

Investigation Report

Summary	
Entity	BUROSERV AUSTRALIA PTY LTD (ACN 135 379 387) (Buroserv)
Type of entity	Carriage service provider (CSP)
Relevant legislation	<i>Telecommunications Act 1997</i> (Cth) (the Act) Industry Code C661:2022 Reducing Scam Calls and Scam SMs (the Code)
Date of findings	7 April 2025

Findings

The Australian Communications and Media Authority (**ACMA**) finds that Buroserv has contravened the Code, as set out at **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Summary of contraventions

Legislation	Provision	Number of contraventions	Dates
The Code	Subclause 1.1.3	81	24 September 2023 to 10 September 2024
	Subclause 4.2.10	2	24 September and 14 December 2023
	Subclause 4.4.3	3	12 May, 13 May and 16 July 2024
	Subclause 4.4.4	56	12 March, 17 March (2 occasions), 1 May to 10 September 2024 (53 occasions).
	Subclause 4.6.2	20	8 to 23 May (3 occasions), 2 to 26 July (9 occasions) and 1 to 21 August (6 occasions) 2024
	Subclause 6.1.1	8	21 days after the end of each quarter from July 2022 to June 2024

Reasons

- The reasons for the ACMA's findings, including key elements which establish the contraventions, are informed by:
 - information and documents obtained from Buroserv under the statutory notice given by the ACMA under subsection 521(2) of the Act dated 8 August 2024, and
 - ACMA analysis of traceback emails made by carriers and CSPs (**C/CSPs**) under the Code.

Relevant background

2. The Code is an industry code registered by the ACMA under Part 6 of the Act. The Code places obligations on all C/CSPs to implement measures to protect consumers from harms caused by scams and to disrupt scam activity in Australia.
3. The Code includes obligations on C/CSPs to:
 - (a) if notified of a material issue of alleged call line identification (CLI) spoofing that transited their network, forward details to the C/CSP from which it received the calls (with a copy to the ACMA), as soon as practicable
 - (b) exchange information about alleged scam calls being originated and /or carried over their network, as soon as practicable
 - (c) share information about the origin and transit path of the confirmed scam calls with the ACMA, within the requisite timeframe
 - (d) report scam calls and scam SMSs blocked to the ACMA.
4. The purpose of the Code is to protect consumers from harms caused by scams by disrupting phone scam activity in Australia. Key elements to achieving this objective are network-wide level compliance with traceback arrangements and effective information sharing across the sector and with government agencies.
5. The Code contains specific timing obligations that must be read in conjunction with the Industry Guideline G664:2022 Reducing Scam Calls and Scam SMS Supplementary Information (the **Guideline**). These obligations include timeframes for notifications of material instances of scam calls, including to the ACMA. Adherence to these timeframes is critical to timely identification of emerging scam threats and actions by C/CSPs and government agencies to disrupt scam activities.
6. The Code also places obligations on C/CSPs to report to the ACMA on a quarterly basis. This information is critical to understanding eco-system-wide scam trends, the activities of individual C/CSPs, threats to consumers and the effectiveness of industry-wide disruption activities.
7. The ACMA's investigation into Buroserv's compliance with the Code is supported by information provided by a Notifying CSP to Buroserv via traceback emails (copying in the ACMA) on 24 September and 14 December 2023, 12 and 17 March 2024 and additional traceback requests between May to September 2024 as obtained from Buroserv.

Compliance with subclause 4.2.10 – Countering CLI Spoofing

8. Subclause 4.2.9 of the Code states:

If a C/CSP identifies a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing in calls received from other C/CSPs, that C/CSP (the Notifying C/CSP) must raise the issue, as soon as practicable, with the Originating C/CSP or the Transit C/CSP delivering the call traffic (with a copy to the ACMA), for investigation and action to stop the alleged CLI Spoofing.
9. Subclause 4.2.10 of the Code states:

If the Notifying C/CSP provides the notification under clause 4.2.9 to a Transit C/CSP, the Transit C/CSP must, as soon as practicable, forward the details, (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSP from which they received those calls.
10. The ACMA has considered Buroserv's compliance with subclause 4.2.10 for the 24 September and 14 December 2023 traceback requests in **Tables 2 to 3** below.

