



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FROM SERVICE PROVIDERS TO COLLABORATE WITH THE NCC TO COMPLEMENT THE NCC OPT-OUT REGISTRY SYSTEM (OORS)

REFERENCE NUMBER: NCC/RFP/01/2026/2027

Questions	Answers
Operational Requirements 1. What adoption rate does the NCC expect or forecast among direct marketers in year one, and is there a penalty or grace period for late registration? 2. How does OORS interact with the existing DMASA Do Not Contact list? Will DMASA data migrate in, or will marketers need to check both indefinitely? 3. Who adjudicates disputed opt-out violations? Does the accredited provider make the enforcement call, or does the NCC decide based on evidence the provider submits? 4. What uptime and support SLA does the NCC expect, given the requirement that the registry stay accessible except for unforeseen technical interruptions?	Operational Requirements 1. 100% adoption rate as the NCC will provide the registration window. There is no penalty for late registration. 2. OORS is the statutory NCC registry, and it will not integrate with any other existing registry and there is no data migration that will be done. 3. There NCC will retain the regulatory investigation and enforcement decision and accredited service provider should collect, preserve, and submit evidence. 4. The NCC has a standard 99.9% Monthly availability uptime, which excludes approved maintenance and support.

5. The technical criteria assume a project start date of 1 October 2026, before the 9 October bid closing date. What is the actual intended award and mobilization timeline?	5. Bidders should treat 1 October 2026 as an apparent drafting or baseline date; this assumption is for their proposals to their target milestones. The alignment will be done after accreditation date.
Technical Integration and Specifications 1. Does the requirement to cleanse monthly mean marketers pull a bulk extract and run a difference check locally, or must every contact be checked against the registry via API at send time? This changes the infrastructure and cost model substantially. 2. What transaction volume for registrations, lookups, and cleansing checks must the winning solution support at launch and at scale? 3. Is the existing 2021 portal using MS SQL, .NET Core, and Azure a platform new proposals must integrate with and extend, or is it fully replaceable? 4. What specifically counts as valid evidence of an opt-out violation, and what format or chain of custody does the NCC require for it to hold up in an enforcement action?	Technical Integration and Specifications 1. A recurring monthly cleansing before campaigns. No API integration allowed for cleansing. 2. No volume baseline. Bidders should state transparent sizing assumptions and provide elastic scaling and load-test thresholds. 3. The System must integrate with or extend it, not replace the system. 4. Evidence should include the consumer's verified opt-out record and effective date, marketer identity, communication content, channel, sender identifier, date and time, destination identifier, campaign or consent record, cleansing result, and immutable audit logs.

5. Are there existing data-sharing standards or interfaces with ICASA, the mobile network operators, or DMASA that the solution is expected to integrate with? Use-Case Clarity 1. Is OORS intended as real-time, per-call blocking at the network level, or strictly a pre-campaign list-cleansing product for marketers? The RFP text reads as the latter. Please confirm. 2. Does OORS cover all direct marketing channels equally such as voice, SMS, email, WhatsApp, and post, or are there channel-specific rules? 3. If a consumer has separately opted in to marketing from a specific company, does registering on OORS override that existing consent, or does it only block unsolicited contact from marketers with no relationship to them? 4. Is the accredited provider expected to operate the consumer and marketer-facing channels (like the app, chatbot, WhatsApp, and USSD) indefinitely as an ongoing product, or will the NCC take over front-end operation at some point?	5. No data sharing. Use-Case Clarity 1. OORS is primarily a registry and pre-campaign database-cleansing mechanism, not a telecommunications network-level call-blocking service. 2. The OORS framework is directed at unwanted electronic communications, which includes telephone, SMS, email, fax, wireless access, and similar technologies. WhatsApp should be treated as an electronic channel. 3. A consumer who registered a pre-emptive block overrides prior electronic-marketing consent until the consumer removes or changes the block. 4. All operations will be under the NCC.
---	---

