

<b>Case Reference</b>	R/E/I/104
<b>Title</b>	Reporting of Service Difficulty – M1’s Mobile Service Disruption on 15 January 2013
<b>Case Opened</b>	15 January 2013
<b>Case Closed</b>	13 September 2013
<b>Complainant</b>	IDA initiated this proceeding pursuant to the Code of Practice for Telecommunication Outage Reporting (“ <b>Outage Code</b> ”)
<b>Respondent</b>	M1 Limited (“ <b>M1</b> ”)
<b>Case Summary</b>	<p>On 15 January 2013, a service difficulty incident occurred in M1’s network which caused some of M1’s mobile users to experience difficulty in making and receiving calls, and in accessing short message service, and other mobile data services (“<b>Service Difficulty Incident</b>”). The Service Difficulty Incident was only fully resolved on 18 January 2013.</p> <p>While M1 had provided regular updates to IDA throughout the Service Difficulty Incident, that its 3G mobile telephone services in the south-western parts of Singapore (West Coast, Jurong and Tuas) were affected, M1 did not however inform IDA that its 2G mobile telephone services in the north-western parts of Singapore (Woodlands, Yishun and Kranji) were also affected by the same incident. This was notwithstanding that IDA had, during the occurrence of the Service Difficulty Incident, sought M1’s confirmation on the extent of service outage.</p> <p>IDA was informed that the Service Difficulty Incident also affected M1’s 2G mobile telephone services in the north-western parts of Singapore only on 21 January 2013, when M1 submitted the interim written incident report required under the Outage Code.</p>
<b>IDA’s Determination</b>	<p>In this case, M1 explained that its priority during the Service Difficulty Incident was to restore service expeditiously and to minimise the impact to affected customers, of which a majority are 3G customers. As a result, the disruption to its 2G mobile telephone services in the north-western parts of Singapore was overlooked in its reporting to IDA.</p> <p>Under the Outage Code, licensees are required to ensure that all reports, information and documents submitted to IDA relating to service difficulty incidents, are true, accurate and complete to the licensees’ best of ability, knowledge and judgement. In this regard, M1’s failure to inform IDA that its 2G mobile telephone services had been affected during the Service Difficulty Incident represented a contravention of the Outage Code.</p>

Further, in failing to provide accurate information that its 2G mobile telephone services were also affected during the Service Difficulty Incident, confusion might have been caused to the general public, due to the inaccurate impression given that the Service Difficulty Incident affected M1's 3G mobile telephone services only. IDA's efforts to assess the most appropriate approach to inform and address the concerns of the general public during the Service Difficulty Incident were also hindered as a result.

Taking into consideration the above, IDA imposed a financial penalty of **S\$10,000** on M1 for its contravention of the Outage Code.