Table 2: 24 September 2023 traceback request

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. Buroserv is a CSP as defined in the Code as it is a CSP as defined at section 87 of the Act. Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with subclause 4.2.10 of the Code.
--------------------	---

Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing, under subclause 4.2.9 of the Code?	<p>Yes. On 24 September 2023, Buroserv received a notification from a Notifying CSP about a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing, via a traceback request under subclause 4.2.9 of the Code. The notification contained 62,935 call detail records from a Buroserv allocated CLI that entered the Notifying CSP's network between 18 and 19 September 2023.</p> <p>The notification identified a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing in accordance with the Guideline.</p>
Was Buroserv the Transit CSP?	<p>Yes. On 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received 62,935 calls from an international telecommunications operator Entity A. Entity A is a CSP as set out in the Code as it falls within the definition of a CSP under subsection 87(2) of the Act.</p> <p>Therefore, Buroserv was the Transit CSP in relation to those calls.</p>
Did Buroserv provide details to the C/CSP from which it received those calls (cc'ing the ACMA), as soon as practicable?	<p>No. Buroserv provided evidence of their communication with Entity A. The ACMA did not receive any copy of the notification. The evidence indicates that Buroserv failed to copy in the ACMA when forwarding Entity A details of 62,935 calls that allegedly used a CLI spoofed number in the notification.</p>

11. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 24 September 2023 traceback request, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.2.10 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline, because it failed to copy in the ACMA when forwarding the details of alleged CLI Spoofing in 62,935 calls to the C/CSP from which it received those calls.

Table 3: 14 December 2023 traceback request

Is Buroserv a CSP?	<p>Yes. See Table 2.</p> <p>Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 4.2.10 of the Code.</p>
Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing, under subclause 4.2.9 of the Code?	<p>Yes. On 14 December 2023, Buroserv received a notification via a traceback request from a Notifying CSP about a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing under subclause 4.2.9 of the Code. The notification contained 18,273 call detail records from 168 Buroserv allocated CLIs that entered the Notifying CSP's network on 12 December 2023.</p> <p>The notification identified a material issue of alleged CLI Spoofing in accordance with the Guideline.</p>
Was Buroserv the Transit CSP?	<p>Yes, on 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received 18,273 calls from three international telecommunications operators Entity B, C and D, and one Australian CSP, Entity E. The three international entities are CSPs as set out in the Code as they fall within the definition of a CSP under subsection 87(2) of the Act.</p> <p>Therefore, Buroserv was the Transit CSP in relation to those calls.</p>
Did Buroserv provide details to the C/CSP from which it received those calls (cc'ing the ACMA), as soon as practicable?	<p>No. Evidence obtained from Buroserv in the form of its communications with Entity E between 8 to 14 December 2023 in relation to 213 calls allegedly from 72 spoofed numbers does not demonstrate that Buroserv forwarded Entity B, Entity C and Entity D, with a copy to the ACMA, the details of remaining 18,060 calls that allegedly used 96 spoofed numbers.</p>

12. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 14 December 2023 traceback request, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.2.10 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline, because it failed to forward the details of alleged CLI Spoofing of 18,060 calls (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls, as soon as practicable.

13. In summary, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the traceback requests of 24 September 2023 and 14 December 2023, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.2.10 of the Code, nor did

it comply with the Guideline because it failed to forward the details of alleged CLI spoofing, with a copy to the ACMA, to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls as soon practicable.

Compliance with Clause 4.4.3 - Exchanging information about alleged Scam calls

14. Subclause 4.4.1 of the Code states:

If a C/CSP identifies a material issue of alleged Scam Calls in calls received from other C/CSPs, that C/CSP (the Notifying C/CSP) must provide details of the alleged Scam Calls, to the Originating C/CSP or Transit C/CSP which delivered the alleged Scam Calls to it, for investigation as soon as practicable, via an agreed electronic means (with a copy to the ACMA).