Tolerance for Partial Bids and Partnering Models 1. Can a bidder propose only a subset of the listed components, for example proposing evidence collection and violation detection only, rather than the full solution? The scoring already grants partial credit on multi-channel accessibility, which suggests component-level bids may be acceptable. 2. If different bidders are strongest in different components, will the NCC combine or co-accredit complementary providers, or must each accredited provider deliver the whole solution independently? 3. Is there a path to supplying data or technology to an accredited operator as a commercial vendor after award, without being named or evaluated as part of that operator bid? 4. How many providers does the NCC expect to accredit in this round, and will the accreditation criteria or rankings be made public?	Tolerance for Partial Bids and Partnering Models 1. The Service provider must pass technical evaluation phase before they can be considered for accreditation. 2. Bidder should clearly state its scope, dependencies, integration responsibilities, and whether it can operate independently; the NCC will confirm whether it may combine complementary components after accreditation. 3. No. 4. No fixed number of accreditations and the accredited service provider will be published on the NCC website
Early Exit and Long-Term Transition Clauses 1. Regarding the 10-year accreditation period, what are the accepted mechanisms for an accredited service provider to initiate an early exit from the agreement without incurring punitive	Early Exit and Long-Term Transition Clauses 1. The final agreement will define termination condition for convenience, notice periods, alternative dispute resolution, transition assistance, data return or deletion, asset and

damages, assuming adequate notice and handover periods are provided? 2. If a bid is awarded to a consortium consisting of a local Prime Contractor and a foreign Subcontractor, and the foreign Subcontractor subsequently establishes a fully compliant local South African entity with CSD registration, is it permissible to novate or restructure the contract to alter the partnership dynamics or elevate the Subcontractor to a Prime Contractor status during the 10-year period? 3. If the local Prime Contractor faces liquidation, acquisition, or material breach during the 10-year accreditation, does the NCC allow an approved Subcontractor to assume the primary accreditation to ensure business continuity, provided the Subcontractor meets all local compliance requirements at that time? 4. Given the 10-year duration, what contractual provisions exist for early termination or restructuring if future legislative changes to the Consumer Protection Act or POPIA materially alter the mandate or eliminate the requirement for the OORS entirely? 5. Since the service provider assumes the operational costs and relies on enterprise adoption for revenue, is there a commercial hardship mechanism allowing the	licence treatment, and liability caps. 2. Not automatically. A change of prime contractor would require prior written NCC approval, continued compliance, due diligence, and confirmation that the change is permissible under procurement law and does not amount to an impermissible material variation or transfer of the accreditation. 3. The subcontractor would have no automatic succession right without the NCC-approval. 4. The agreement will include change-in-law, regulatory change, force majeure where applicable, scope adjustment, suspension, and termination provisions. 5. Parties can agree in negotiating on the revenue sharing framework as and when necessary.
---	--

provider to renegotiate the revenue-sharing framework or exit the partnership if direct marketer adoption falls below commercially viable levels? 6. If the NCC accredits multiple providers and the market becomes fragmented, can an accredited provider voluntarily scale down their service offering or withdraw from certain components without breaching the 10-year agreement?	6. Only if the final contract permits scope reduction or the NCC approves a variation.
Project Management Capacity and Governance 1. The evaluation criteria allocate 30 points for project management, requiring bidders to demonstrate an agile or hybrid approach with clear governance structures. Does the NCC currently have a dedicated product owner, an internal agile steering committee, and the necessary technical capacity ready to engage with the accredited provider starting from the stated project start date? 2. Regarding the requirement to demonstrate readiness for change management, will the NCC lead the external stakeholder communications and change management efforts directed at the direct marketing industry, or is the service provider expected to absorb the cost and	Project Management Capacity and Governance 1. Yes, the NCC has a Steering Committee and technical capacity to engage. 2. The NCC owns regulatory messaging, policy positions, enforcement communications, and official stakeholder authority. Therefore, the NCC will lead stakeholder communications and change management. The service provider will support campaigns, onboarding, training,

responsibility of industry-facing change management? OORS Operating Environment and Interdependencies 1. The evaluation framework requires bidders to demonstrate an understanding of the OORS operating environment and interdependencies with existing systems. Can the NCC provide a detailed technical architecture diagram, API specifications, and a data dictionary of the current OORS environment to ensure bidders can accurately map these interdependencies in their project plans? 2. Aside from the Azure cloud infrastructure and the .NET Core portal developed in 2021, what specific legacy systems, internal NCC complaint management databases, or third-party government systems must the new solution directly interface with during the pilot rollout phase? 3. For the quality assurance and testing plans required in the project methodology, will the NCC provide a dedicated staging or user acceptance testing environment for the existing OORS platform, or must the service provider provision and host all parallel testing environments?	service communications, and analytics. OORS Operating Environment and Interdependencies 1. Bidders should document assumptions and make discovery a gated mobilisation deliverable. 2. The information will be provided to the accredited service provider. 3. Service provider should host all parallel testing environments.
---	---

