

P1-1 – Contract renewal and burden of proof (22/08)

Case Code: P1-1

Incident Date: 22/08 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Daniel Mark Jackson; SME 2 (name not provided)

A customer disputed agreeing to a new EE contract; I sought evidence requirements while an SME insisted the burden of proof sat with the customer and that silence made a contract binding.

Narrative Report

I raised the case on 22/08 because a customer said he never agreed to a new EE contract and I needed clarity on proof of enforceability before applying Early Termination Charges. I first received advice to look for a call recording, and I challenged the idea that the customer had to disprove the contract, suggesting EE must prove it. The SME claimed sending correspondence without customer objection created a binding agreement and stated regulators would side with the company, dismissing my questions about consent. I pressed on the need for evidence of consent, but the SME continued to assert customer silence was sufficient.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Daniel Mark Jackson (22/08 13:44):

> "He's considering cancelling and has been informed about HTTC, but he claims he never agreed to a new contract. What do we need to provide to prove that the contract is enforceable?"

Daniel Mark Jackson (22/08 14:08):

> "Is it not for ee to prove that he is under contract, rather than for the customer to prove that he isn't... I'd have thought it would be inflammatory going back to him and saying it's down to him to prove he isn't in contract"

SME 2 (22/08 14:30):

> "yes if we contact a cx with contract info and they dont call in to object it is a binding agreement!"

SME 2 (22/08 14:34):

> "where did you get that from? thats known as a burden of proof but we have proof... OfCom wont agree with the cx and an Ombudsman would explain the cx is responsible to read and agree/object to all correspondence from service providers"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Contract Consent (Ofcom GC C1.5): Asserting that a contract is binding solely because correspondence was sent and not challenged ignores the requirement for express consent and risks negative option billing.
- Potential Compliance Issue – Evidence and Burden of Proof: Shifting burden to the customer and relying on silence rather than documented affirmative consent undermines enforceability and could mislead consumers about their rights.

- Working Conditions – Dismissive Support Culture: Dismissing queries about consent with “where did you get that from?” discourages agents from raising legitimate compliance concerns.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Risk of being held to charges without demonstrated consent, potential regulatory breach.
- Agent impact: Left without defensible guidance on enforceability, increasing risk and stress when challenging questionable advice.
- Pattern: Reinforces recurring theme of incorrect burden-of-proof assumptions and dismissive responses to compliance questions.

P1-2 – Repeated failed credits and premature complaint closure (22/08)

Case Code: P1-2

Incident Date: 22/08 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Daniel Mark Jackson; Sarah Jane Fleming

A customer's £317.86 credit failed twice and complaints were closed prematurely; despite two prior failures and an absent TL, I was told to reuse the same ineffective channel and delay the customer.

Narrative Report

On 22/08 I sought help for a customer with a £317.86 debt repeatedly promised to be removed. Two complaints had been opened and closed months apart claiming the credit was approved, but the balance remained. Because the amount exceeded £200, I was told a manager review was mandatory; my TL Noel was absent. I highlighted the prior failures and requested escalation. Sarah advised using the same team credit chat despite the earlier failures and to set a callback, without intervening directly to resolve the long-running issue.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Daniel Mark Jackson (22/08 14:56):

> "[redacted] has 317.86 outstanding on account, and has been promised multiple times this would be removed. I should resubmit to credit chat? anything we can do to speed things up, considering the delay?"

Daniel Mark Jackson (22/08 15:07):

> "Noel isn't in today unfortunately, there have been two complaints opened and closed about this already, one closed two months ago, the other closed three months ago, both complaints stated that the credit had been approved and submitted to TL. He's very unhappy"

Sarah Jane Fleming (22/08 15:15):

> "can you follow up with thoasess agents , you can still pop it in your teams credit chat even if your TL isnt there... aploigise to the cx set a call beak to update him"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Complaint Handling (Ofcom GC C4): Closing complaints without confirming resolution and instructing reuse of a failed process risks non-compliance with effective complaint resolution obligations.
- Working Conditions – Lack of Proactive Support: Direct intervention was declined despite repeated process failure, leaving the agent to re-run a broken workflow.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Continued pursuit for an uncorrected debt after two failed complaints, increased frustration and potential harm.
- Agent impact: Forced to delay and recycle an ineffective process, adding stress and handle time.

