Schedule 5 - DGCOS – 1st August 2025 to 31st July 2026

Information to be included an ADR entity's annual activity report

(a) the number of domestic disputes the ADR entity has received;

No. enquiries received (domestic)	No. enquiries received (cross-border)	No. disputes received (domestic)	No. disputes received (Cross-border)	No. disputes accepted (continued to case) (domestic)	No. disputes accepted (Continued to case) (cross-border)
• 40	• 0	• 40	• 0	• 40	• NA

(b) the types of complaints to which the domestic disputes and cross-border disputes relate;

Types of disputes:

- Cancellations 2
- Compensation 3
- Customer service 1
- Incomplete Installation 2
- Mis-selling 1
- Product 28
- Workmanship 3

(c) a description of any systematic or significant problems that occur frequently and lead to disputes between consumers and traders of which the ADR entity has become aware due to its operations as an ADR entity;

Product-related complaints remain the most common reason customers contact DGCOS. In many instances, these complaints arise because the product does not meet the customer's expectations in terms of performance or appearance, rather than as a result of an actual defect. Where a genuine manufacturing fault is identified, it is covered by the manufacturer's warranty, and DGCOS works with the installer to ensure the appropriate remedial action is taken to resolve the issue.

(d) any recommendations the ADR entity may have as to how the problems referred to in paragraph (c) could be avoided or resolved in future, in order to raise traders' standards and to facilitate the exchange of information and best practices;

DGCOS can help reduce future product-related complaints by continuing to provide clear guidance to both installers and consumers on product performance, expected tolerances, and the distinction between cosmetic concerns and genuine manufacturing defects not accepting that 'guidance' says. Encouraging installers to set realistic expectations at the point of sale and during installation can help minimise misunderstandings. Where complaints do arise, DGCOS can use trends identified through ADR cases to share lessons learned, promote best practice across its membership.

(e) the number of disputes which the ADR entity has refused to deal with, and the percentage share of the grounds set in paragraph 13 of Schedule 3 on which the ADR entity has declined to consider such disputes;

Total no. of disputes rejected	0

Reason	**No. rejected**	**Percentage of rejected**
a) the consumer has not attempted to contact the trader first		
b) the dispute was frivolous or vexatious		
c) the dispute had been previously considered by another ADR body or the court		
d) the value fell below the monetary value		
e) the consumer did not submit the disputes within the time period specified		

f) dealing with the dispute would have impaired the operation of the ADR body		
g) other (enquired too early, not yet complained to trader, trader not member, advice call etc…		

(f) the percentage of alternative dispute resolution procedures which were discontinued for operational reasons and, if known, the reasons for discontinuation;

	No. discontinued	**Percentage of discontinued**
Discontinued for operational reasons	0	

Reasons for discontinuation:

(g) the average time taken to resolve domestic disputes and cross-border disputes;

	Domestic	**Cross-border**
Average time taken to resolve disputes (from receipt of complaint)	3 days (1st stage days 1-8)	NA
Average time taken to resolve disputes (from 'complete complaint file')	18 days (2nd Stage)	NA

(h) the rate of compliance, if known, with the outcomes the alternative dispute resolution procedures (amongst your members, or those you provide ADR for)

We do not actively measure or monitor this aspect. However, it is worth noting that instances where consumers return due to non-adherence to the agreed-upon terms are exceptionally rare.

(i) This point has been removed in amendments on 1 January 2021

Please add any additional information or data you think might be useful or interesting at the bottom of this report.

Schemes are considering ISO27001 which is only at proposal stage, however if approved and gained ISO 27001 principles can support the responsible use of AI within Schemes by ensuring appropriate controls are in place to protect confidential information, manage access, and ensure AI-generated outputs are reviewed and validated. This helps maintain the security, accuracy, and integrity of information used throughout the ADR process.