

K00944

FILE NOTE

5:30pm - 6:00pm

CAPE BRIDGEWATER - ALAN SMITH

I called Alan Smith in response to a message left by him. He believes his fax line 055 267230 is locking (probably) caused by the machine as he indicates a voice can be heard to the I/C caller even when the phone is unplugged.

He has been doing some sort of check with ~~Peter Smith~~, but I am unable to contact ~~Peter~~ at this time. I shall arrange for someone to go to the premises tomorrow 27/4/1994.

~~Eric Thompson~~

Difficult Network Faults Manager

26/4/94

SOLUTION = : - DOES NOT EXIST
 :CUS - CUSTOMER
 = 10/05/94 CSR: ZV333FIELD EMPLOYEE: E767
 IN HAND ~~ROSS WADSON~~
 10/05/94 I reported this incident in LEOPARD on 055217777 and notified ~~Chris Doody~~. We were able to duplicate the incident during testing; 217777 was diverted to 236101 with easycall and when 236101 was busy, a call to 217777 would return one burst of ring then busy.
 11/05/94 ~~Chris Doody~~ called me this morning and said the incident is caused by AXE104 system limitation, that is the incident is normal and the customer is aware of that.
 11/05/94 09:25, Mr Alan Smith was notified of the result.

SOLUTION = 11/05/94 10:33 ZV333
 Chris Doody is sending a report on the incident.

DATE	START	END	SYMPT	CAUSE	ACT'N	EMP
10/05/94	13.47	13.48	NF	WJ	YT	E767

***** NO PART DETAIL *****

ORDER = S6701981 STATUS = CL
 CUSTOMER = 259289 TELEPHONE = 055 267267
 CAPE BRIDGEWATER HOL. CAMP ALAN SMITH
 BLOWHOLE RD
 CAPE BDMTR VIC 3306

CALLLED IN = 04/05/94 14.03
 CLOSED = 04/05/94 14.04
 DESCRIPTION = 27/04/94 13:30 Visit to Alan Smith by ~~ROSS WADSON~~.....
 NARRATIVE = 4/05/94 13:48 ZV333
 27/04/94 13:30 Apointment for ~~ROSS WADSON~~ to visit Alan Smith to investigate the report of 267230 possibly holding up, after the phone was hung up.
 :BNU - BUSY NOT IN USE
 : - DOES NOT EXIST
 :CUS - CUSTOMER

SOLUTION = 4/05/94 CSR: ZV333FIELD EMPLOYEE: E767
 This fault report was initiated by ~~ROSS WADSON~~. ~~ROSS WADSON~~ was doing some testing with Alan Smith and apparently they were able to hang up Smith's phone and while ~~ROSS WADSON~~ was still listening at his phone he could hear Mr Smith talking in his office. In fact Mr Smith counted to 10 then picked up his phone again and ~~ROSS WADSON~~ had been able to hear the count to 10.
 On the 27/04/94 at 13:30 ~~ROSS WADSON~~ visited the premises to investigate these claims. ~~ROSS WADSON~~ called ~~ROSS WADSON~~ on 03 5507309 and made 10 test calls. ~~ROSS WADSON~~ was hanging up then counting to 10 and picking the phone up again, each test call was released (that is line was heard to drop out) at

SOLUTION = 5/05/94 9:10 ZV333
 within 1 second of hanging up. ~~ROSS WADSON~~ was able to hear Ross count 1 then the line released.
 I spoke to ~~ROSS WADSON~~ whilst he was on site and we made further test call (18 calls of which 2 were from 267267), during these test calls we obtained the same result as previous, that is the line released within 1 second. We also tried the T200 from 267267 on 267230 and it released immediately on hanging up. We then tested the suspect T200 on 267267 and it displayed the same symptom on this different line. This T200 is an EXICOM and the other T200 is an ALCATEL, we thought that this may be a design 'fault???' with the EXICOM so ~~ROSS WADSON~~

SOLUTION = 5/05/94 9:27 ZV333
 tried a new EXICOM from his car and it worked perfectly, that is, released the line immediately on hanging up. We decided to leave the new phone and the old phone was marked and tagged, ROSS forwarded the phone to FM&D.
 I was speaking to Mr Smith the next day (28/04/94) and he said he has witnesses to prove that his phone used to hold up for over 10 seconds. He wants a letter to say nothing else has been fixed prior to the visit by Ross that could

105

FILE NOTE 28/4/94 5.35pm K00932

Alan Smith - Cape Bridgewater

Rang Alan Smith in response to message from [redacted]. Alan was concerned about the outcome of an investigation into a fault condition on his telephone service 267230 whereby after initiating a call, and then hanging up, the called party was still connected. Thus when the handset was picked up again the called party was still there. This would last for up to 10-12 seconds.