- Pattern: Recurrence of escalation avoidance and reliance on channels that have already failed.

P1-3 – Prolonged wait times and selective support responses (23/08)

Case Code: P1-3

Incident Date: 23/08 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Jessica O'Driscoll; SMEs (names not provided)

I waited over an hour for confirmation on a billing refund request; SMEs were active but unresponsive, and when a TL arrived she initially ignored my outstanding request.

Narrative Report

On 23/08 I asked for support with a billing refund and received no acknowledgement for nearly an hour despite SME activity in the chat. After 12 minutes I followed up with no response. At +55 minutes TL Jessica O'Driscoll answered another agent but ignored my query. I posted again at +1:04 and finally received a response at +1:06.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Timeline summary (times as recorded in narrative):

- 0 minutes: Initial request for assistance (no response).
- +12 minutes: Follow-up asking if anyone was available (no response despite active SMEs).
- +55 minutes: TL Jessica O'Driscoll responded to a different agent, ignoring my request.
- +1:04: I posted again seeking help.
- +1:06: TL Jessica O'Driscoll responded to me.

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Working Conditions – Excessive Wait Times: Over an hour without support forced prolonged customer hold or callbacks.
- Support Culture – Selective Engagement: Active leaders prioritised other queries while ignoring an older request, undermining fair support triage.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Unacceptable hold or callback delays for a simple confirmation.
- Agent impact: Elevated stress managing a waiting customer without support.
- Pattern: Aligns with broader delays and unresponsiveness across cases.

P2-2 – Disputed call divert charges and support abandonment (05/09)

Case Code: P2-2

Incident Date: 05/09 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Daniel Mark Jackson; SME (name not provided)

A customer disputed chargeable call divert; after being told liability existed because charges were not disclaimed, the SME ceased responding when I asked for escalation support.

Narrative Report

On 05/09 I sought guidance because a customer had contracted specifically for call divert and was not told diverted calls would be chargeable. After a 12-minute wait, the SME asked if the customer was told calls would be free; I clarified the cost was not mentioned. The SME argued the customer was liable because the contract did not state charges would not apply. I asked if the SME could handle an escalation that evening; when I confirmed I could call the customer immediately, the SME stopped responding for the rest of the shift, forcing me to raise it again with another staff member.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

SME (05/09 18:49):

> "im done at 7pm, when you calling them back?"

Daniel Mark Jackson (05/09 18:49):

> "I can do it now"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Material Omission (Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008): Treating silence on charges as sufficient disclosure where the feature drove the sale risks misleading omission.
- Working Conditions – Support Abandonment: SME disengaged after confirming availability, leaving the agent to restart the process with another colleague.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Delay in resolving a sales transparency dispute; risk of unfair charges.
- Agent impact: Duplicated effort and extended handling time due to abandonment.
- Pattern: Echoes repeated escalation avoidance and inconsistent support.

P2-7 – Escalation rejection and “Final Bill” delays (07/09)

Case Code: P2-7

Incident Date: 07/09 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Jason Campbell; Keelyn Ryan

A customer facing £395 termination charges was told to wait for a final bill; my escalation request was rejected after delay, leaving the customer without timely resolution.

Narrative Report

On 07/09 I queried termination charges likely caused by a new contract order. Jason Campbell advised waiting for the bill to confirm an error. I noted the customer found waiting a month unacceptable and requested escalation. After a seven-minute delay TL Keelyn Ryan rejected the escalation because the bill was not yet produced. I offered to reconnect the customer immediately; no one replied, and I had to explain the situation to another TL the next day.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Jason Campbell (07/09 17:19):

> "in that case we would have to wait for the bill to be produced to see for certain"

Keelyn Ryan (07/09 17:36):

> "is the cease charges an error ? we cant do anything until that bill is out"

Daniel Mark Jackson (07/09 17:37):

> "he has actually gone, I said someone would contact him tomorrow. but I'm sure he'll take a call now if you'd like to take it on"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Complaint Resolution (Ofcom GC C4): Deferring action until a bill is produced creates a barrier to dispute resolution and shifts burden back to the customer.
- Working Conditions – Escalation Avoidance: Clear escalation for a high-value dispute was declined, forcing further follow-up and duplication.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Prolonged uncertainty over £395 charges, required to recontact.
- Agent impact: Left without authority to resolve, increasing stress and workload.
- Pattern: Consistent with delays and refusal to engage in real-time escalations.

