Audity

SAMPLE REPORT

Freight Invoice Audit

Bellbird Homewares Pty Ltd · carrier: FreightCo Pty Ltd · FY26 (July 2025 – June 2026)

ILLUSTRATIVE — READ THIS FIRST

Bellbird Homewares, FreightCo and StoreSafe do not exist. The invoices, rate cards, work instructions and every figure in this document are synthetic — constructed by Audity to demonstrate the method. Nothing here relates to any real client, and no real client data has ever been published by Audity.

The dataset was deliberately built to contain each class of billing error the audit looks for, so it holds more errors — and more cleanly evidenced errors — than a typical year of invoices. Read the recovery totals as a demonstration of method, not as a forecast of your result.

What is real is everything else: the structure of the report, the standard of evidence behind each claim line, the separation of claims from queries from optimisation opportunities, and the accompanying claim schedule with its live formulas and full transaction ledger. This is exactly what a client receives.

ON THE NUMBERS IN THIS PACK

This sample recovers $3,431.66 against $131,477.03 of billed freight — 2.6% of annual spend, returned in cash from the carrier.

It separately identifies $8,400–$10,100 a year of structural saving that is not a claim against anyone: freight that is simply being bought the wrong way. That is a further 6–8%.

Those two numbers together are what the 3–8% on audity.com.au refers to. That range is not an industry survey — it is what Luke Ashwood has found in freight accounts across twenty years on the buyer's side, and it is quoted as his own experience rather than dressed up as research. Cash recovery and structural saving are different things and are never added together in a claim.

Prepared by Luke Ashwood · Audity · audity.com.au · luke@audity.com.au · 0431 980 777

The bottom line

RECOVERABLE IN CASH FROM FREIGHTCO

$3,431.66

On $131,477 of freight billed across FY26 — 2.6% of the year's spend. Ex GST.

FreightCo billed Bellbird for things the contract does not allow. Here is what, and how much.

Charged for a tail lift service that was never requested — 36 times	**$1,386.00**
Fuel surcharge billed at 16.0% when the contract says 14.5% — 6 months	**$893.81**
Four consignments billed twice on the same invoice	**$736.00**
Last year's Sydney–Melbourne rate still being charged — 3 months	**$270.00**
Fuel surcharge on top of the overcharges above	**$145.85**
Total to claim back	**$3,431.66**

Every line is rated High confidence. Each one rests on a direct contradiction between the invoice and the rate card, the SLA or the standing work instructions — not on interpretation. The full claim, line by line with invoice numbers, is in the accompanying claim schedule and is ready to submit as it stands.

Separately: money that could stop going out the door

PER YEAR, IF THE FREIGHT IS BOUGHT DIFFERENTLY

$8,400 – $10,100

Not a claim against FreightCo. This is freight Bellbird is buying the wrong way.

Almost a third of Bellbird's consignments are courier-weight parcels travelling on pallet rates. Moving that band to a per-kg service would save roughly $8,400–$10,100 a year. The workings are under “Money you could stop spending”.

THESE TWO NUMBERS ARE NOT ADDED TOGETHER

$3,431.66 is cash owed and recoverable now. $8,400–$10,100 is an annual saving available if Bellbird changes how it ships. They are different things, and Audity never combines them into a single headline figure.

The detail

Each finding below states what was agreed, what actually happened, and where to find the workings in the claim schedule.

1. Tail lift charged but never requested — $1,386.00

What was agreed: the standing work instructions state that tail lift is not required and must not be used or charged unless specifically requested in writing per consignment. No such requests were made in FY26.

What happened: FreightCo charged the $38.50 tail lift fee on 36 consignments, across 11 of the 12 months. Example — invoice FC-202507, consignment CON4002 (MEL–BNE, July 2025). The fee itself matches the rate card; the issue is that the service was never asked for, so the correct charge is nil and the full amount is claimable. All 36 lines are listed in tab “A5 Detail”.

2. Fuel surcharge overcharged — $893.81

What was agreed: SLA clause 8.2 sets the fuel surcharge at 14.5% of base freight from 1 July 2025, applied to base freight only.

