

Reference: 2222046

Information Requests

information.requests@ofcom.org.uk

31 July 2026

Freedom of Information request: Right to know request

Thank you for your request for information about BT mis-selling complaint volumes and comparative ADR scheme performance.

We received this request on 6 July 2026 and we have considered it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the FOI Act').

Your request and our response

I'm making a separate request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 for the following recorded information. This is the second of two requests submitted today; they cover different subject matter and I've kept each within scope to stay inside the cost limit.

1. For each of the last five financial years, the number of complaints Ofcom has recorded about BT concerning mis-selling of services. Where the data allows, please break this down by whether the complaint involved a customer identified or flagged as vulnerable, elderly, or disabled.

To the extent that Ofcom holds information within the scope of your request which has not already been published we consider that disclosure of this information is exempt under the FOI Act. In particular, section 44(1)(a) of the FOI Act exempts disclosure of information if its disclosure is prohibited under another enactment. Ofcom is prohibited under section 393(1) of the Communications Act 2003 ("the Communications Act") from disclosing information about a business which we have obtained in the course of exercising a power conferred by the Communications Act, unless we have the consent of that business or one of the statutory gateways under section 393(2) of the Communications Act is met, neither of which applies here. Section 44 of the FOI Act is an absolute exemption and therefore is not subject to a public interest test.

2. The terms of reference, methodology, and any provider-specific findings from Ofcom's most recent periodic review(s) of the Communications Ombudsman. I'm particularly interested in any part of the review that examined how cases are closed before reaching investigation, and whether providers can influence those closures.

Information relating to Ofcom's review of ADR in the telecoms sector, including the review's scope, methodology, evidence gathering and our assessment of ADR schemes, is set out in our published statement: [Statement: Review of ADR in the telecoms sector](#).

The published statement sets out Ofcom's findings from the review.

While we hold provider specific information on reasons for closure, we are unable to disclose this as we consider it exempt from disclosure under section 44 of the FOI Act (as explained above).

To the extent that you are seeking information about whether providers can influence the closure of cases before they reach investigation, we note that the statement explains the matters examined as

part of the review and our conclusions. Ofcom has not identified any additional information falling within the scope of your request beyond that which is already published.

3. Any information Ofcom holds on the comparative performance of CISAS and the Communications Ombudsman beyond the September 2024 Lucerna Partners case review, including any internal analysis of the outcome differences that review identified. For context, the Lucerna review found the Communications Ombudsman tends to make lower distress and inconvenience awards than CISAS and flagged more decisions with quality concerns.

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/siteassets/resources/documents/consultations/category-1-10-weeks/review-of-adr-in-the-telecoms-sector/main-and-supporting-docs/annex-9---lucerna-case-review.pdf?v=388856><https://www.ofcom.org.uk/phones-and-broadband/service-quality/adr-schemes-performance>

The [Lucerna case review](#) formed part of Ofcom's review of ADR in the telecoms sector. As set out in the review, despite differences in how the ADR schemes operate, the evidence indicated that consumers are, overall, receiving fair and consistent outcomes and that the differences identified do not appear to have a material impact on outcomes for consumers.

Between periodic reviews, Ofcom monitors the performance of the ADR schemes against a range of key performance indicators, which are published on our website: [ADR schemes' performance](#). We also undertake quality assurance activities, including reviewing ADR decision letters and considering complaints about the ADR schemes received by our Customer Contact Team. Where appropriate, we discuss issues arising from that monitoring with the ADR schemes.

We have not identified any additional published analysis comparing the performance of CISAS and Communications Ombudsman beyond that contained in the ADR review and supporting documents referred to above.

Yours sincerely,

Information Requests

Request an internal review

If you are unhappy with the response you have received to your request for information, or think that your request was refused without a reason valid under the law, you may ask for an internal review. If you do, it will be subject to an independent review within Ofcom. We will either uphold the original decision, or reverse or modify it.

If you would like to ask us to carry out an internal review, you should get in touch within two months of the date of this letter. There is no statutory deadline for us to complete our internal review, and the time it takes will depend on the complexity of the request. But we will try to complete the review within 20 working days (or no more than 40 working days in exceptional cases) and keep you informed of our progress. Please email the Information Requests team (information.requests@ofcom.org.uk) to request an internal review.

Taking it further

If you are unhappy with the outcome of our internal review, then you have the right to [complain to the Information Commissioner's Office](#).