P2-8 – Escalation delay and vulnerable customer (08/09)

Case Code: P2-8

Incident Date: 08/09 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat and WebEx

Customer Type: Vulnerable – customer listed as vulnerable, deposit refund dispute

Key Staff Involved: Eamonn O'Shea; SME 1 (name not provided); SME 2 (name not provided)

A vulnerable customer disputing a deposit refund faced delayed and fragmented support; multiple SMEs and a TL disengaged for long periods, leaving me without escalation ownership.

Narrative Report

On 08/09 I requested escalation for a vulnerable customer who felt misled about a deposit refund. TL Eamonn O'Shea initially responded but six minutes later said he was taking another escalation call, leaving me without support. SME 1 engaged but did not address the escalation request; after they stopped responding, I waited eight minutes until SME 2 joined, also focusing only on policy. I posted Copilot AI guidance to validate the need to escalate. After 17 minutes Eamonn returned and offered a WebEx chat. Following our discussion, I noted at 16:09 that I still lacked enough information to progress the case. I sent updates at 16:40, 16:49, and 17:22 with no response. At 17:27 Eamonn asked for the account number already in the chat; I replied immediately. No further response came until 18:40, over two hours later, when he said he would follow up.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Eamonn OShea (08/09 14:39):

> "Going on an Escalation Call"

Copilot AI (posted by agent 08/09 14:55):

> "Escalation Request: If the customer explicitly asks to speak to a manager or TL... Unresolved Frustration: The customer is clearly unhappy... if they're losing trust or becoming irate, a TL might help de-escalate."

Daniel Mark Jackson (08/09 16:09):

> "I'm going to feel a little silly calling back regarding the request to speak to a manager, if I am then unable to progress the case forward... What do you think?"

Daniel Mark Jackson (08/09 16:40):

> Update sent (no response).

Daniel Mark Jackson (08/09 16:49):

> Update sent (no response).

Daniel Mark Jackson (08/09 17:22):

> Detailed summary of callback sent (no response).

Eamonn OShea (08/09 17:27):

> Asked for the account number.

Eamonn OShea (08/09 18:40):

> "I'll follow up"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Vulnerable Customers (Ofcom GC C5): Significant delays and lack of ownership for a vulnerable customer's refund dispute risk unfair treatment and inaccessibility.
- Working Conditions – Support Abandonment: TL disengaged for long periods, asking for already-provided details and responding hours later.
- Support Quality – Fragmented Guidance: Multiple SMEs and a TL provided policy reiteration without escalation handling, prolonging resolution.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Extended uncertainty for a vulnerable customer over financial matter.
- Agent impact: Left in limbo, duplicating updates without response, heightened stress.
- Pattern: Highlights repeated delays, abandonment, and poor handling of vulnerabilities.

P3-1 – Vulnerable customer and support insensitivity (12/09)

Case Code: P3-1

Incident Date: 12/09 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat and WebEx

Customer Type: Vulnerable – elderly, bedbound, likely dementia

Key Staff Involved: Eamonn O'Shea

A highly vulnerable customer risked landline disconnection while the TL responded with procedural advice and publicly admonished me in aggressive tones instead of engaging with safeguarding.

