

Dear Sir,

It is of great alarm that the Productivity Commission is even considering removing the TUSO from the Australian population that is covered by SkyMuster, the 3% of the NBN footprint that covers rural and remote Australia. This service is nowhere near reliable enough to use as a replacement telephony service in the form of VOIP. Just from my own personal experience it is plagued by dropouts, and if it's raining, forget about even trying to use it.

This is nowhere near good enough to run a business and should **NEVER** even be considered being used for emergency contact. NBN Co and its own service providers tell you that. It is apprehensible that the Productivity Commission is using such words as "acceptable risk" in updating the TUSO. It just seems preposterous that the world can spend \$300 billion (it is being kept under wraps how much Australia contributed) trying to find a lost aeroplane that contains 300 dead souls, yet we can't put aside a billion a year to provide reliable communications to regional and remote areas of Australia to keep the people safe who are producing the necessary food to keep the other 97% of the Australian population (and the world) fed.

The draft report's own figures show the TUSO is only spending \$253 million on telephony. I have been unable to find an accurate figure on the amount of money spent annually on phones and internet by the Australian population. Some reports suggest mobile phones were \$10 billion in 2014. That means from your own figures of fixed to mobile phone usage, there would be perhaps \$3-5 billion on fixed lines in 2014. If you work on \$50/month fixed internet cost per Australian family that would be another \$5 Billion. That would equate to approx \$18 billion being spent on phone and internet and I would suggest that is very conservative. Yet proponents of change are concerned about \$0.25 Billion?!!

The TUSO should be expanded to include data, and not just telephony. The exorbitant cost of supplying a reliable telephone and minimum data service (of 20 mBits) to remote Australia should be spread evenly across the population, so that **ALL** Australians truly do have access to the same priced internet services and have 99.9% reliable phone access. Spreading the cost to all Australians would only be perhaps a 3-5% increase on the average metropolitan costs, and in the scheme of things insignificant to ensure the **Health & Safety** of rural and remote Australians, the unknown and (most of the time) unthanked custodians of the great land of Australia.

Ross Rea