

Comments from Individuals

(Anonymised)

- 1) I am writing in relation to the draft TCP code. Clause 6.5.4(a) speaks of "the ability for Customers to access usage information that is near to real-time information e.g. ideally no older than 48 hours". A time-span of 48 hours is NOWHERE near to real-time. A great deal of data can be consumed over a period of 48 hours, and the customer could easily accrue expensive data overrun charges being none the wiser until their bill arrives. This is a major source of complaints to the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman. Given the current state of technology, there is absolutely no reason why a period of a few MINUTES should be the maximum time for usage webpages to be updated. THAT time-frame is more reasonably considered to be close to real-time. Clause 6.6.2 allows the same 48-hour time-frame for 50%, 85% and 100% of data-usage alerts to be sent to the customer. For the same reason, this is equally unsatisfactory and offers consumers NO PROTECTION AT ALL from data overrun charges.
- 2) It would be great to see all pensioners get things we need to use the internet and stay in touch with every body.
- 3) This is totally unfair to elders who have worked hard all their lives. Having worked with electronic technology in my latter working life, I cannot keep up now - it is extremely stressful. Those also unable to afford this technology are stuck - do u think this fair. I don't understand how you can do this.
- 4) We do need to have the affordability to have Internet connection at home, since more and more are online. Same with mobile phones there should be much more affordable mobilephone plans with new mobile phone device. My husband receive the government age pension and myself receive only the meagre New Start Allowance, I'm 62 years of age. Our lives are going backwards, due to too expensive basic necessities. We had to switch OFF our internet connection at home last year due to lack of affordability.
- 5) Access to billing details and to all payment methods must must be available on-line and off-line with out incurring any additional charges for choosing a particular payment method. Consideration should be given to offering low cost restricted access packages (e.g. discounts for access in non-peak periods, smaller upload and download limits) for pensioners and other low income earners at significant discounts to standard package offerings. Options to resolve payment difficulties (e.g hardship arrangements) must be readily available with no stigma and no penalty. Telecommunications are now an essential social utility just like electricity and water and access to it by low income earners and people with a disability must be provided on an equitable basis with all other users.
- 6) Yes I pay extra on my phone bill because I do not have direct debit and receive a paper bill I fill this unfair I am on a pension and need to fine extra because I wish to see my bill and paid it when I have the money to do so .
- 7) As a consumer with disability i continue to find it very difficult to get any useful information from phone companies about the handsets that can be used by people with hearing loss. Why isn't this included in the code to make sure that they provide infromation for consumers? all the flash new mobile phones look great but none of the staff can tell you if it works for older people or people with disability. Don't they want to sell to this growing group of Australian consumers?

8)

FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION:

I believe Internet Service Providers (ISPs) should be responsible for the loss of additional services when the internet fails – specifically, Subscription Television such as Netflix or Foxtel.

Recently my ISP (Wires Broadband) had a technical fault which caused myself and others in the neighbourhood to be without an internet connection for 19 days. While they were happy to credit my account with the days I'd missed out on internet connectivity (which was important as I predominately work from home), as I understand it, the current rules do not make them accountable for crediting me any fees for lost Netflix (and nor were they willing to).

I realise the monetary amount is relatively small, and it's certainly not a case of me being unable to pay for my subscription tv service, however I think the rule is morally wrong. I told them about my Netflix not working the same day as I reported the internet fault. As it stands, I now have to pay for a subscription television service I was unable to use for nearly 3 weeks, because Wires' service failed me.

Would you please consider changing the rules so that other people aren't subject to this? It's not a lot of money to me, but I'm sure there are others out there struggling financially for whom it would be a worthy sum. It's hard enough to try and conduct business without an internet connection (not to mention the time spent having to constantly chase the ISP for updates on when it will be fixed), but it just doesn't seem fair that I also have to foot the bill for an additional service that my ISP has rendered useless.

I feel that changing the rules would help ISPs understand the weight of their responsibilities. In my case, they took weeks to fix the problem and then got away with crediting me the bare minimum for the inconvenience, which I don't think was adequate compensation.

Thank you for considering this matter; I'd be interested in your thoughts.

Kind regards