Narrative Report

On 12/09 I requested a TL for a sensitive case involving an elderly, bedbound customer likely with dementia facing landline disconnection. After an 11-minute wait, TL Eamonn O'Shea responded with cancellation steps but ignored the duty-of-care concerns. In the same public message he criticised me for not raising a complaint, using capital letters and multiple exclamation marks. I requested a WebEx chat due to the tone and lack of safeguarding focus; subsequent guidance stayed procedural, centred on callback limits, leaving me unsupported.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Eamonn OShea (12/09 20:05):

> "Also, you did NOT raise a complaint on behalf of the customer!!!"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Dignity at Work – Aggressive Tone: Public use of caps and multiple exclamation marks constitutes aggressive communication and public admonishment.
- Potential Compliance Issue – Vulnerable Customers (Ofcom GC C5): Procedural advice without addressing safeguarding for a bedbound, likely dementia customer risks failing required special consideration.
- Working Conditions – Inadequate Support: Lack of empathetic guidance in a high-risk case leaves the agent without meaningful support.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Risk of disconnection without tailored support for vulnerability.
- Agent impact: Public criticism and absence of safeguarding guidance increase stress and discourage escalation.
- Pattern: Continues theme of procedural focus over vulnerability and public reprimand.

P4-1 – Excessive wait for escalation and support abandonment (20/09)

Case Code: P4-1

Incident Date: 20/09 – year not specified

Channel: Billing Support Group Chat and Direct Message

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Keelyn Ryan; Kassie Caulfield

A unified billing dispute requiring a manager took 50 minutes to gain support; one TL DM'd then disappeared, and another tried to deflect to mobile despite the customer refusing.

Narrative Report

On 20/09 at 12:03 I requested a TL escalation for a unified broadband and mobile billing dispute; the customer demanded a manager and refused department hand-offs. After 27 minutes TL Keelyn Ryan DM'd "what's up". I replied within two minutes but she never replied again. At 12:39 (36 minutes after the initial request) TL Kassie Caulfield responded in the group chat and pushed the issue to mobile. I reiterated the customer had refused and there were broadband issues. Kassie continued to resist taking the call. It took 50 minutes to secure support.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Keelyn Ryan (20/09 12:30):

> "what's up"

Daniel Mark Jackson (20/09 12:32):

> "ah! hi, thank you, one moment please."

Kassie Caulfield (20/09 12:39):

> "Yes he will need to go to mobile"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Working Conditions – Support Abandonment: Initial TL engagement via DM ceased immediately, forcing further wait.
- Working Conditions – Excessive Wait Times: 50 minutes to secure escalation for a live customer is unreasonable.
- Dignity at Work – Lack of Trust and Respect: Challenging the agent's assessment rather than assisting undermines professional judgement.
- Potential Compliance Issue – Complaint Handling (Ofcom GC C4): Attempting to silo a unified complaint against customer wishes creates barriers to resolution.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Extended hold and resistance to handling a unified complaint.
- Agent impact: Long delay and undermined judgement elevated stress.
- Pattern: Matches broader issues of deflection and delayed escalations.

P4-3 – Vulnerable customer and rigid bill shock application (28/09)

Case Code: P4-3

Incident Date: 28/09 – year not specified

Channel: Group chat and Direct Message

Customer Type: Vulnerable – 96-year-old long-standing customer

Key Staff Involved: SME (name not provided); Team Leader via DM (name not provided)

A 96-year-old long-standing customer received a £258.15 bill; while a TL privately agreed to refund, an SME publicly rejected the request on rigid criteria, ignoring vulnerability.

Narrative Report

On 28/09 I requested authorisation for a bill shock refund for a 96-year-old customer charged £258.15 after family removed the landline and told her calling mobiles would not cost extra. I waited eight minutes in the group chat. During the wait I secured full refund agreement from a TL via DM to protect the customer. The SME response in the group chat later rejected the request based on internal thresholds, disregarding vulnerability.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

SME response (time not specified):

- > Rejected the bill shock request based on “Higher Credits bracket” and technical definitions, ignoring vulnerability.

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Vulnerable Customers (Ofcom GC C5): Applying rigid credit criteria without considering a 96-year-old’s vulnerability risks unfair treatment.
- Support Quality – Inconsistency: TL privately approved while SME publicly rejected, creating conflicting guidance.
- Dignity and Culture – Rigid Policy Application: Statement “her family told her it would be ok but we didnt” shows lack of empathy for an elderly customer.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Conflicting guidance and potential denial of fair relief for a vulnerable person.
- Agent impact: Forced to reconcile contradictory instructions under time pressure.
- Pattern: Illustrates inconsistency and policy-first handling over empathy for vulnerable customers.