Alan had discussed this problem with Cliff Matheson from AUSTEL and [redacted] from the Customer Response Unit.

Local technician, [redacted], visited Alan's premises to investigate the situation. According to Alan, he was there for over an hour and a half, however Alan believes during this time, [redacted] returned to the Depot in Portland and returned again. Alan could not be sure of this as he in fact went into Portland after [redacted] arrived, and when he returned, [redacted] was still in attendance.

[redacted] apparently replaced the handset, but according to Alan told Alan "there was no problem with the phone". Alan advises that the service has worked correctly since [redacted] visited the premises.

Alan's concern is, what was the problem. Was the phone faulty, or was it a network problem?

I advised him I would give him the fault details of the fault and the rectification procedure.

Alan went on to complain about sending faxes to Austel, 3 separate faxes, that Austel claim they did not receive, but in fact received blank papers. According to Alan, Austel's fax log recorded received of the three faxes.

Alan is concerned as to what happened in this case, and went on to say that he had had previous trouble in both sending and receiving faxes. That is, messages had not been received when he sent them or he had not received messages sent from other areas.

[redacted]

CAPE BRIDGEWATER HOLIDAY CAMP

CALL DETAILS - 267230

SOURCE DOCUMENTS F.O.I 0628 TO 0660 INCLUSIVE

These documents (attached) cover period 2200 hours on the 27.9.93 to 0715 hours on the 14.12.93, approximately 77 days.

They display lock up times of up to 17 hours, ring times > 1 hour, conversation times of up to 17 hours, short burst rings consecutively of 2 - 1 - 2 seconds.

It would appear that the majority (88) of lock ups are created by a generated "1", often followed by 3599 seconds of ring, then from zero to 17 hours conversation time. There are 88 such calls totalling 863 hours out of total time of approximately 1848 hours - this equals 46.7% unavailability.

From January to December '93 and through '94, Alan Smith repeatedly reported "echo" on the line, "dead lines", no dial tone, together with incoming fax complaints of busy when not. This explains why.

We have random sheets (non concurrent) for December '93 and January and February '94, showing the continuation of the fault. This (detail follows) gave blockage time of 52.7% of the period covered.

David Stockdale's (Telecom) letter instances that this is common (attached FOI 0125).

F.O.I. NO.

LOCK UP I/C

LOCK UP OUT

OUTGOING

0628		33.6
0629		7.4
0630		69.9
0631		19.5
0632		27.7
0633		31.9
0634	12.7	34.4
0635	1.0	14.2
0636		80.7
0637		11.7
0638		13.8
0639		9.3
0640		9.9
0641		55.8
0642		21.7
0643		31.1
0644		59.4
0645		23.1
0646		21.2
0647		33.8
0648		21.4
0649		55.7
0650		
0651		23.7
0652		12.2
0653		25.6
0654		11.1
0655		5.7
0656		19.2
0657		26.6
0658		9.5
0659		9.9
0660		18.8

TOTALS

13.7 HRS.

849.5 HRS.

COMBINED TOTAL = 863.2 HRS.

354

Doody, Chris

K04604

From: ~~Chris Doody~~
To: ~~Chris Doody, +1~~
Subject: Request for information on failure of CCAS monitoring Equipment
Date: Wednesday, 4 May 1994 4:00PM

Hew,

The question has been asked by staff from the Commercial Customer Response Unit, as to the reason for the change in the monitoring equipment of Mr A Smith's lines from CCAS to Smart 10. I have given them a brief note on the reasons, ie, modifying the CCAS to operate on AXE lines and the possibility of corrupted data. The CRU wants a more comprehensive report as to the reasons for the discrepancies in the reports. In particular, they require an explanation of the long held calls (as interpreted from CCAS data) as well as the reason for the "1" that often appears on the start of these long held periods.

~~Chris Doody~~ gave me an abridged version of the reasons over the telephone, however I believe that we will require something a little more substantial, particularly if the issue is raised during the arbitration process.

Could I please get from you a description of the reasons for this incorrect CCAS data. Looking back through the CCAS reports, it seems that the incidence of the long held periods started about November 1993.

If you require any additional info, please don't hesitate to give me a ring.

Cheers