Foreign Subcontracting and SBD 1 Compliance

1. Regarding SBD 1 Part B, Clause 2.5 and the Foreign Supplier Questionnaire: If a local, fully compliant South African entity registered on the CSD submits the bid as the Prime Contractor, can they subcontract the consumer-facing application layer to a foreign technology provider?
2. To follow up, can the NCC confirm that in this Prime and Subcontractor structure, the foreign technology partner only needs to complete the Foreign Supplier section indicating No to local tax liability, and does not require its own CSD or SARS Tax PIN to avoid disqualification?

Data Sovereignty and Brand Visibility

1. Section 6 of the RFP lists Data Sovereignty and Protection as a mandatory requirement, stating that the hosting of ICT Infrastructure and ICT Data Center must be within the South African Jurisdiction. If the Prime Contractor hosts the Master OORS Database and backend APIs securely in a local South African data center, is it permissible to use a globally hosted mobile application as a transmission channel or edge node to route consumer consent signals into that local database?

Foreign Subcontracting and SBD 1 Compliance

1. The prime contractor remains accountable for performance, compliance, data protection, and subcontractor conduct.
2. Yes, however before the service provider must register with the CSD and SARS before accreditation.

Data Sovereignty and Brand Visibility

1. The bidder must map every data flow and subprocesses and show that all infrastructure and data covered by the mandatory requirement remain in South Africa.

2. Will the NCC accept this hybrid architecture as fully POPIA compliant and meeting the mandatory criteria for Phase 1, provided the core data resides locally? 3. Regarding the Technical Evaluation for Phases 2 and 3: If the primary bidder leverages an existing, globally recognized mobile application to fulfill the multi-channel accessibility requirement, is it acceptable for the consumer-facing interface to prominently feature the subcontractor's branding alongside the NCC branding? 4. Will the presence of a subcontractor branding on the front-end channels negatively impact the administrative compliance or technical scoring of the Prime Contractor submitting the bid? 5. Section 4.2 requires bidders to propose revenue generation models and a revenue-sharing framework with the NCC. In a Prime and Subcontractor relationship, is it acceptable for the Prime Contractor to hold the exclusive financial relationship and revenue-share agreement with the NCC, while privately managing the software licensing costs of their subcontractor out of their retained earnings?	2. Yes. 3. Yes, it is acceptable 4. No, it would not affect any scoring. 5. The NCC will need to have sight of the agreement between the Prime Contractor and Subcontractor, including their financial arrangement; however, the revenue-sharing framework will be with the Prime contractor.
---	---

1. Zero financial impact on the NCC and consumers / revenue model

Sections 4.1 and 9.3 require potential collaborators to operate at their own operational cost and at “no cost to the NCC and consumers”, supported by a signed confirmation letter. The RFP also requires potential collaborators to propose a detailed revenue-generation or monetisation model and a revenue-sharing framework with the NCC.

Could the NCC please clarify the intended scope of the “no cost to the NCC and consumers” requirement?

In particular:

1. Does this mean that the preparation, submission, development, implementation and/or ongoing operation of the proposed solution must not result in any cost to the NCC?
2. Does “no cost to consumers” mean that consumers may never be charged for accessing or using any channel or service forming part of the proposed solution, including during the subsequent 10-year accreditation period?
3. Alternatively, is the requirement intended primarily to confirm that the NCC and consumers will not be required to fund the bidder's RFP participation and implementation/operational costs?

1. Yes

2. Yes, no cost to the consumer

3. Yes

4. Given that the RFP expressly requires a monetisation model and revenue-sharing framework with the NCC, what categories of revenue or charges does the NCC envisage as permissible? 5. May the proposed commercial model include fees payable by direct marketers or other commercial users, provided that there is no cost to the NCC or consumers? 2. SBD 1 and SBD 4 pro forma documents The Phase 1 administrative requirements refer to the Invitation to RFP – SBD 1 and Service Provider's Disclosure – SBD 4, and instruct bidders to complete and sign the “provided”/“supplied” pro forma documents. We have not identified these pro forma documents within the RFP document available to us. Could the NCC kindly confirm whether the prescribed SBD 1 and SBD 4 forms were issued separately and, if so, where these may be accessed? Alternatively, please confirm whether bidders should utilise the applicable standard National Treasury SBD forms.	4. The NCC is not prescriptive on the revenue sharing model. 5. The NCC is not prescriptive on the commercial model. All the documents are published on the NCC website (There is a link to downloadable ZIP folder) and eTender portal.
---	---

3. CSD registration and collaborative/consortium submissions

The RFP requires the service provider to be registered on the Central Supplier Database.

