

## Your response

Question	Your response
<p><b>Q1. Do you agree with our assessment that our proposals will not affect any specific groups of persons (including persons that share protected characteristics under the EIA 2010 or NIA 1998)? Please state your reasons and provide evidence to support your view.</b></p>	<p>Yes, we agree with this assessment. While the proposals may lead to some changes, they largely relate to how operators will need to work and so we do not believe they will significantly affect consumers' experiences.</p>
<p><b>Q2. Do you agree with our assessment of the potential impact of our proposal on the Welsh language? Do you think our proposal could be formulated or revised to ensure, or increase, positive effects, or reduce/eliminate any negative effects, on opportunities to use the Welsh language and treating the Welsh language no less favourably than English?</b></p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p><b>Q3. Do you have any comments about our proposed definitions in articles 3 to 8 of Part 1 of the draft PRS Order for key service concepts that are used throughout the Order?</b></p>	<p>We are happy with these proposed definitions – in particular, for <b>controlled PRS</b> we welcome the change from referring to 'call' to referring to 'electronic communication' and think this is helpful in making clear the scope of the definition.</p>
<p><b>Q4. Do you have any comments about our proposed definition for PRS regulated providers and regulated activity in article 9 in Part 1 of the draft PRS Order?</b></p>	<p>We are happy with this proposed definition and do not have any additional comments.</p>
<p><b>Q5. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to registration and registration exemptions in Part 2 of the draft PRS Order?</b></p>	<p>We are largely happy with this proposed approach.</p> <p>We welcome the proposal to reduce the amount of information which we need to provide when registering individual PRS under article 10 of the draft PRS Order. In particular, as a charity which often sets up PRS when fundraising in response to specific emergencies, removing the requirements around promotion details, branding and service dates is helpful</p>

	<p>because we often cannot know all of these at the point when we launch a campaign - they are dependent on how the emergency develops and the nature of our response.</p> <p>We also welcome the transition arrangements which Ofcom is proposing for existing providers and appreciate the steps taken to avoid our needing to re-provide information. We would appreciate certainty on the time frames which existing providers would need to meet when registering new PRS. We frequently set up new PRS as part of our fundraising activity, often at short notice, for example to enable members of the public to support particular areas of our work. Our understanding from the consultation is that we would need to register these new PRS with Ofcom within five working days of their going live - unlike new PRS providers, who need to register new PRS five working days in advance of their going live. It would be great if Ofcom were able to spell out whether this is correct when finalising the PRS order, because the nature of our PRS activity means that it would be very difficult for us to register all our PRS five working days in advance of their going live.</p>
<p><b>Q6. Do you have any comments on our proposed requirements relating to due diligence and risk assessment in Part 4 of the draft PRS Order?</b></p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p><b>Q7. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to security testing in Part 5 of the draft PRS Order?</b></p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p><b>Q8. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to misleading information and/or the promotion and marketing of PRS in Part 6, Chapters 1 and 2 of the draft PRS Order?</b></p>	<p>We are happy with this proposed approach. It would be helpful to understand whether Ofcom will produce guidance about how to apply these standards to accompany the PRS Order. While we appreciate the need to align regulation of PRS with Ofcom’s approach to regulation more generally, the draft PRS Order’s format as a legal document is written in less accessible language than the Phone-paid Services Authority’s Code and accompanying guidance. In particular, the accompanying guidance which the PSA provided was helpful in summarising key requirements for organisations and members of the public to understand – either as rules to follow or as expectations to have of services. If possible, we</p>

	would be keen to have similar guidance to support in interpreting Ofcom's PRS Order.
<b>Q9. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to pre-contract information and express consent for imposing certain charges in Part 6, Chapter 3 of the draft PRS Order?</b>	We are happy with this proposed approach. As with Question 8, it would be helpful if Ofcom were also to produce accompanying guidance to support in interpreting these requirements.
<b>Q10. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to provision of CPRS in Part 6, Chapter 4 of the draft PRS Order?</b>	We are happy with this proposed approach. As with Question 8, it would be helpful if Ofcom were also to produce accompanying guidance to support in interpreting these requirements.
<b>Q11. Do you have any comments about our proposed requirements relating to vulnerable consumers in Part 6, Chapter 5 of the draft PRS Order?</b>	We are happy with this proposed approach, and find the re-drafted definition of 'vulnerable customers' helpful in remaining high-level while also giving a sense of some of the circumstances where a person might be more likely to be at risk. As with Question 8, it would be helpful if Ofcom were also to produce accompanying guidance about how to interpret these requirements.
<b>Q12. Do you have any comments about the proposed requirements relating to prevention of harm and offence in Part 6, Chapter 5 of the draft PRS Order?</b>	We are happy with this proposed approach. As with Question 8, it would be helpful if Ofcom were also to produce accompanying guidance about how to interpret these requirements.
<b>Q13. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to competition and voting services in chapter 6 of Part 6 the draft PRS Order?</b>	No comment.
<b>Q14. Do you have any comments about our proposed requirements in respect of certain CPRS in chapter 7 of Part 6 our draft PRS Order?</b>	No comment.
<b>Q15. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to the recovery of Ofcom's expenditure in Part 3 of the draft PRS Order?</b>	No comment.
<b>Q16. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to additional requirements on network operators in Part 7 of the draft PRS Order?</b>	No comment.
<b>Q17. Do you have any comments about our proposed requirements relating to information requirements in Part 8 of the draft PRS Order</b>	No comment.
<b>Q18. Do you have any comments about our proposal to retain current PSA data retention periods for 2 years (for consumer data) and 3</b>	We are happy with this proposed approach and do not have any additional comments.

<p><b>years (for DDRAC data) in Part 9 of the draft PRS Order, with a preservation requirement following an investigation being opened?</b></p>	
<p><b>Q19. Do you have any comments about our proposed approach to enforcement in Part 10 of the draft PRS Order?</b></p>	<p>We are happy with this proposed approach and do not have any additional comments.</p>
<p><b>Q20. Do you agree with our provisional assessment that our proposals are justifiable, non-discriminatory, proportionate and transparent? Please provide further information</b></p>	<p>Yes, we agree with Ofcom’s provisional assessment. As outlined above, while the proposals are transparent it would be helpful if there were accompanying guidance as part of implementation. As well as assisting organisations, this would also help make it straightforward for members of the public to understand what they are entitled to expect.</p>
<p><b>Q21. Do you agree with our implementation period? Please state your reasons and provide evidence to support your view?</b></p>	<p>Yes, given the nature of the proposed changes we agree with the implementation period and welcome the proposed transitional arrangements for existing providers.</p>