unbiased way.
- 2.37 In relation to principle 6, we consider that:
- a) It is important that the Compliance Advice is comprehensive and covers online reviews, a material aspect of many TRPs' offering, in order to ensure that consumers can trust online reviews when choosing a trader. As mentioned above, the CMA proposes to review the Compliance Advice from time to time and, when the CMA issues new general guidance on online reviews, we can assess whether any changes are required in Principle 6 of Compliance Advice for consistency with the expected general guidance.
 - b) Regardless of their size, TRPs' approach to online reviews should be consistent with this principle to stay on the right side of consumer law. The Compliance Advice is not prescriptive about the measures that TRPs should adopt to comply with this principle (eg the measures developed and used to tackle fake and misleading reviews should be determined by the nature of the risks posed to consumers by the website/platform and the need to prevent consumer harm).
- 2.38 We have clarified that TRPs' obligations under principle 6 apply even when a TRP displays or refers to reviews originally published on other platforms or outsources the process of moderation of online reviews to a third-party.
- 2.39 We believe that the Compliance Advice is sufficiently clear that TRPs should comply with all the principles in this guidance (including principles 3 to 5), to stay on the right side of the law.
- 2.40 In relation to additional principles proposed by a few respondents, we have not added any new principles but have addressed these concerns by amending the existing principles. In particular, we have addressed these concerns by:
- a) adding that principle 5 implies that TRPs should cooperate with enforcement authorities (see paragraph 54);

- b) clarifying that, when a TRP takes out deposits and/or offers guarantees (eg refunds up to a certain amount when things go wrong), it should ensure that:
 - (i) the terms under which these deposits are held are fair and transparent (and that deposits are held securely); and
 - (ii) the conditions under which a consumer will be able to make a claim under any guarantee or financial protection are fair and communicated to the consumer in a prominent and clear way.

Questions on illustrative examples

Are the ‘dos and don’ts’ examples provided in the Draft Compliance Advice helpful? If not, why not? How could they be improved?

Are there any additional or different illustrative examples that would help businesses to understand how to apply the principles in the Draft Compliance Advice? If so, what would these cover and why?

- 2.41 Many respondents thought that the illustrative examples of claims that might mislead consumers were helpful in giving businesses a better understanding of how the principles in the advice applied.
- 2.42 Some respondents argued that the language used to describe the examples for each principle could be clearer. In particular, a few respondents raised questions about the clarity of some examples provided in relation to principles 1 and 2, regarding:
 - a) What offences make traders unsuitable to be listed on a TRP, taking into account rehabilitation considerations, and how TRPs should check traders’ criminal records effectively and in a proportionate way. One respondent, in particular, questioned whether TRPs would have a legal basis to exclude a trader from their platform on the basis of previous conduct, or whether a TRP can be expected to determine whether each trader is suitable for their platform based on the TRP’s subjective assessments of such conduct.
 - b) Whether TRPs are required to vet sub-contractors used by traders to perform the task contracted for through a TRP and how TRPs should vet these sub-contractors. A few respondents noted that imposing stringent requirements on TRPs to vet sub-contractors would increase a trader’s administrative burden, increase costs for them and TRPs, and reduce the supply of traders to meet consumer demand; and

- c) Whether the Draft Compliance Advice prevents TRPs from listing traders without a track record, as this could mean that TRPs could never allow new traders to join, potentially amplifying the supply shortage in the trade sector.
- 2.43 In relation to the example in principle 3 about ensuring that a trader is contactable, one respondent cautioned about the use of ‘forwarding’ or ‘secure’ numbers that are automatically generated to put the consumer in contact with the trader but are not the actual trader’s contact number. The risk with these ‘forwarding’ or ‘secure’ numbers is that, absent a genuine number, consumers may be unable to communicate with the trader if the trader leaves the platform.
- 2.44 In relation to principle 6, a couple of respondents suggested that the examples provided in relation to principle 6 should make clear that TRPs would not be compliant with principle 6 if they ‘censor’ online reviews (ie editing genuine negative reviews to make them appear less negative to consumers). Another respondent proposed that TRPs should not publish suspicious reviews while the authenticity of those reviews is being investigated.
- 2.45 More generally, some respondents asked for the Compliance Advice to be more specific and prescriptive in some areas, such as prescribing minimum vetting checks (principle 2) and a mandatory dispute resolution mechanism (principle 3).

CMA’s response

- 2.46 The CMA is pleased that most respondents found the illustrative examples helpful. We are also grateful for the specific suggestions we received in relation to some of the examples.
- 2.47 We have amended some of the examples to make them clearer.
- 2.48 In relation to the examples in principle 2:
- a) We did not consider that it was appropriate or useful to list all the offences that can potentially make a trader unsuitable to be recommended by a TRP and/or to prescribe how TRPs should conduct criminal checks. We have, however, clarified in paragraph 35 that TRPs should take appropriate steps – taking a risk-based approach – to ensure that traders are suitable to appear on their platform (including, where a TRP considers it necessary to carry out criminal records checks).
- b) The example in paragraph 38(i) of the Draft Compliance Advice only required TRPs to ensure that traders joining the platform have effective

processes in place to check that any entity or employee that undertakes the work on their behalf also meets their minimum vetting requirements. We clarified that this example does not mean that TRPs must vet the employees or subcontractors used by the trader themselves. Rather the TRP should check that the trader itself has the necessary processes in place to ensure that the employees and subcontractors that conduct the work on its behalf meet the TRP's minimum vetting requirements.

