

Hill, Trevor

From: Darling, Peter  
To: Johnstone, Philip R; Hill, Trevor; Quan, Alex  
Cc: Clarke, Lawrie; Duc, Nguyen; Darling, Peter; Dugan, Yasmin  
Subject: FW: AUSTEL Mandatory Performance Regulation  
Date: Monday, 13 December 1993 10:41AM  
Priority: High

From: Darling, Peter  
To: Campbell, Ian; Marshall, Ross  
Cc: Hambleton, Dennis V  
Subject: AUSTEL Mandatory Performance Regulation  
Date: 13 December 1993 10:38  
Priority: High

Ross and Ian,

This E-Mail is to alert you to a possible regulatory interaction with the current work on "COTS Cases" and ongoing work with AUSTEL on network performance.

As you know, a Ministerial Direction gave AUSTEL power to set end-to-end network performance standards. The AUSTEL Standards Advisory Committee established a working group (designation WG 12/1) to set these standards, and Telecom has had a fairly hostile reception in this working group.

Yasmin Dugan from my area has been co-ordinating this work, working closely with Network Products (especially Operations) and the Business Units. The AUSTEL staff member leading the group originally wanted a very wide list of mandatory parameters, but after discussion with Bob Horton and a presentation to the Standards Advisory Committee by Yasmin, AUSTEL have agreed to limit the scope of the initial work to the few parameters our customer surveys had shown as being of most concern. This work is now well advanced.

I believe that the "Service Operation Deemed Satisfactory" Project Team as part of the COTS case work has also been looking at issues relevant to a service specification and testing procedure, and that originally they came out with a large number of parameters to specify and test.

The powers to set mandatory performance standards that AUSTEL has been given could well be used in some sort of regulatory outcome from AUSTEL's current COT case investigation. I believe it is essential that we provide a consistent approach to AUSTEL. I'm hopeful that your team has taken Telstra's corporate position to AUSTEL as the starting point for their work. I strongly request that you give us early advice if for strategic reasons we should change our position with AUSTEL in the SAC and the working group 12/1.

Peter Darling,  
Standards & Regulatory Strategy

3 A

Don, spent last Friday morning attempting to measure line resistances at Rockbank - but it was abortive because no-one was at the premises, and can't do measurements without someone at the premises. Aim to do the Fish Farm on Wednesday, all being well. Some measurements have been done on the Voice-link cables and they show a slightly higher resistance than theory.

After travelling the cable run, I can understand why! The measurements on Friday morning did, however, show that there are significant cable problems between Rockbank exchange and Dawson's premises. Ideal solution is to plow in new cable by shorter route - I will be talking to John McCoy (CAN) about this.

The measurements are being done by the Power Co-ordination people and they do have other work to do and are short staffed.

I am not aware how Alan H's ringer measurements are progressing, but I suspect they should have been finished by now.

The theoretical analysis is currently being refined to take into account the quirks in ringer installations that keep turning up - refer to earlier message about non-standard ringer at Jindabyne South! Parameters for Cape Bridgewater RCM have been obtained, but I don't believe them - I am attempting to check them. Some of the people supplying this information live in "old Telecom" !

Discuss

---

Peter.

-----  
From: Pinel, Don  
To: Gamble, Peter  
Cc: Blake, Ed  
Subject: RE: CAN Testing  
Date: Monday, 15 November 1993 5:19PM

Peter

I need this more and more every day. When can I get it and which customers will it cover. We need to extend this to all customers covered by the Austel direction and get it completed by the end of this week.

Don

-----  
From: Gamble, Peter  
To: Pinel, Don  
Cc: Blake, Ed  
Subject: RE: CAN Testing  
Date: Wednesday, November 10, 1993 10:08AM

Don, I will put some words around it today and summarize the results in a table and then forward it to you. By then I should have resolved the Fish Farm cable details!

Peter.

-----  
From: Pinel, Don  
To: Gamble, Peter  
Cc: Blake, Ed  
Subject: RE: CAN Testing

A09392

*world standards and are in fact superior to those used in other similar networks of equivalent digital penetration.*

- *Telecom Australia has all the tools, skills and procedures needed to detect and locate troubles reported by the CoT customers.*
- *The troubles found revealed some switching faults and potential for network congestion. The contribution made by these in degrading network performance was rated as insignificant.*

(d) *Telecom generally accepts the findings and recommendation of the report."*

#### **AUSTEL'S COMMENTS ON TELECOM'S RESPONSE**

11.8 Prior to receiving Telecom's response to the Bell Canada International report as outlined in paragraph 11.6 above, AUSTEL had written to Telecom informing it that the claim in the Bell Canada International report to the effect that Telecom's customers received a grade of service that meets global standards goes too far because the study was an inter-exchange study only and did not extend to the customer access network - AUSTEL had agreed to the study being so limited on the basis that other monitoring it had requested Telecom to undertake on AUSTEL's behalf should provide AUSTEL with the data on the efficacy of the customer access network.

11.9 AUSTEL also noted that from the COT Cases' perspective there were limitations in Bell Canada International's first report, namely -

- *test call patterns used by Bell Canada International may not be typical of the COT Cases - but that of itself does not necessarily invalidate the outcome*
- *it did not extend to testing of PBX (rotary) search facilities that are of significance to some COT Cases but, again, this does not invalidate the results of the tests as far as they went*
- *it did not include test calling via 008 numbers which is of relevance to some COT Cases but, yet again, this does not invalidate the results of the tests as far as they went."*

(Letter dated 16 December 1993, AUSTEL to Telecom's Managing Director, Commercial Business)

3-C