d'informed 313 on 15-10-92

MR Smith las complained that an the 13-10-92 he received mining calls at 1.20: 1.40 2.00

and no pope was there when he approved the calls. - (Ic dropones on answer?)

We look the Elmi disconnected not the Long and was installines to at MR smiths house. He CLAS. Should to evidence of above

INCOMING ANSWERED EHD SEIZURE 13.40.40 CONVERS.7IME: 000675 SEIZURE : 13.29.25 DATE 1992-10-13 . NUMBER OF RINGS: RINGING: 13.29.13 13.40.40 H-0N 000001 13.29.25 H-OFF 000001 13.29.23 R 13.29.22 R 13.29.20 R 13:29.19 R 13.29.17 R 13.29.16 R 13.29.14 R 13.29.13 R

INCOMING ANSWERED END SEIZURE 15.04.03 CONVERS.TIME: 000172 SEIZURE : 15.01.11 DATE 1992-10-13 : NUMBER OF RINGS: 14 RINGING: 15.00.50 15.04.03 H-ON 000001 15.01.11 H-0FF 000001 15.01.09 R 15.01.08 R 15.01.08 R 15.01.05 R 15.01.03 R 15.01.02 R 15.01.00 R 15.00.59 R 15.00.57 R 15.00.56 R 15.00.54 R 15.00.53 R 15.00.51 R 15.00.50 R

A TELSTRA minute written on 2 July 1992 to NETWORK OPERATIONS and the FAULT BUREAU VIC/TAS, and obtained under the F.O.I.



Telecom Australia

Minute

File HA-AC 4/1/18 Subject GRADE OF SERVICE COMPLAINT MR ALAN SHITH 055-26 7267

Phone 055-73 0200

From MARK ROSS
CUSTOMER SERVICES MANAGER
HAMILTON - VIC/TAS REGION



- NETWORK OPERATIONS
- FAULT BUREAU VIC/TAS



Please find enclosed documentation in regard to a Grade of Service Complaint from Mr Alan Smith of Cape Bridgewater.

Our local technicians believe that Mr Smith is correct in raising complaints about incoming callers to his number receiving a Recorded Voice Announcement saying that the number is disconnected.

They believe that it is a problem that is occurring in increasing numbers as more and more customers are connected to AXE.

Can you please investigate this problem and provide me with a written reply so as I can forward this to Mr Smith and our local Federal Member, before what is already a difficult situation, gets right out of hand.

Mikes

Mark Ross Customer Services Manager - Hamilton

2/1/42

mr1981b3

Telecom Secret

TO

C04006

Issues Involved During the Resolution - Factors Considered

- 1. Alan requested \$150k
- 2. Chances of legal action high
- 3. Chances of media action 100%
- 4. Poor performance of Telecom:
 - historically
 - March ? problem
 - Local Portland problem fixed in October
 - · , wiring and cabling issues
 - RVA on congestion
- 5. Slow resolution of past problems both technical and claims
- 6. COT involvement:
 - chances of class action
 - · chances of mass media action
 - chances of membership growth
 - Adelaide Pizza
 - Mt Gambia
 - Portland
- Evidence of problems:
 - Many letters stating the problem of not getting through to Alan Smith
 - People prepared to make statements of problems
 - Claims that Alan had rung himself from his Goldphone and not got through
 - Austel and Ombudsman both had trouble getting through
 - Many claims which might be difficult to substantiate in court but would be credible in the media
 - Viability of business for the future increased bookings since the service
 Period of time
- 8. Costs incurred:
 - Additional phone calls to chase up business about \$1000
 - Legal costs about \$1000
 - Camps prepared but not run
 - Advertising
 - Time
- 9. Alan's time and other consequential costs health, stress, etc.

...

0

-2-

4

TO

Telecom Secret

C04007

10. Loss of business:

- Camps lost because party could not contact Alan (evidence in letters \$10,000
- Extrapolating about \$40,000 over a period

11. Loss of parmership:

Alan claims \$100,000 loss because he had an opportunity to sell a share in his business but this opportunity was lost because the potential partner stated he could not contact Alan Smith initially and lost faith in the telephone service available - hence withdrew his offer