15. Subclause 4.4.3 of the Code States:

C/CSPs must accept and acknowledge, via agreed electronic means (with a copy to the ACMA), receipt of a notification under clause 4.4.1.

16. The ACMA has considered Buroserv's compliance with subclause 4.4.3 with respect to the 12 May, 13 May and 16 July 2024 traceback requests in **Table 4** below.

Table 4: 12 and 13 May and 16 July 2024 traceback requests

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2 . Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 4.4.3 of the Code.
Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged Scam Calls, under subclause 4.4.1 of the Code?	Yes. On 2 October 2024, Buroserv advised the ACMA that it received from a Notifying CSP the following notifications of material issues of alleged Scam Calls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 May 2024 Ticket no. 615908 - 13 May 2024 Ticket no. 696007 - 16 July 2024 Ticket no. 707382
Did Buroserv accept and acknowledge, via agreed electronic means (with a copy to the ACMA), receipt of the notification?	No. Buroserv provided evidence of their communications with the Notifying CSP which indicates that Buroserv failed to accept and acknowledge the receipt of the notifications within the requisite timeframe for all three notifications, and additionally, it failed to copy in the ACMA when acknowledging the notification dated 13 May 2024.

17. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, on three occasions in relation to the 12 May, 13 May and 16 July 2024 Traceback requests, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.4.3 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline, because it failed to accept and acknowledge the receipt of the notifications within the requisite timeframe, and to copy in the ACMA when acknowledging the notification dated 13 May 2024.

Compliance with subclause 4.4.4 - Exchanging Information about alleged Scam Calls

18. Subclause 4.4.1 of the Code states:

If a C/CSP identifies a material issue of alleged Scam Calls in calls received from other C/CSPs, that C/CSP (the Notifying C/CSP) must provide details of the alleged Scam Calls, to the Originating C/CSP or Transit C/CSP which delivered the alleged Scam Calls to it, for investigation as soon as practicable, via an agreed electronic means (with a copy to the ACMA).

19. Subclause 4.4.4 of the Code states:

If the Notifying C/CSP provides the notification under clause 4.4.1 to a Transit C/CSP, the Transit C/CSP must, as soon as practicable, forward the details (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSP from which they received those calls.

20. The ACMA has considered Buroserv's compliance with subclause 4.4.4 with respect to the 12 March 2024, 17 March 2024 (two occasions) and 1 May to 10 September 2024 (53 occasions) traceback requests in **Table 5 to 8** below.

Table 5: 12 March 2024 traceback request

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2 . Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 4.4.4 of the Code.
Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged Scam Calls, under subclause 4.4.1 of the Code?	Yes. On 12 March 2024, Buroserv received a notification from a Notifying CSP about alleged Scam Calls, via a traceback request under subclause 4.4.1 of the Code. The notification contained 23,365 calls from 18 Buroserv allocated CLIs entering the Notifying CSP's network between 29 February and 8 March 2024. The notification identified a material issue of alleged Scam Calls in accordance with the Guideline.
Was Buroserv the Transit CSP?	Yes, on 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received 23,365 calls from five international telecommunications operators Entities B, F, G, H, I and an Australian CSP Entity E. The five international entities are CSPs as set out in the Code as they fall within the definition of a CSP under subsection 87(2) of the Act. Therefore, Buroserv was the Transit CSP in relation to those calls.
Did Buroserv provide details to the C/CSP from which it received those calls (cc'ing the ACMA), as soon as practicable?	No. Evidence obtained from Buroserv in the form of its communications with the 6 entities indicates that it did not forward to Entities F and G, with a copy to the ACMA, the details of 12,761 of these alleged Scam Calls from 9 CLIs. Additionally, Buroserv also failed to copy in the ACMA when providing details of the remaining 10,604 alleged Scam Calls from another 9 CLIs to Entities B, E, H and I.

21. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 12 March 2024 traceback request, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.4.4 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline, because it failed to forward the details of 12,761 alleged Scam Calls (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls, as soon as practicable. Additionally, Buroserv failed to copy in the ACMA when forwarding the details of the remaining 10,604 alleged Scam Calls to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls.

