

Assess record for 'Consultation document on developing a harmonised methodology for classifying and reporting consumer complaints across the European Union'

Meta Informations	
Creation date	24-09-2008
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	165880426081226808
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N
Questionnaire	
Do you collect consumer complaints? - single choice reply- (compulsory)	Yes
Do you collect consumer enquiries? -single choice reply- (compulsory)	Yes
Do you classify complaints and enquiries separately? -single choice reply- (compulsory)	Yes
How do you define complaints? -open reply- (compulsory)	
It is a claim from a consumer, a professional or other, against "someone" (professionnal, private individual, firm, etc.) and about some pratices.	
How do you define enquiries? -open reply- (compulsory)	
Someone asking fo information; it does not necessarily charge or call into question someone or some practices.	
Other definitions. Please specify here. -open reply- (optional)	
Who is eligible to send you a complaint? - multiple choices reply- (compulsory)	Consumer Business Other
Please specify other -open reply- (compulsory)	
Institutions, consumer group (or any others group), local authorities, etc., but nowadays our tool is not configurated for accurate identification and tracaebility about whic category is concerned	
For which sectors do you collect data?	
Please send a copy of the classification structure you use (e.g. a table indicating the different sectors) to SANCO-consumercomplaints@ec.europa.eu -open reply- (compulsory)	
Every sectors related to consumer policy and consumer protection	
Which is your preferred policy option on the issue of harmonising consumer complaints classification systems? -single choice reply- (compulsory)	Introduce a voluntary system

Please explain. -open reply- (compulsory)

Such a voluntary system will enable the best the Commission and the MS to examine and consider for a few years the efficiency and workability of the elaborated methodology and tool, in view to improving it. In addition, it will enable the MS who have currently no tool or methodology for gathering consumer complaints to get used to a system for classification and reporting consumer complaints.

Do you agree that only the classification of complaints addressed to third parties (e.g. public agencies, ministries, self-regulatory bodies, consumer NGOs, trade associations, ADR bodies, others) should be harmonised and not those made to sellers/retailers? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Please give your view on whether a new classification system should include data on the following variables.

Number of complaints -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Number of enquiries -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Sectors -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Nature/type of complaint (e.g. faulty goods, late delivery, overcharging, incorrect labelling, etc.) -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Mediums of transaction (e.g. face to face, internet, telephone sales, etc.) -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Associated monetary value -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Type of infringement and relevant legislation (e.g. horizontal legislation such as Unfair Commercial Practices or sector specific legislation such as Package Travel) -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Should the system use COICOP? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

No

Should the system use an alternative sectorial classification? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Please specify -open reply- (compulsory)

The tool COICOP classification is "simple" and "limited". The system used in France is detailed to a greater degree than the COICOP classification. Then, the French tool goes deeper to identify, eg. practices and sectors. Therefore, France would like to keep its tool for classification and reporting complaints and enquiries as it is more detailed and thus more accurate. In addition, it may be useful to elaborate a system more detailed than COICOP, additional information would be voluntary but it would enable MS having a detailed and accurate collecting system to report their complementary data to the Commission who could be interested in it.

How often should participating parties report aggregate collected complaints to the Commission? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Other

Please specify -open reply- (compulsory)

every 6 months (semester)

Would you be prepared to change your existing classification methodology to be in line with a voluntary harmonised methodology? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

No

Would the provision of an IT tool developed by the Commission persuade you to use a harmonised methodology? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

What would be the cost implications of changing your methodology? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Significant

Please specify -open reply- (optional)

There would be material and practical costs, especially in order to train and adapt the human network educated and used to handle the current French Tool and its detailed list and classification (above one hundred of local contact points, several hundreds of persons)

Do you use an IT tool to classify complaints? -single choice reply- (compulsory)

Yes

Please provide more information on the system: is it a specialised software or a single spreadsheet, etc. -open reply- (compulsory)

The French tool is a specialised software dedicated to collecting on line. It is available throughout the French territory in more than local 100 contact points, to collect and classify complaints and enquiries. Afterward, data are centralized up in a unique database for analysis.

Comments -open reply- (optional)

As regard reporting of the associated monetary value, France thinks it may be advantageous in some cases but shouldn't be compulsory. The French authority stresses that its tool is very detailed, operational and efficient, and it has been spread for some time now through its contact points which masterize it. Thus, France has reservation nowadays about adapting or changing its tool before being made available with a concrete and detailed example of the IT Tool the Commission would propose. The harmonised system should not substitute to national systems or tools in MS having one and wishing to keep it, interface could be developed to fill the harmonised tool. Particularly, France would like to keep using its tool in addition.

Personal data

Name of organisation -open reply- (compulsory)

DGCCRF (general directorate for competition policy, consumer policy and fraud controls)

Country of establishment of the Organisation -open reply- (compulsory)

france

Address -open reply- (compulsory)

DGCCRF bureau A3 - télédod 042 59 Bd Vincent Auriol, F-75703 Paris cedex 13

Website address (if available) -open reply- (optional)

Name contact person -open reply- (compulsory)

Catherine MAINGUET

Telephone number contact person -open reply- (compulsory)

00 33 1 44 97 24 18 (00 33 1 44 97 30 41)

E-mail contact person -open reply- (optional)

catherine.maignuet@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr copy, a2@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr

Stakeholder group -single choice reply- (compulsory)	Member State Authority
Size of the organisation -single choice reply- (compulsory)	Other
Please specify -open reply- (compulsory)	
> 3000	

[PRINT](#)[EXPORT RECORD](#)