Where a proposal is submitted by a lead organisation working together with an external technical/implementation partner, could the NCC please confirm:

1. whether only the lead bidder is required to be registered on CSD;
2. whether all consortium members, technical partners or subcontractors must also be independently registered on CSD; and
3. whether such parties must be formally linked as associates to the lead bidder's CSD profile or whether disclosure within the proposal is sufficient.

4. Data sovereignty and hosting requirements

The RFP requires the hosting of ICT infrastructure and the ICT Data Centre to be within South Africa and requires compliance with POPIA. It further states that consumer information collected through the OORS must be stored on servers located in South Africa.

Where a bidder proposes a solution that integrates with, augments or complements the existing NCC OORS, could the NCC please confirm whether the South African hosting requirement applies specifically to the bidder's proposed components and any OORS information

All bidders must be registered on the CSD, the consortium agreement must be submitted with the proposal.

All OORS collected data must reside within the borders of South Africa and comply to all applicable South African legislation.

The service provider will host the proposed solution within the South African borders, and the existing OORS infrastructure will remain with the NCC

processed or stored by those components, rather than requiring the bidder to host the NCC's existing OORS infrastructure itself?

5. Integration with the existing OORS

The RFP describes the existing OORS technology environment, including MS SQL, MVC/N-tier architecture, C#, .NET Core, Web API and Azure DevOps, and invites solutions that augment, supplement or complement the existing system.

Could the NCC please clarify:

1. whether successful collaborators will be provided with API access and the relevant technical/interface documentation required to integrate with the OORS;
2. whether bidders should assume that the NCC will retain ownership, administration and hosting of the core OORS while accredited collaborators operate complementary channels/services; and
3. whether there are prescribed security, authentication, data-exchange or interoperability standards that bidders should incorporate into their proposed architecture at this stage.

1. Yes, the API interface will be provided according to a proposed solution.

2. The NCC will retain ownership and the administration of the OORS

3. Yes, the requirement will be provided to a successful bidder.

7. Ten-year accreditation period

Section 8.1 provides that successful service providers will be accredited for a period of 10 years.

Could the NCC please clarify whether the 10-year accreditation is intended to constitute:

- a fixed contractual term;
- an accreditation period subject to an SLA and ongoing performance/compliance requirements; or
- an accreditation that may be periodically reviewed or renewed during the 10-year period?

The contract will be on a 10 year term, which will be reviewed annually subject to performance and compliance requirements.

8. Ownership and intellectual property

Given that collaborators are expected to fund their own development and operational costs while potentially developing applications, chatbots, integrations and other technology to complement the OORS, could the NCC please clarify the anticipated position regarding intellectual property ownership?

In particular, should bidders assume that they will retain ownership of their pre-existing and independently developed technology, subject to appropriate licences/integration rights being granted to the NCC, or does the NCC anticipate ownership of technology developed under the collaboration?

The bidder will retain the ownership of their pre-existing and independently developed technology.

9. Electronic component of the submission Section 16 requires three copies – one original and two duplicates – together with an “electronically accessible proposal packaged similar to the physical copies.” Could the NCC please confirm the required format and medium for the electronic submission (for example, USB storage device) and whether it should contain a complete electronic replica of the signed physical submission, including all annexures and supporting documentation?	Any electronically accessible format will be accepted and it must be packaged similar to the physical copies.
The conversational automation scope aligns closely with our work across AI chatbots, workflow automation, CRM integrations, multilingual customer journeys and voice and messaging channels. The WhatsApp, SMS/USSD and multichannel requirements are particularly relevant. Before we invest in the full submission, could you confirm whether international service providers may participate as the prime bidder, or whether a South African entity or consortium partner is required?	It may participate directly; however, it will need to adhere to SA laws, and one of the mandatory requirements of the RFP is the following, which will need to be adhered to: Data Sovereignty, Data Privacy, and Protection. If you have a partner in South Africa, you can use them. Service providers must attach a signed letter of such confirmation. The hosting of ICT Infrastructure and ICT Data Center must be within the South African Jurisdiction. Service Provider must comply with the Protection of Personal Information Act (POPIA) in terms of data privacy and protection. The NCC may conduct a site visit for confirmation.
The combination of mobile, WhatsApp, SMS/USSD, multilingual AI assistance and evidence workflows is closely aligned with the systems our team can design and integrate.	There are no addenda to the initial documents published on the NCC website and etender portal, and the closing date is 09 October 2026 at 14:00.

