

94/269

26 February 1996

**BRUCE MATTHEWS**cc Peter Gilmartin  
Elle Calero**CHARGING DISCREPANCIES RAISED BY ALAN SMITH**

The following is a guide to documentation provided by Alan Smith on 19 December 1995, in support of his claim of massive incorrect charging on his 008/1800 account.

2. I understand that you have commenced examining the documentation provided. The following information is intended to assist you in assessing the validity of Mr Smith's claims, as it identifies the documents Mr Smith regards as specifically supporting his assertions.
3. It should be noted that AUSTEL has advised Mr Smith that it is investigating the charging discrepancies he has raised to ascertain their potential systemic nature. It has been stressed to Mr Smith that this investigation is being undertaken in the context of AUSTEL's ongoing work resulting from its 1992 Inquiry into Standards for Call Charging and Billing Systems, and is not related to his arbitration.
4. Mr Smith identified 27 examples of charging discrepancies which he regarded as specifically supporting his claims. These examples have been marked and referenced accordingly in the documentation he provided. In summary, Mr Smith claimed that -
  - 008 account and CCAS records for the period 4/7/93 to 6/7/93 showed charging discrepancies (Example 1);
  - his 008 account showed longer calls than apparent in CCAS records specifically on 20/5/93 (Example 2);
  - a Telstra 008 billing record and CCAS records for calls on 14/4/94 showed charging discrepancies (Example 3);
  - a Telstra 008 billing record, CCAS records and a 008 account showed charging discrepancies on 26/4/94 (Example 4);
  - various discrepancies were apparent as a result of test calls made to his service by Telstra from Ballarat. See Example 23. (Example 5);

- a Telstra 008 billing record showed calls made on 24/5/94 were of a longer duration than apparent on CCAS records for the same day (Example 6);
- a CCAS record for 29/5/94 showed a discrepancy in the number of calls made when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 7);
- a CCAS record for 31/5/94 showed a discrepancy in the duration of calls when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 8);
- a CCAS record for 24/5/94 showed a discrepancy in the duration of a call when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 9);
- a CCAS record for 3/6/94 showed a discrepancy in the duration of a call when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 10);
- his 008 account for 12/4/94 showed a call which did not appear on a CCAS record for the same day (Example 11);
- a CCAS record for 16/4/94 showed a discrepancy in the duration of calls when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 12);
- a CCAS record for 18/4/94 showed a discrepancy in the duration of calls when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 13);
- a CCAS record for 1/6/94 showed a discrepancy in the duration of calls when compared with his 008 account for the same day (Example 14);
- CCAS records of his outgoing calls showed unusually long 'wait times' (Example 15);
- Telstra call event data for July 1994 was in some instances inconsistent with his 008 account for that period (Example 16);
- the duration of calls listed on his 008 accounts for the second half of 1993 were often inconsistent with CCAS records for the same period (Example 17);
- records of CCAS monitoring undertaken for other customers connected to the Cape Bridgewater exchange demonstrated that other customers in the Portland area had raised charging discrepancies with Telstra (Example 18);
- hand written notes by a Telstra 1100 operator indicated that a caller received a "dead line" when calling Mr Smith's 008 number, however Mr Smith's account shows that he was charged for this call (Example 19);
- Telstra records show that Amanda Davis was charged for two calls to Mr Smith which CCAS records show Mr Smith did not receive (Example 20);
- Cheryl Haddock received a recorded message when calling Mr Smith's 008 number, however his 008 account showed short duration calls from her number for the corresponding period (Example 21);

- a call made on 13 January at 11.57 am listed on his 008 account could not have occurred because the previous call commenced at 11.50 am and was 9 minutes and 49 seconds in duration (Example 22); ✓
- documentation shows notes made by Telstra which indicate that test calls made to his 008 number were unsuccessful, however these calls appeared on Mr Smith's 008 account (Example 23);
- analysis done by George Close and Associates identifies faults associated with outgoing and incoming calls on Mr Smith's Goldphone service (Example 24);
- notes made by Telstra on outgoing and incoming call event records show discrepancies and faults associated with Mr Smith's service (Example 25);
- his 008 account and call event records for a corresponding period showed charging discrepancies (Example 26); and
- a billing record for his service was inconsistent with outgoing call event records for the service (Example 27).

5. Mr Smith wrote to me on 20, 22 and 27 December 1995 outlining details of other charging discrepancies. These letters are on file 94/269. I also spoke with Mr Smith on 20 February 1996 about charging discrepancies associated with his Goldphone service. Mr Smith requested that AUSTEL investigate these matters along with the alleged discrepancies associated with his 008 service. I confirmed with Mr Smith that his preference was that the charging discrepancies associated with his Goldphone service be investigated first.

6. I am happy to discuss any aspects of the above with you.



Darren Kearney  
Senior Policy Analyst  
Consumer Liaison