P5-1 – Store mis-selling and refusal of manager support (02/10)

Case Code: P5-1

Incident Date: 02/10 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard – caring responsibilities limit access to store

Key Staff Involved: SME (name not provided)

A customer with childcare constraints disputed a store-promised £15 discount; the SME said nothing could be done and refused a manager escalation.

Narrative Report

On 02/10 I sought help for a customer claiming a £15 discount promised for 24 months ended after three. He said returning to the store was impossible due to caring for three children under 10. After a 15-minute wait, the SME replied there was nothing we could do and insisted he must return to the store. When I explained he requested a manager, the SME refused the escalation, saying a manager would say the same.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

SME (02/10 18:15):

> "there is nothing a manager can do in this case you need to advise if escalated that they will tell him the same"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Complaint Handling (Ofcom GC C4): Refusing escalation because of predicted outcome blocks access to dispute resolution.
- Vulnerable Consumers – Accessibility: Insisting on a store visit despite declared caring constraints fails to adjust the process for accessibility.
- Support Quality – Disempowerment: Advising “nothing we can do” leaves the agent without tools to resolve mis-selling.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Barrier to resolving a mis-selling claim and inability to access required channel.
- Agent impact: Placed in conflict without escalation support, increasing stress.
- Pattern: Repeats theme of escalation refusals and rigid channel requirements.

P5-3 – Store mis-selling and escalation refusal (04/10)

Case Code: P5-3

Incident Date: 04/10 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: SME (name not provided); Jason Campbell

An in-store contract dispute with a promised discount was denied escalation despite official guidance requiring it; citing the “Albert” guide did not override the refusal.

Narrative Report

On 04/10 I requested guidance for a customer disputing a store-promised discount for 24 months that ended after three; he asked for a manager. The prevailing practice was to force customers back to the store due to lack of call recordings. The SME said no TL would take it and insisted the customer must return to the store. I posted an “Albert” guide screenshot showing escalations are required when a customer asks for a manager. TL Jason Campbell still refused, stating a manager would not be able to do anything without a call recording. I had to pass the refusal to the customer.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

SME (04/10 12:39):

> "No TL will take that at all, CX has to go back to the store, end of."

Daniel Mark Jackson (04/10 12:48):

> "I'm just following albert"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Complaint Handling (Ofcom GC C4): Refusing manager access despite explicit customer request creates a barrier to the complaints process.
- Working Conditions – Conflicting Guidance: Official knowledge base required escalation, but management overruled with unwritten custom, creating role ambiguity.
- Dignity and Culture – Dismissive Tone: “end of” shuts down dialogue and discourages advocacy for customers.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Denied escalation and forced to return to store, hindering resolution.
- Agent impact: Forced to contradict official guidance and deliver refusal, increasing stress.
- Pattern: Consistent with escalation refusals and conflict between policy and practice.

P6-10 – Vulnerable customer and “wait to dispute” guidance (18/10)

Case Code: P6-10

Incident Date: 18/10 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Vulnerable – cognitive difficulties and panic

Key Staff Involved: Jason Campbell

A vulnerable customer panicking over a £32.99 bill for a cancelled service was told to dispute later; immediate adjustment was refused to avoid “double crediting”.

Narrative Report

On 18/10 I sought to cancel a £32.99 bill for a customer with cognitive difficulties who was panicking; the account had been active only since Tuesday and I cancelled it that day. I asked to cancel the bill immediately. TL Jason Campbell refused to avoid potential “double crediting” once the final bill issued. I asked if it was fair to tell the customer he must dispute the charge later; Jason confirmed he could dispute but warned not to promise success.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Jason Campbell (18/10 15:38):

> "yea - He can dispute the bill is he so wishes, but dont make any promises with it"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Potential Compliance Issue – Vulnerable Customers (Ofcom GC C5): Deferring resolution and requiring future contact places undue burden on a vulnerable, distressed customer.
- Complaint Handling (Ofcom GC C4): Knowing a charge is erroneous yet instructing to dispute later generates avoidable repeat contact.
- Support Quality – Lack of Empathy: Prioritising process convenience over immediate relief for a panicking customer.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Continued anxiety and need to re-engage to fix a known issue.
- Agent impact: Unable to resolve promptly, creating ethical and stress burdens.
- Pattern: Mirrors delay-first approaches and lack of adjustments for vulnerability.