Where we can help Mobile & web experience · WhatsApp and messaging integrations · multilingual AI chatbot · workflow automation · analytics · secure platform engineering We would be interested in reviewing the full technical and commercial requirements and identifying the strongest compliant approach for the NCC. Could you confirm any current addenda or submission updates?	
1. Remuneration and permitted payer. Clause 4.1 requires a collaborator to operate at its own operational cost and at no cost to the NCC and to consumers, while clause 4.2 and technical evaluation criterion 2 (20 points) require a detailed revenue generation or monetisation model together with a revenue-sharing framework with the NCC. We ask the NCC to confirm which parties an accredited service provider may lawfully charge, and specifically whether direct marketers may be charged for registration, list-cleansing, API access or verification services. We further ask the NCC to confirm whether any category of charge is prohibited beyond charges to the NCC and to consumers, and whether the NCC will set	The only fee that is permitted is per the Amended Regulations 4 of the Consumer Protection Act.

or approve a tariff for any permitted charge. 2. Outcome of the briefing session. We ask the NCC to confirm whether the non-compulsory briefing session held on 18 September 2026 produced minutes, an attendance register or a questions-and-answers addendum, and where these may be obtained. We further ask whether all written questions received by 25 September 2026 at 16h00 will be consolidated and issued to all prospective service providers, and through which channel this will be done, given that the RFP required no prior registration of interest. 3. Submission method and format. Clause 16.1 directs delivery of proposals to the NCC tender box at the SABS Campus, Building C, 1 Dr Lategan Road, Groenkloof, Pretoria, while clause 16.3 requires three copies (one original and two duplicates) together with an electronically accessible proposal packaged similar to the physical copies. We ask the NCC to confirm (a) whether hard-copy delivery to the tender box is the only accepted method of submission, or whether an emailed submission is also	The Q & A will be published on the NCC website, eTender portal and they will be forwarded to the Participants of the briefing session. Both physical and any electronically accessible format is required and there is no need for separate USB, only one is required.
---	--

accepted; (b) whether the electronic copy is to be provided on a USB flash drive, and whether one such drive is required inside each of the three sealed packages or as a single separate sealed package; and (c) whether any file format or file naming convention is prescribed for the electronic copy.

4. **Statutory returnable documents not listed in the RFP.** Table 2 under clause 9.3 lists only SBD 1, SBD 4, proof of CSD registration and the two signed confirmation letters. We ask the NCC to confirm whether SBD 6.1 (preference points claim form), a valid tax compliance status PIN or tax clearance certificate, and B-BBEE evidence (in the case of an exempted micro enterprise, a sworn affidavit in place of a verification certificate) are required as part of the proposal, or whether these will be requested at a later stage. We further ask the NCC to confirm whether any preference point system applies to this accreditation, as none is stated in the RFP.

Please submit only the requested document as per the advert.
No preference point system will apply to this RFP.

1. Prescribed OORS fees and financial model

We note that Annexure N of the amended CPA Regulations prescribes the following OORS fees for 2026:

- Initial registration fee: **R2,574.00**
- Annual renewal fee: **R1,930.50**
- Cleansing fee: **R0.12 per data entry**

The Regulations further prescribe increases to these fees for subsequent years.

The RFP separately requires prospective collaborators to submit a detailed **revenue-generation/monetisation model and revenue-sharing framework with the NCC**.

Could the NCC please clarify whether an accredited collaborator is expected to apply the **same prescribed OORS tariff structure** when providing services that complement the OORS, or whether bidders may propose an alternative or additional commercial model for services delivered through their solution?

In particular, please confirm whether the prescribed registration, annual renewal and cleansing fees would:

(a) be collected directly by the NCC;
(b) be collected by an accredited collaborator on behalf of the NCC; or
(c) form part of the collaborator's proposed financial and revenue-sharing model.

Where bidders may propose additional commercial services or charges, could the NCC also clarify which categories of services may

The only fee that is permitted is per the Amended Regulations 4 of the Consumer Protection Act. All the prescribed fees will be collected by the NCC.