Table 6: 17 March 2024 Traceback request

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2 . Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 4.4.4 of the Code.
Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged Scam Calls, under subclause 4.4.1 of the Code?	Yes. On 17 March 2024, Buroserv received a notification from a Notifying CSP about alleged Scam Calls, via a traceback request under subclause 4.4.1. of the Code. The notification to Buroserv contained 3,877,646 calls from 16 Buroserv allocated CLIs entering the Notifying CSP's network between 21 February and 7 March 2024 The notification identified a material issue of alleged Scam Calls in accordance with the Guideline.
Was Buroserv the Transit CSP?	Yes, on 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received 3,877,646 calls from two international telecommunications operators Entities B and F. The two international entities are CSPs as set out in the Code as they fall within the definition of a CSP under subsection 87(2) of the Act. Therefore, Buroserv was the Transit CSP in relation to those calls.
Did Buroserv provide details to the C/CSP from which it received those calls (cc'ing the ACMA), as soon as practicable?	No. Evidence obtained from Buroserv in the form of its communications with both entities indicates that it did not forward Entities B and F, with a copy to the ACMA, the details of 3,877,646 alleged Scam Calls from 16 CLIs.

22. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 17 March 2024 traceback request, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.4.4 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline, because it failed to forward the details of 3,877,646 alleged Scam Calls (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls, as soon as practicable.

Table 7: 17 March 2024 Traceback request

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2 . Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with subclause 4.4.4 of the Code.
Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged Scam Calls, under subclause 4.4.1 of the Code?	Yes. On 17 March 2024, Buroserv received a notification from a Notifying CSP about alleged Scam calls, via a traceback request under subclause 4.4.1. of the Code. The notification contained 260,560 alleged Scam Calls from 11 Buroserv allocated CLIs entering the Notifying CSP's network between 20 February and 11 March 2024. The notification identified a material issue of alleged Scam Calls in accordance with the Guideline.
Was Buroserv the Transit CSP?	Yes, on 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received 260,560 calls from three international telecommunication operators Entities B, H and F and an Australian CSP Entity E. The three international entities are CSPs as set out in the Code as they fall within the definition of a CSP under subsection 87(2) of the Act. Therefore, Buroserv was the Transit CSP in relation to those calls.
Did Buroserv provide details to the C/CSP from which it received those calls (cc'ing the ACMA), as soon as practicable?	No. Evidence obtained from Buroserv in the form of its communications with the four entities indicates that it did not forward Entity F the details of 256,371 alleged Scam Calls from 7 CLIs. Additionally, Buroserv failed to copy the ACMA when providing details of the remaining 4,189 alleged Scam Calls from another 5 CLIs to Entities B, H and E.

23. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 17 March 2024 traceback request, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.4.4 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline, because it failed to forward the details of 256,371 alleged Scam Calls (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSP from which it received those calls, as soon as practicable. Additionally, Buroserv failed to copy in the ACMA when forwarding the details of the remaining 4,189 alleged Scam Calls to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls.

Table 8: May 2024 to September 2024 Traceback requests

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2 . Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 4.4.4 of the Code.
Did Buroserv have evidence of a material issue of alleged Scam Calls, under subclause 4.4.1 of the Code?	Yes. On 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received additional notifications of material issues of alleged Scam Calls between 1 May and 10 September 2024. ⁵³ of these notifications, included in Columns A and B of Appendix A, identified a material issue of alleged Scam Calls in accordance with the Guideline.
Was Buroserv the Transit CSP?	Yes. The evidence for the 1 May to 10 September 2024 notifications indicates that Buroserv did not originate the calls referred to in the notifications. The ACMA notes that Buroserv did not identify itself as the Originating CSP for any alleged Scam Calls and therefore considers Buroserv acted as a Transit CSP.
Did Buroserv provide details to the C/CSP from which it received those calls (cc'ing the ACMA), as soon as practicable?	No. Evidence obtained from Buroserv in the form of its communications with the Notifying CSP and CSPs from which it received the calls does not demonstrate that it forwarded the details to the CSPs from which it received the alleged Scam Calls in 23 of the notifications, as listed in Column A of Appendix A. Additionally, Buroserv failed to copy in the ACMA when providing details of the alleged Scam Calls in 30 notifications to CSPs from which Buroserv received those calls, as listed in the Column B of Appendix A.

24. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 1 May to 10 September 2024 traceback requests, Buroserv failed to comply with subclause 4.4.4 of the Code, and that it also did not comply with the Guideline, on a total of 53 occasions, because it failed to:

- (a) as soon as practicable, for the 23 occasions between 1 May and 10 September 2024, forward the details of alleged Scam Calls (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls; and
 - (b) for the 30 notifications between 1 May and 10 September 2024, failed to copy in the ACMA when forwarding the details of the alleged Scam Calls to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls.
25. In summary, as outlined in Tables 5 to 8, the ACMA finds that, on a total of 56 occasions between 12 March to 10 September 2024, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.4.4 of the Code, nor did it comply with the Guideline because it either failed to, as soon as practicable forward the details of alleged Scam Calls (with a copy to the ACMA) to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls or failed to copy in the ACMA when forwarding the details of alleged Scam Calls to the C/CSPs from which it received those calls.

Compliance with subclause 4.6.2 - Exchanging Information about confirmed Scam Calls

26. Subclause 4.6.2 of the Code states:

Where Scam Calls are confirmed, each C/CSP in the transit path must:

- (a) share information about the origin of the Scam Calls (including where possible the CLI of the A-Party) with the ACMA via agreed electronic means as per the template in Appendix B; and*
- (b) provide details about the transit path of the Scam Calls (including, where possible, the CLI of the A-Party) to relevant government agencies via agreed electronic means, as per the template in Appendix B*

27. The ACMA has considered Buroserv's compliance with subclause 4.6.2 in relation to confirmed Scam Calls in **Table 9**.

Table 9: May 2024 to September 2024 traceback requests

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2. Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 4.6.2 of the Code.
Have Scam Calls been confirmed?	Yes. On 2 October 2024, Buroserv confirmed it received additional notifications of material issues of alleged Scam Calls between May and September 2024. Buroserv provided evidence of their communications with both the Notifying and upstream CSPs. The evidence indicates a confirmation of Scam Calls either by Buroserv or upstream CSPs for 20 notifications between 8 May to 21 August 2024 referred to in Column C of Appendix A.
Has Buroserv shared information about the origin and transit path of the Scam Calls (including where possible the CLI of the A-Party) with the ACMA via agreed electronic means as per the template in Appendix B of the Code?	No. Evidence obtained from Buroserv by the ACMA on 2 October 2024 indicates that Buroserv did not share information about the origin and transit path of these alleged Scam Calls with the ACMA via agreed electronic means, as per the template in Appendix B of the Code on those 20 occasions.

28. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that, in relation to the 1 May to 10 September 2024 traceback requests, on a total of 20 occasions, Buroserv did not comply with subclause 4.6.2 of the Code, because it failed to share information about the origin and transit path of the confirmed Scam Calls with the ACMA, as per the template in Appendix B of the Code.

Compliance with subclause 1.1.3 – Guideline timeframes

29. Subclause 1.1.3 of the Code states:

The Code should be read in conjunction with CA G664:2022 and where the G664 Guideline sets out timeframes for actions, C/CSPs must adhere to these timeframes.

30. By not meeting the timeframes set out in the Guideline, the ACMA finds that Buroserv has also contravened subclause 1.1.3 of the Code on a total of 81 occasions, including:

- (a) on 2 occasions for the purpose of subclause 4.2.10 in relation to the traceback requests in Tables 2 and 3;
- (b) on 3 occasions for the purpose of subclause 4.4.3 in relation to the traceback requests in Table 4;
- (c) on 56 occasions for the purpose of subclause 4.4.4 in relation to the traceback requests in Tables 5 to 8; and
- (d) on 20 occasions for the purpose of subclause 4.6.2 in relation to traceback requests in Table 9.