P6-11 – “Goodwill” credit and system failures (18/10)

Case Code: P6-11

Incident Date: 18/10 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Keelyn Ryan; Jason Campbell

A customer billed for TV after service cessation required a £ correction; while TL agreed to a goodwill credit, my tool failure and lack of follow-up caused a 21-minute delay until another TL intervened.

Narrative Report

On 18/10 I requested a TL to authorise a credit for TV services billed after cessation on 17/10. The customer refused to pay the full Direct Debit or switch to card, insisting the amount be corrected immediately. After a 12-minute wait, TL Keelyn Ryan asked the amount and said to apply it as goodwill. My credit tool was not working; I asked her to apply it but received no reply. After seven more minutes TL Jason Campbell intervened, requesting details, and applied it. Total time from initial request to action was 21 minutes.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Keelyn Ryan (18/10 14:17):

> "how much his the credit ?"

Keelyn Ryan (18/10 14:18):

> "apply that as GW"

Daniel Mark Jackson (18/10 14:19):

> "could you applu this as my credits aren't working, please"

Jason Campbell (18/10 14:26):

> "I will PM me the details"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Working Conditions – System Failures: Agent tools failed for routine credits, forcing escalation.
- Working Conditions – Excessive Wait Times: 21-minute delay for a straightforward correction kept customer and agent in limbo.
- Potential Compliance Issue – Billing Accuracy (Ofcom GC C1/C5): Treating a billing error as “Good Will” misclassifies the correction and can distort complaint data.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Delay in correcting an incorrect charge for ceased service.
- Agent impact: Dependency on TL due to tool failure and lack of immediate follow-up.
- Pattern: Adds to evidence of delays and mislabelling of corrective actions as goodwill.

P6-8 – Escalation refusal and conflicting leadership (19/10)

Case Code: P6-8

Incident Date: 19/10 – year not specified

Channel: Direct Message and Support chat

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Jessica O'Driscoll; Keelyn Ryan

A customer disputing Early Termination Charges was promised escalation by one TL, then refused by another because charges were not yet on the bill, forcing me to break a promise and drawing only a thumbs-up reaction to my distress.

Narrative Report

On 19/10 I privately messaged TL Jessica O'Driscoll about a complex dispute with a former lawyer/MP claiming a “long standing understanding” to leave without Early Termination Charges. Jessica reviewed and confirmed that if posted in the support chat, a TL would take the escalation. After the customer requested the escalation, I posted it; TL Keelyn Ryan refused, saying the termination fees were not on the account yet. I noted I was acting on Jessica's decision. Keelyn dismissed Jessica's judgement. I expressed distress that I had to break my promise to the customer after following leadership advice; Keelyn offered no reply beyond a thumbs-up reaction.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Keelyn Ryan (19/10 17:12):

> "obviously jess didnt know the HTTC weren't on a bill yet... I cant even take the call to discuss them"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Working Conditions – Conflicting Guidance: Advice from one TL was undermined by another, leaving the agent unable to keep commitments.
- Potential Compliance Issue – Complaint Handling (Ofcom GC C4): Refusing escalation until charges appear on a bill blocks dispute resolution.
- Dignity at Work – Dismissive Behaviour: Responding to expressed stress with only a thumbs-up trivialises the agent's situation.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Promise of escalation broken; required to wait until billing catches up.
- Agent impact: Undermined by conflicting leadership, increasing stress and loss of trust.
- Pattern: Reflects systemic escalation refusals and leadership inconsistency.

P6-7 – Excessive wait and systemic billing inability (24/10)

Case Code: P6-7

Incident Date: 24/10 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Jason Campbell

A mis-sold pricing error confirmed on the sales call could not be fixed monthly; I waited over 30 minutes while the TL without system access delayed taking the escalation.