12. Possible legal costs:

- If Alan took legal action Telecom would incur significant legal costs to defend
- If Telecom lost, we could also incur Alan Smith's costs
- Estimated what possible bill?
- 13. Inquiry costs both Austel and Ombudsman's Office has been actively involved. Enquiries are ongoing. Cost of ? - about Sawig
- 14. Cost of arbitration Mr Smith wanted to use an independent arbitrator to resolve the dispute - cost in a case in Sydney \$25k
- 15. Management time I have spoken to Alan Smith regularly (daily) over a period. I began making appointments for when I would ring him - he nearly always rings me prior to the call. When I did not ring him daily (even if I was not scheduled to) he wrote to Frank Biount and Dong Campbell or both. He had regularly rung Doug Campbell's office (Judy Lanstrom) several times a week and Austel and others in Telecom. This was despite my setting up a regular contact point (Mark Ross in Ballarat) for him and a specialist diagnostic technical manager (Bruce Pendlebury). Mark spoke with Alan Smith once a week at least. Bruce averaged 5-6 calls a week to and from Alan Smith. He also contacted the Area Manager, Don Lucas, on a regular basis. Don also visited Alan Smith at Cape Bridgewater. This was going to continue forever if all matters were not resolved.
- 16. Legal position Mr Smith's service problems were network related and spanned a period of 3-4 years. Hence Telecom's position of legal liability was covered by a number of different acts and regulations. The immunity claimed has never been tested in court and the current immunity from paying loss of business compensation depends upon Section 8 of the BCS Tariffs lodged with Austel. This is probably the least clear of the immunities. In my opinion Alan Smith's case was not a good one to test Section 8 for any previous immunities - given his

- 3 -

Telecom Secret

C04008

evidence and claims. I do not believe it would be in Telecom's interest to have

Overall, Mr Smith's telephone service had suffered from poor grade of network performance over a period of several years; with some difficulty to detect exchange problems in the last 8 months.

In the media Telecom would not have looked good at a time when we are working hard to improve general customer perceptions.

In a legal battle, Telecom's chance of winning would have to be about 50/50. The bad publicity for Telecom would have been significant.

In my view were Alan Smith to win a legal battle he could have been awarded payment as high as \$40,000. If we went to arbitration a payour of the order of \$80,000 would not be out of the question; with costs of setting up the arbitration

In the interests of expediency and Commercial judgement I considered it better to reach a commercial semiement

Mr Smith's communication arrangement is questionable:

- other ways eg second line, fax, 008, etc of contacting him not set up

- use of answering machine improper or incorrect

answering arrangements when Mr Smith was not there and sochiefe lay - Telecom's defence in some doubt on causality

There we prepared not recuebit at the the of nettlement. Ale someth de un not proposed a perch bethe most what of his claim.

Rom Pithank

This facsimile from 60 minutes dated 18 June 1993 is self explanatory.



60 MINUTES FACSIMILE

To: MR ALAN SMITH (055) 267 230

From: JULIAN CRESS

Date: June 18th 1993 No of pages 1....

DEAR ALAN,

JUST A NOTE TO LET YOU KNOW THAT I HAD SOME TROUBLE GETTING THROUGH TO YOU ON THE PHONE LAST THURSDAY. PRETTY IRONIC CONSIDERING THAT I WAS TRYING TO CONTACT YOU TO DISCUSS YOUR PHONE PROBLEMS

THE PROBLEM OCCURRED AT ABOUT 11AM. ON THE "008" NUMBER I HEARD A RECORDED MESSAGE ADVISING ME THAT "008" WAS NOT AVAILABLE FROM MY PHONE AND ON YOUR DIRECT LINE IT WAS CONSTANTLY ENGAGED.

AFTER ABOUT HALF AN HOUR ! CONTACTED SERVICE DIFFICULTIES IN SYDNEY, THEY CALLED THE LOCAL OPERATOR IN YOUR AREA WHO REPORTED BACK THAT YOU WEREN'T ON THE PHONE BUT THAT THE LINES IN YOUR AREA WERE CONGESTED AT THE TIME.

I'M AWARE THAT YOU HAVE BEEN HAVING PROBLEMS LIKE THIS FOR SOME YEARS NOW AND WISH YOU THE BEST IN SORTING THEM OUT.

YOURS SINCERELY,

24 Ariamon Road Willoughies 2048 PH: (02) 438 3433 FAX: (02) 936 0527

& RAP

50

15H

2411

AUSTRALIAN SINGLES CENTRE 1143 Toorak Rd, Camberwell 3124 Ph 8896659 Fx 8893129

5th July 1992

Mr Alan Smith RMB 4408 Cape Bridgewater Portland 3306

Dear Alan

Futher to my previous letter in February.

On the 26th of June I rang you at about 9pm and spoke to you, this was not my first attempt as on my previous attemps I received a recorded message as I have in the past. Because I knew of your problem I persisted until I got you, however had I been a new enquiry you would have lost business on this occasion.

Kind Regards

Peter Turner

6