**One-on-One Stakeholder Meetings**

**Report**

**1. Stakeholder Meeting (Mr Marsh)**

**Private Citizen –** Mr Marsh

**Date** **–** 02/08/2023

**Attendees –** Mr Marsh; Mr Stanton (CA); Ms Wilson (CA).

Mr Marsh’s submission [(published here)](https://commsalliance.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/94813/Private-citizen-submission%2C-A-Marsh-2-emails-combined.pdf), to the review was discussed, with a focus on how these issues might be addressed in the TCP Code review.

Mr Marsh raised a number of complaints-related concerns – positively received by Comms Alliance - and suggested that it could be clearer to consumers that they could contact the TIO to escalate complaints relating to potential non-compliance with the TCP Code’s requirements. It was agreed/acknowledged by all parties that a number of issues raised related to requirements in the Complaints Handling Standard and could not be addressed through this review. It was also discussed that the TCP Code itself already includes information about the TIO’s role, but that because consumers are not the Code’s primary audience, this may not be as clear as it could be, from a consumer-reader’s perspective. It was therefore suggested that CA could look to include clear information about the role of the TIO in its [‘TCP Code information for consumers’](https://commsalliance.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/84382/TCP-Code-information-for-consumers.pdf) information sheet, which, as the name suggests, is directed at consumers. Mr Marsh was aware of this information sheet and considered this an appropriate response.

**2. Stakeholder Meeting (Mr Handley)**

**Private Citizen –** Mr Handley

**Date –** 24/07/2023

**Attendees –** Mr Handley; Ms Wilson, CA; Ms Rainey and Ms Brown, Drafting Committee representatives (both from Optus).

The meeting lasted for about 45 minutes. The focus of the discussion was the issues raised in Mr H’s submission [(published here)](https://commsalliance.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/94654/Private-citizen-submission%2C-Mr-J-Handley.pdf), namely payment methods.

The meeting acknowledged Mr Handley’s concerns and confirmed that this issue would be addressed in the review. It was noted in the discussions that this issue – payment options strongly favouring direct debit pre-payment - had arisen when providers responded to and addressed concerns around the risk of ‘bill shock’ by offering plans and payment options designed to give control to customers, with the post-paid model for service provision having been replaced to a large degree by a more flexible, ‘subscription’ model of service provision. Mr Handley was positive about the discussions and confirmed that he would be happy to comment further on proposals for new requirements.