Compliance with subclause 6.1.1– Reporting

31. Subclause 6.1.1 of the Code states:

C/CSPs must, within 20 Business Days of the end of each calendar quarter, report to the ACMA:

- (a) For Scam Calls, in the format and detail specified in Appendix D; and*
- (b) For Scam SMS, in the format and detail specified in Appendix E.*

32. Appendix D and E of the Code requires C/CSPs to report the total number of Scam Calls and Scam SMS blocked respectively during the calendar quarter, as well as a breakdown of the Scam Call and Scam SMS types.
33. To determine Buroserv’s compliance, the ACMA has addressed the questions set out in **Table 10** below.

Table 10: Reporting obligations

Is Buroserv a CSP?	Yes. See Table 2. Accordingly, Buroserv must comply with clause 6.1.1(a) and (b) of the Code.
Did Buroserv within 20 Business Days of the end of each quarter since the code commenced in July 2022, report to the ACMA the number of scam calls, and the number of Scam SMS, it blocked, in the format and detail specified in Appendix D and, E respectively, of the Code?	No. The ACMA did not receive reports from Buroserv about the number of Scam Calls or Scam SMS it blocked between the July to September 2022 quarter and the April to June 2024 quarter, within the requisite timeframes. Accordingly, Buroserv did not meet the requirement for provision of the details specified by Appendix D and E of the Code for each quarter between July 2022 and June 2024.

34. Accordingly, the ACMA finds that Buroserv has not complied with subclauses 6.1.1(a) and (b) of the Code on 8 occasions because it failed to provide required blocking details within 20 days of the end of each calendar quarter between July 2022 and June 2024.

Appendix A - contravention details for subclauses 4.4.4 and 4.6.2 as addressed in Table 8 and Table 9.

May to September 2024 traceback requests

Subclause 4.4.4 (Not forwarded details to other CSPs)		Subclause 4.4.4 (Not copied in the ACMA)		Subclause 4.6.2 (Not shared information with the ACMA)	
Date of Notification	Column A - 23 notifications ticket no.	Date of Notification	Column B - 30 notifications ticket no.	Date of Notification	Column C - 20 notifications ticket no.
1 May 2024	693997	8 May 2024	615289	8 May 2024	615289
2 May 2024	694246	15 May 2024	606431	12 May 2024	615908
12 May 2024	615908	15 June 2024	621680	23 May 2024	617496
13 May 2024	696007	25 June 2024	703540	2 July 2024	624176
15 May 2024	696688	2 July 2024	624176	11 July 2024	625888
22 May 2024	697902	8 July 2024	705747	19 July 2024	708240
23 May 2024	617946	11 July 2024	625888	19 July 2024	708248
27 May 2024	698640	15 July 2024	707109	24 July 2024	708331
29 May 2024	699130	16 July 2024	626639	24 July 2024	708351
4 June 2024	700038	16 July 2024	626644	24 July 2024	708393
21 June 2024	702280	16 July 2024	626649	24 July 2024	708594
26 June 2024	623338	19 July 2024	627398	24 July 2024	708802
10 July 2024	706345	19 July 2024	708240	25 July 2024	709015
12 July 2024	706842	19 July 2024	708248	26 July 2024	709258
12 July 2024	707002	23 July 2024	627681	1 August 2024	710339
16 July 2024	707382	24 July 2024	627886	2 August 2024	629698
21 July 2024	627415	24 July 2024	708331	5 August 2024	710677
2 August 2024	629698	24 July 2024	708351	5 August 2024	710952
5 August 2024	710677	24 July 2024	708393	7 August 2024	630406
21 August 2024	632518	24 July 2024	708594	21 August 2024	632518
4 September 2024	634829	24 July 2024	708802		
4 September 2024	716537	25 July 2024	709015		
5 September 2024	707583	26 July 2024	709258		
		1 August 2024	710339		
		5 August 2024	629980		
		5 August 2024	710952		
		7 August 2024	630406		
		21 August 2024	632630		
		9 September 2024	717494		
		10 September 2024	717758		