The bidder can propose any other commercial model provided that it does not contravene the regulations.

appropriately be monetised, particularly in light of the RFP requirement that the proposed collaboration have **no financial impact on the NCC or consumers?**

2. Revenue/profit-sharing model

The RFP requires bidders to propose a revenue-sharing framework with the NCC.

Could the NCC please clarify whether it envisages the commercial arrangement as:

- a percentage of gross revenue generated through the proposed solution;
- a profit-sharing arrangement after agreed operational expenses;
- a transaction- or service-based revenue share; or
- another model to be proposed by the bidder?

If a profit-sharing arrangement is contemplated, is there an indicative percentage or minimum expectation from the **NCC and/or the dtic** that bidders should incorporate into their financial modelling?

Alternatively, should bidders propose their preferred methodology, percentage and underlying assumptions as part of the RFP response, with the final commercial arrangement to be negotiated with the successful collaborator following the award? Could the NCC also confirm whether it envisages an initial implementation or observation period before the final revenue-sharing arrangement becomes operational, or whether the proposed model is expected to apply from commencement?

The proposed revenue-sharing arrangement will further be discussed after accreditation, however the service provider must provide the proposal on the revenue sharing model.

3. Consumer opt-out categories and preference functionality

In relation to the consumer-facing functionality of the OORS, could the NCC please clarify whether the **opt-out categories currently reflected within the OORS are prescribed categories that complementary solutions must replicate**, or whether an accredited collaborator may propose a different level of categorisation while remaining interoperable with the NCC OORS? For example, would the NCC consider a solution that initially provides a less granular preference structure, with categories and preference functionality subsequently developed based on consumer research, usage data and demonstrated demand, subject to NCC approval?

We would appreciate guidance on the degree of flexibility available to bidders in designing the consumer experience while ensuring that the consumer's underlying pre-emptive block is correctly recorded and honoured.

4. Duration of a consumer's pre-emptive block

Could the NCC please clarify the intended duration of a consumer's registration of a pre-emptive block on the OORS?

Specifically, once a consumer has registered a pre-emptive block, is that preference intended to remain effective **indefinitely until the consumer elects to amend or withdraw it**, or does the OORS framework contemplate a fixed validity period or periodic consumer reconfirmation/renewal?

If a fixed-term or reconfirmation mechanism is permissible, would the NCC consider a period proposed by the collaborator as part of the solution design, subject to approval?

The system is quite flexible, and the future enhancement are also accommodated.

The pre-emptive block is indefinitely until the consumer intended to withdraw or amend.

We raise this question to ensure that any functionality proposed by us accurately reflects the consumer's statutory choice and does not inadvertently introduce an expiry or renewal mechanism that is inconsistent with the CPA and Regulations.

5. Complaints management and industry dispute-resolution mechanisms

In the context of the proposed OORS collaboration, could the NCC please clarify whether it would consider an accredited industry collaborator providing a **first-line complaints-management and/or dispute-resolution function** for appropriate direct-marketing and OORS-related matters, subject to agreed parameters, escalation criteria, reporting and regulatory oversight? In particular, could the NCC please advise:

- whether appropriate complaints may initially be assessed and facilitated through DMASA's complaints-management framework;
- which categories of complaints, if any, the NCC would regard as suitable for industry-level resolution;
- which matters would need to be referred directly to the NCC, Information Regulator or another competent authority;
- whether the NCC envisages formal referral, escalation and reporting protocols between an accredited collaborator and the NCC; and
- whether an industry complaints and adjudication mechanism may be included

The questions are outside the scope of RFP and therefore are deemed to be operational.

as a value-added component of the solution proposed under the RFP. DMASA anticipates that increased public awareness and adoption of the OORS may correspondingly increase consumer enquiries and complaints relating to direct-marketing practices. We therefore wish to understand whether an appropriately governed industry mechanism could compliment the NCC's statutory role by facilitating timely resolution of suitable matters, while providing clear escalation pathways for matters requiring regulatory intervention. Any such mechanism would operate within parameters agreed with the NCC and would not seek to exercise statutory investigation or enforcement powers reserved for the NCC or another competent regulator. We would appreciate the NCC's clarification on the above matters, as the responses will materially inform the financial model, system architecture, consumer journey, operating model and complaints-management component of our proposal.	
---	--

End.