

Profile Evidence File No/6 008/1800 billing issues Exhibit 6-A to 6-I follows

6-A. Letter from Telstra's lawyers to myself dated 24<sup>th</sup> January, 1994 confirms that I raised the lock-up billing problems on my 055 267267 line from 1<sup>st</sup> January, 1993 - 9<sup>th</sup> August, 1993 (see page 3).

6-B. Official Government Regulatory AUSTEL three page document (which should have been provided to me as promised by the Government after they visited my business on 19<sup>th</sup> December, 1995), was not released to me until after my statutory limitations had expired. This made sure I could not use it to appeal my award! It is clear from this report on page one, using Telstra's own Call Charge Analysis data (CCAS), AUSTEL's Darren Kearney was able to conclude Telstra by May and July 1993 (see dot point 1 and 2 in this letter) had indeed started to incorrectly charge me for call-periods longer than they should have. This mini report dated 26<sup>th</sup> February, 1996 also shows that Telstra was continually incorrectly charging my business on my 008/1800 service in January 1995, (nine months after I entered the Arbitration Process).

6-C. Telstra internal email dated 11<sup>th</sup> October, 1993 FOI folio H36291 which discusses the 1800 billing problem notes: "I am receiving a disturbing number of instances where the 1800 prefix "does not work" in the network".

6-D. Further Telstra internal email dated 1<sup>st</sup> November, 1993 FOI folio H36293 states: "...All Admin groups are being inundated with complaints from customers who have advertised their numbers as 1800 but their customers are simply unable to get through to them. I have also spoken to our fault staff out at Waverly who are also being inundated with the same complaints."

6-E. Telstra internal memo dated 5<sup>th</sup> November, 1993 FOI folio H36178 states under the heading Serious 1800 problem: "...Bruce is concerned that the matter requires fixing [sic] at a national level not just on a fault by fault basis. He also raises the question whether we should be actively promoting 1800 in the current circumstances".

6-F. Two letters from AUSTEL dated 6<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> January, 1994 to Telstra confirm I am still raising the same 008/1800 billing problems. My 008 line was transferred over to the 1800 service

Open Letter File 45-A to 45-H and 46-A to 46-L also confirm I was raising these ongoing 008/1800 billing problems during and after my arbitration.

6-G. Government facsimile dated 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 1998 to John Pinnock (TIO) confirms (from the three page Telstra attachment) 33 Months after my arbitration had concluded, Telstra admitted that it appeared as though my 1800 billing faults raised during my arbitration, appeared to have continued after my arbitration. This document was concealed from me until after the statute of limitations had expired, so I was unable to use this to appeal my arbitration award.

6-H. Two letters dated 10<sup>th</sup> February, 1999 from John Pinnock (TIO) to various Government Officials **advising them that he was** considering investigation whether the Arbitrator had addressed the billing issue in my arbitration when Open Letter File No/45-A, 46-K and 46-L shows they were never addressed during my arbitration?

6-I. Two pages from Telstra's CEO, Frank Blount (who was Telstra's CEO before I went into arbitration and four years thereafter) wrote a joint manuscript with Bob Joss titled "Managing in Australia". This manuscript confirms Mr Blount knew the 1800 faults were a major network problem.

In simple terms, my arbitration billing issues should have been investigated by the arbitrator and had his consultants done so they may well have concluded as did Telstra (see 6-G above) that the billing problems were still affecting my business.



FREEHILL  
HOLLINGDALE  
& PAGE

**COPY**

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 AA93004 DX 240 MELBOURNE

SYDNEY MELBOURNE PERTH CANBERRA BRISBANE LONDON SINGAPORE  
REPRESENTED IN BANGKOK AND JAKARTA

6A