Narrative Report

On 24/10 I requested a TL for a customer mis-sold a package at £39.99 but billed £46.99. I had listened to the sales call and confirmed the error. The customer refused the standard lump-sum workaround because recurring billing could not be corrected. After nine minutes, TL Jason Campbell suggested the Value team, but I noted they could not amend the price. He delayed taking the call, citing no system access and wanting to confirm with another manager. The customer waited over 30 minutes before the escalation was accepted.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Jason Campbell (24/10 18:33):

> "I know the customer is waiting - However, give me 2 mins - I just want to confirm with another TL as I have no acces to the system atm"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Working Conditions – Systemic Inflexibility: Inability to correct recurring billing forces awkward lump-sum fixes and conflicts with customer expectations.
- Working Conditions – Excessive Wait Times: Over 30 minutes to accept an escalation leaves customer and agent waiting.
- Support Quality – Lack of Resources: TL lacked system access, creating bottlenecks despite confirmed evidence.
- Dignity at Work – Lack of Trust: TL re-verified despite agent confirming mis-sell from the call.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Extended hold and unresolved recurring billing error.
- Agent impact: Powerless to fix obvious error, increased stress and handle time.
- Pattern: Reinforces systemic tool/resource gaps and delays in escalation handling.

P6-14 – Delayed engineer visit credit (31/10)

Case Code: P6-14

Incident Date: 31/10 – year not specified

Channel: Support chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard

Key Staff Involved: Sarah Jane Fleming; Noel (Team Leader)

A £40 engineer credit was delayed five days because my TL had not processed it; I sought help and after a 10-minute wait another TL applied it.

Narrative Report

On 31/10 I asked for a £40 engineer credit to be applied immediately so I could call the customer back. I noted I had submitted it to my TL Noel on Monday, but he “hasn't got round to it yet” and was absent until the following Monday. I waited 10 minutes for a response. Sarah Jane Fleming saw the request at 10:43, asked for the account number, and applied it.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Daniel Mark Jackson (10:33):

> "[redacted] should have had £40 credited to his account for an engineer visit, but my TL hasn't got round to it yet. I submitted it on monday... any chance it could be credited now?"

Sarah Jane Fleming (10:43):

> "whats the acc number... sorry just seen it - will apply now for you"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Working Conditions – Administrative Bottlenecks: Reliance on a single TL caused a five-day delay due to inaction.
- Customer Experience – Unnecessary Delays: Customer waited nearly a week for a promised credit.
- Support Quality – Delayed Visibility: 10-minute wait before action after raising an urgent request.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Customer impact: Prolonged wait for owed credit.
- Agent impact: Additional chasing and customer management burden.
- Pattern: Highlights dependency on manual TL actions and slow responses.

P2-1 – Public performance management and team culture (dd/mm – TBC)

Case Code: P2-1

Incident Date: dd/mm – year not specified (time 13:24 cited; exact date not specified)

Channel: Group chat (TBC)

Customer Type: Standard (internal workforce context)

Key Staff Involved: Noel Curran

A TL publicly listed overdue actions with capitalised emphasis and threats of documentation, creating a culture of public shaming.

Narrative Report

Shortly after joining the team, I observed TL Noel Curran posting messages in the public group chat about overdue tasks. Though I was not named, the message listed colleagues' outstanding actions and used capital letters and threats of documentation, setting the tone for the working environment.

Quoted Evidence Blocks

Noel Curran (13:24):

> "All these Actions are Overdue, HOW can we have so many... these must be closed today or else will be documenting, this level for 3 agents is crazy"

Analysis of Potential Concerns

- Dignity at Work – Public Shaming: Public reprimand with caps ("HOW") and threats of documentation in a group setting constitutes humiliation rather than supportive coaching.
- Working Conditions – Pressure Culture: Emphasis on threats over support may deter open dialogue about workload issues.

Impact and Pattern Linkage

- Employee impact: Creates fear-based environment and undermines morale.
- Pattern: Aligns with other cases showing aggressive tone and lack of supportive leadership.

Assessment of Analysis:

The analysis is objective and aligns with the quoted evidence; the use of capitals and threats in a public forum is directly observable and supports the interpretation of public shaming.