- c) The example in paragraph 38(a)(ii) of the Draft Compliance Advice is not intended to prevent TRPs from listing new traders (ie those starting out). We have clarified that TRPs can list traders that do not have a track record, as long as the trader provides evidence that it is trustworthy and can perform the advertised work to an acceptable quality standard.

2.49 In relation to principle 3, we have added an example to signal that TRPs should ensure that the use of 'forwarding' or 'secure' numbers should not prevent a consumer from being able to contact the trader they have contracted with, including if the trader leaves the platform.

2.50 In relation to the comments received about the examples in principle 6:

- a) Paragraph 69(m) of the Draft Compliance Advice already included as a negative example of principle 6: 'Editing or removing negative reviews on the basis that a dispute about the underlying service provided by the trader (or an element of it) has been resolved.' We have amended this example to make clear that TRPs should not edit or allow others to edit reviews, either positive or negative.

- b) The example in paragraph 68(n) of the Draft Compliance Advice noted that a review identified as potentially fake or misleading should be published but flagged as being potentially fake until such time as the investigation about that review was completed. We consider that advising TRPs not to publish reviews while potentially fake or misleading reviews are under investigation could have the undesirable effect of TRPs using the investigation to delay the publication of negative reviews unduly. We have, however, amended this example to add that the investigation of potentially fake or misleading reviews should be conducted promptly.

2.51 In general, given that the Compliance Advice must be suitable for TRPs with different business models and be sufficiently general to cover different situations, we do not consider it appropriate to make the examples for each principle prescriptive. For example:

- a) we consider that it would be counterproductive to include in the Compliance Advice an exhaustive list of minimum vetting checks, as the required vetting checks will depend, to some extent, on the TRP's representations to consumers;
- b) the business model of some TRPs may not include offering a dispute resolution mechanism. Instead of making dispute resolution services a mandatory requirement, we have clarified that TRPs should be clear about what they do or do not offer. If dispute resolution services are offered, then a TRP should be clear about what these services involve, when and how consumers have access to them and deal fairly with claims.

Questions on general and additional issues

Generally, are there any aspects of the Draft Compliance Advice that you consider need further clarification or explanation, and why? In responding, please specify which section of the draft Compliance Advice (and, where appropriate, the issue) your comments relate to.

Overall, is the Draft Compliance Advice sufficiently clear and helpful for the intended audience? Is the language and terminology helpful? Are there any other comments that you wish to make on the Draft Compliance Advice?

- 2.52 A few respondents commented that the Compliance Advice would have more impact if it was shorter and more accessible, including through the use of flowcharts and diagrams. A couple of respondents also noted that it would be useful to give consumers tips about how to choose a trader (eg the advantage of considering and getting quotes from multiple traders).
- 2.53 A few respondents urged: i) for the publication of Compliance Advice to be followed by enforcement action against TRPs that do not comply with consumer law; and ii) for there to be a mechanism to highlight emerging issues and practices as they come to light for consideration and inclusion in future versions of the Compliance Advice as appropriate. These respondents said that these measures were important to ensure a level playing field among TRPs.
- 2.54 More generally, a couple of respondents also made some general proposals for changes to the framework TRPs operate, which would further protect consumers, in addition to the publication of the Compliance Advice, including:
 - a) facilitating access to a shared database of 'rogue' traders by all TRPs or public records for company data to facilitate vetting. The 'rogue' traders database could be based on records held by Trading Standards agencies.

public records for company data to further facilitate vetting and close to real-time verification;

- b) ensuring fast-track court processes and meaningful penalties in cases against 'rogue' traders; and
- c) reviewing current financial legislation and regulations to increase consumer protection through insurance products, guarantee and warranty structures.

CMA's response

- 2.55 As mentioned above, as part of its general intelligence-gathering functions, the CMA will continue to monitor TRPs' compliance with consumer law. Should infringements be identified, the CMA or another consumer enforcement body¹³ may decide to take action. This does not mean that enforcement action must, or will, be taken in every case and decisions on CMA action will be subject to the CMA's prioritisation principles.¹⁴
- 2.56 We also propose to review the Compliance Advice from time to time, to ensure that it remains current and relevant to businesses. Any interested parties are welcome to contact the CMA's complaints and enquiries team (general.enquiries@cma.gov.uk). The CMA will also continue to engage with Trading Standards and consumer organisations, such as Which? and Citizens Advice, to inform its understanding of how the sector is evolving and of any issues that consumers may face in dealing with TRPs.
- 2.57 Proposals made by one respondent for more general reforms in the sector are outside the scope of the CMA's remit.
- 2.58 We have made the Compliance Advice more user friendly and, alongside the Compliance Advice, we have published: i) a short document summarising the content of the guidance in a concise and clear way; and ii) a document with practical tips to consumers using TRPs.

¹³ Eg Trading Standards Services.

¹⁴ [Prioritisation Principles \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk).