

A 008 818 529 Fx. 055 267 230

Country Get – Aways Historical Portland

Victoria's first permanent settlement

4th January 1994

Mis D MacBurnie, in thill follingdale & Page, , Collins Street. MELEOURNE 3000

Dear Ms. MacBurnie,

I am writing this letter to confer with you or your Associate, seemingly you are on holidays, regarding the many letters and conversations ! have had with you in reference to the faults and requests of these faults re Telecom

I am in point form again to ask for your help, Freehill Hollingdale & Page, again for the information which has not been supplied either by yourself or from Telecom to yourself.

Person or persons who supposedly contacted me on the 18th August 1993 at 9.16 a.m. having a conversation with me at Cape Bridgewater 055 267267 for 6 mins and 52 seconds, and again on the same day in the afternoon at 2.15 p.m. for 11 mens and 14 second . I have repeatedly asked for this request. The fact that ve not got this information is hindering my claim under the fast sck proposal we have mutually accepted, both Telecom and C.O.T. : asualties of Telecom)

Confirmation by Telecom that we have had faults on our line as late as August 1993. I ask or request for this confirmation

Written confirmation by Telecom that the testing equipment that they had monitoring my lines (not the equipment I had on my premises) registering telecommunication faults. I would like clarification of the faults registered up to date. Telecom have not supplied this information.

cc AS.

r. 4

I have not had to date any correspondence regarding the sample of bills to which I sent to your office re letter Denise MacBurnie dated the 12th November 1993. I still have not received any information regarding these questions ascertaining to the overcharges and short duration of calls. My own phone bills show similar discrepencies, so therefore this information I am seeking is part of my claim re settlement proposal

- 5. Re letter sent to Denise MacBurnie 15th October 1993. I did not ask for sonly the originals and locations re paragraph 3 What I asked for is a clarification that the sort duration calls (test calls) were actually made to my premises. Those test calls came in, 6 in all, 5 registered engaged from Horsham exchange I have already spoken to Mr Peter Penny from the Horsham exchange on that evening. He has confirmed that each 5 calls came in as busy. The first call registered O.K. by which we had a conversation. I ask again of Telecom for confirmation of these 5 busy tone calls that did not reach this premises in letter form.
- 6. As you are aware Austel have in their possession documentation regarding the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp. They have information regarding my communication faults over a certain duration. This briefcase having been inadvertently left by the Melbourne Network Support Group (Telecom).

(ii) Re letter addressed to David Hawker MP Federal
Member for Wannon, signed Mr. Ian Campbell, Managing
Director, Commercial Business, dated 23rd August 1993.
Re paragraph 7. Mr. Campbell has written stating that
several letters from the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
clients had supported my claims of an inadequate
telecommunications service. I quote Mr. Smith has
provided several letters from his clients supporting his
claims. Each of which have been investigated without a fault
being found. I would like now for Mr. Campbell to forward
me or perhaps to Mr. Hawker MP the number of persons Mr.
Campbell checked by way of this paragraph.

(iii) Re paragraph & Does Mr. Campbell still maintain that I have had no known communication faults as mentioned in this paragraph and I quote "no network fault has been found over the last few months!

With reference to paragraph 6, no network fault has been found over the last few months although 2 problems with Mr Smith's private equipment have been identified including misoperation of his answering machine. I would like to add to Mr Campbell's statement of 2 problems with Mr Smith's private equipment.

R11447

On purchasing a hand set from Retravision a Telecom. model 2000, hand held, this equipment and its faults was experienced by 2 Telecom Technical personell, Mr. Ray Morris from Melbourne and Mr. Gordon Stokes from Portland. This hand set would not switch off when completing telephone conversations Both Telecom employees found this fault to be prevalent on many occassions while testing this equipment. The fault was that the off button would not activate sometimes on the first try. Sometimes it took the operator of this equipment as many as 5 or 6 times before the set switched off. This would have allowed the line to be free for other incoming calls. This equipment was ONE week old. I then re-purchased another. A new hand set on the advice of Ray Morris, Melbourne Commercial Division. Telecom. This same equipment did the same thing again, here at Cape Bridgewater I then contacted Telecom Commercial Suppliers of this equipment and told them of the malfunction. I then took the equipment back to my supplier. I have not been game to buy a third (this equipment is supplied by Telecom and GUARANTEED by Austel!!)

On answering the second reference of my private equipment, ...my answering machine. While in Melbourne, which was not a common occurance. Telecom's Mr. Ray Morris rang a Margaret Reefman who was working and staying at my premises, looking after my camp. As she was living on the premises, she did not have the answering machine connected. While having a shower and attending to her normal daily toiletries, she activated the answering machine with the incoming call from Mr. Ray Morris, Telecom, believing this non-answered call was a

to the above questions, namely paragraphs I through 7

This request will enable me to gain the information that is required to further my claim re the fast track proposal

In closing however, I would like to ask again of Mr. Campbell, does he really believe or expect me to believe that in paragraph 9 of his letter, that I have been kept fully informed of all matters and conditions of his service? I would appreciate his reply in writing

R11448

TREEHILL HOLLINGDALE



28 January, 1994

K01160

Mr Alan Smith Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp

By facsimile No. 055 267 230

Dear Mr Smith

Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp DLM:001660539

We refer to your letter dated 4 January 1994 to Denise McBurnie.

We also refer to your telephone conversation with Denise McBurnie on 25 January 1994 and confirm that Telecom wishes to establish Mr Steve Black and Mr Paul Rumble of Telecom, as your point of contact for requests for information from our client. Any further requests for information which you have for our client should therefore be directed to Mr Black or Mr Rumble.

In response to your request for information we provide below our client's responses to the questions raised in paragraphs 1-6 of your letter. In your letter you requested answers to the questions raised in paragraph 1-7. Your letter did not contain a paragraph 7 and we were unable to ascertain any further questions from your letter. Our client has instructed us to respond to the questions raised in paragraphs 1-6 of your letter as follows:

(1) Paragraph 1

Telecom has previously advised both yourself and AUSTEL that it did locate the names of two employees who made the calls referred to in this paragraph. These employees are involved in investigating reported faults and testing customer services by making a number of calls each day. Given the elapse of time between the making of the two test calls in question and the time you requested release of the caller's name, it would be difficult to determine any detailed information regarding the discussions which took place during those test calls. It is Telecom's position that it will not release the names of employees unless Telecom considers the release of such information to be reasonable and proper in all the circumstances.

BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS

101 COLLINS STREET

MELBOURNE 3000 AUSTRALIA

GPO BOX 128A MELBOURNE 3001

TELEPHONE (03) 288 1234 FACSIMILE (03) 288 1567

TELEX AA33004 DX 240 MELBOURNE

SYDNIY MALBOURER

PERTH CANDERRA BRISARE REPRESENTED IN SANGEOK AND JAKARTA

LONDON

SINGAPORE

Mr Alan Smith 28 January, 1994



Page 2

(2) Paragraph 2

Y01161

An examination of the fault history for telephone number 055 267 267 indicates that you made a total of nine reports to Telecom's Fault Report Services during the period 1 January 1993 until 9 August 1993. As a result of testing conducted into these reports the following results were obtained:

- In January 1993 two reports resulted in:
 - (i) on 6 January 1993, a handset was replaced at your premises.
 - (ii) on 13 January 1993, a printed circuit board at the Portland Telephone Exchange associated with your telephone equipment was replaced.
- On 18 February 1993 your report was referred to the Customer Operations
 Group in Ballarat. This report involved the repair of a fault that was found on
 another customer's PABX located in Ballarat.
- Testing associated with the remaining six reports occurred between 20 May 1993 until 9 August 1993 and resulted in the fault reports being cleared as "No Fault Found" or "No Fault Found, but additional network testing to be undertaken". This additional testing found no evidence of any network faults.

(3) Paragraph 3

Telecom has recently had in place equipment to monitor your service at the Portland Exchange. This equipment is involved in passive line potential monitoring and does not "register" fault conditions as such, but provides a report on the line status experienced, for example, incoming call, outgoing call, time of call. Interpretation of the output of this monitoring is required in conjunction with other information and testing to allow Telecom to determine the overall performance of a customer's service.

Other forms of service monitoring which can be used by Telecom are AXE Test System and Common Channel Signalling Monitoring. Again, these systems both produce data that requires analysis and cross referencing with other materials. It is therefore not possible to provide the information as requested in paragraph 3 of your letter. A detailed analysis of your service occurs as an ongoing process and any anomalies detected during that time are acted upon directly.

(4) Paragraph 4

As the information provided originally in your letter dated 12 November 1993 was of a limited nature, no specific response was possible to your allegations concerning over charging and short duration of calls. However, Telecom does have clearly defined policies and principles for call charging and billing. These principles are:

- customers will be charged only for calls which are answered.
- unanswered calls are not charged.

FHPMELC4\94025008.1

Mr Alan Smith 28 January, 1994



Page 3

unanswered calls include calls encountering engaged numbers (busy), various Telecom tones and Recorded Voice Announcements as well as calls that "ring out" or are terminated before or during ringing.

(5) Paragraph 5

As Telecom has previously advised to you, the incident referred to in this paragraph relates to the use of Malicious Call Trace (MCT) that was placed on your line as part of the testing of your service. MCT resulted in the line being "held busy" for 90 seconds after the actual call was terminated. Consequently, the first call was made, answered and terminated, and the following five calls, all made within the 90 second period received a busy tone. Subsequent to this incident, MCT was removed.

(6) Paragraph 6

(i) As you have noted in your letter the Elmi Tape which was retained by you from a brief case inadvertently left at your premises by a Telecom employee was apparently returned by you to AUSTEL. Telecom has been unable to locate that tape and has instructed us that it received a different tape from AUSTEL than the one to which you refer in paragraph 6(i) of your letter.

Consequently, Telecom is unable to comment or provide any opinion of the tape to which you refer at this stage. Telecom is currently endeavouring to confirm with AUSTEL the location of the tape to which you refer. It is also Telecom's opinion that it is not appropriate for Telecom to comment on this piece of material at this time and it would be more appropriate for Telecom's comment to be conveyed during the Fast-Track arbitration procedure.

- (ii) Prior to receipt of the letters provided by you to Telecom, Telecom had had reason to investigate the matters referred to in those letters and had completed those investigations without a fault being found. Telecom did not consider it necessary to conduct such investigations again when they had already been completed Mr Campbell's statement of "each of which have been investigated without fault" in his letter to Mr Hawker was therefore correct.
- (iii) As noted above in Telecom's response to the questions raised in your paragraph 2. Telecom has not found any evidence of network faults applicable to and which could affect your service during the period to which you refer.

Yours faithfully
FREEHILL HOLLINGDALE & PAGE
per:

Denise McBurnie Solicitor

D. M. M. Sum

PHPMELC4\94025008.1

DEC 15 '93 11:54 FREEHILLS MELB, 03 2881567

2.2

FREEHILL
HOLLINGDALE
& PAGE

20.094.

16 December 1993

Mr Aian Smith Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp RMB 4408 CAPE BRIDGEWATER VIC

By facsimile

Dear Mr Smith

Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp Our Ref: RAB:DLM:1660539

I refer to your letter of 6 December 1993 and to our subsequent telephone conversation. In your letter you asked for information concerning recent testing of your 008 number undertaken by Bell Canada International (BCI) at the request of our client, Telecom Australia.

With respect to your first question, our client has informed us that BCI's testing of your 008 service was conducted from the central database. A 008 services works by providing a translation of the 008 number to an ordinary telephone number. When a call is made to a 008 number, that call is switched through to the central database system. At this point, the 008 number called is checked in the database and the appropriate number that it translates to is determined. From this point the call is then switched to the translated number.

With respect to your second question, BCI did not test your 008 number from locations other than the central database system.

With respect to your comment concerning a customer from Mount Gambier, South Australia who has reported to you that he had difficulty contacting you on your 008 service, if you are able to provide our client with more details (such as the caller's telephone number) our client may be able to investigate and comment further on the problem which this customer has reported to you.

Yours faithfully
FREEHILL HOLLINGDALE & PAGE
per:

Denie 17 Bunio

Denise McBurnie Solicitor

BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
10: COLLINS STREET
MELBOLENE 3000 AUSTRALIA
GFO 30X 128A MELBOURNE 3001
TELEPHONE (05) 288 1284 FACSIMILE (03) 288 1567

Hill. Trevor

From:

Hill, Trevor

To:

Pinel, Don; Hambleton, Dennis V Austel Submission - Comments.

Subject: Date:

Thursday, 14 October 1993 10:58AM

Priority:

High



I regret that other Austel bush -fires this week have not allowed me to devote the time to review your submission to the extent that I would have preferred nor that your efforts deserved.

Initial comments are:

1. Exec Summary.

Background.

We need to focus Austel's attention as much as possible on the current rather than the past level of service delivered to Cot Cases.

Para 8. - Instead of "was not as high as desired" change to "did not meet customer's expectations"

After "1993" insert new para.' A number of these settlements were only resolved after many meetings
between the parties and were often enhanced by Austel's presence in its now stated role as "honest broker":

At the end of the 3 dot points insert:

"It is these claims that are the basis for and focus of Austel's Investigation into the current level of service quality experienced by these customers."

Para 14 - "pressures" rather than "limitations"

Para 16 - because...".of their perceived lack of independence."?

Para20 - "influence" rather than "support or not"

Para 25 - After "suggestion is proposed" insert " Telecom seeks Austel's comments on this suggestion. Actual implementation of the suggestion would need to take into account comments received and any other organisational initiatives and imperatives that may impact on the suggestion.

Para 26 - Please note that, as stated at previous meetings, I have strong reservations re our response to this issue. There is a big difference between making the allegation of misleading and deceptive behaviour and proving an actual breach of S52 of the TPA. This response removes any hurdles by providing an admission on behalf of the company. If senior management of C&C truly believe that this illegal behaviour has occurred then it is incumbent upon those same managers to take immediate action against the staff involved.

My view is that Telecom's response to this issue should reflect the advice from Denise McBurnie, Freehill, Hollingdale & Page, Solicitors.

I will continue to work thru' the doc. and feed my comments to you asap.

Trevor Hill