What happened: billed correctly at 14.5% from July to September 2025, then stepped up to 16.0% for six invoices from October 2025 to March 2026, then back to 14.5% in April. Nothing in the contract permits 16.0%. Example — invoice FC-202510 charged $1,838.08, being 16.0% of the $11,488.00 base; at 14.5% it should have been $1,665.76. Month-by-month workings in tab “A4 FS Calc”. The surcharge was correctly applied to base freight only, not to accessorials, in all 12 months.

3. Four consignments billed twice — $736.00

CON4381 and CON4401 at $184.00 each on invoice FC-202604, and CON4461 at $276.00 and CON4494 at $92.00 on FC-202606. Each pair is identical in consignment reference, lane, pallet count and amount. The second occurrence of each is claimed. Both are shown side by side in tab “A6 Detail”.

4. Superseded Sydney–Melbourne rate — $270.00

What was agreed: the rate card cuts the SYD–MEL per-pallet rate from $98.00 to $92.00 from 1 July 2025.

What happened: for July to September 2025, all 22 SYD–MEL consignments (45 pallets) were still rated at the old $98.00 — $6.00 per pallet too high. FreightCo applied the correct rate from October onward. All other lanes were billed correctly all year. The 22 lines are in tab “A1 Detail”.

5. Fuel surcharge on the overcharges — $145.85

The surcharge is a percentage of the freight base, so the errors in findings 3 and 4 inflated it too — July to September 2025 on the rate overcharge, and April and June 2026 on the duplicates. Recomputed line by line in tab “A4 FS Calc”.

What was checked

Every freight line was recomputed from the rate card in force at the invoice date and compared to the amount billed. Every accessorial was tested against the rate card and the work instructions. Fuel surcharge was recomputed monthly from the invoiced freight base. The ledger was screened for duplicates and arithmetic errors. A materiality floor of $5 per line applied, with small recurring errors of a common cause grouped into one claim. The full normalised ledger sits in the claim schedule so any figure can be reproduced.

The recomputation is automated — all 549 lines, not a sample — which is the only way twelve months gets checked properly. What is not automated is the judgement: whether a charge had any contractual basis, whether a finding is strong enough to claim or belongs in the queries section, and what is worth pursuing. Every claim line in this report was reviewed and rated by hand before it was included.

Documents relied on

- FreightCo invoices FC-202507 to FC-202606 — 12 monthly invoices, 549 line items, $131,477.03 ex GST billed, as a line-level CSV extract.
- Contracted rate card for all five lanes used, plus the tail lift accessorial rate.
- SLA extract — fuel surcharge mechanism cl. 8.2, DIFOT target, GST treatment.
- Standing work instructions — tail lift prohibition, standard pallets, delivery windows.

What this audit could not test

- SLA clause 11 (service-failure credits) was not supplied, so no credit entitlement could be assessed. Raised as an open question below.
- Invoices came as a CSV extract, assumed to be a faithful copy. Spot-checking against the PDF originals before submission is prudent.
- The rate card is per-pallet only, so cubic-conversion and break-point checks did not apply.
- GST was not itemised; all claims are ex GST, with GST to follow via adjustment notes.

Open questions — not in the claim

The SLA sets a 98% monthly on-time delivery target with credits under clause 11, but clause 11 and FreightCo's delivery performance reports were not provided. If performance fell below target in any month, credits would be claimable on top of the amounts above. To find out: ask FreightCo for clause 11 and their monthly DIFOT reporting, or use Bellbird's own receipt-date data.

Nothing unproven is ever put to a carrier. This stays out of the claim until the evidence exists.

Money you could stop spending

This section is about how Bellbird buys freight, not about what FreightCo owes. It is indicative and must not be added to the claim.

Courier-weight freight on pallet rates

152 of the 497 consignments shipped in FY26 — 31% — weighed between 60 and 140 kg, averaging 101 kg, and took a single pallet space. On the per-pallet structure they cost $18,926 for the year including fuel surcharge, an average of $124.51 each.

At market per-kg courier rates of $0.50–$0.60 per kg, with a $35 minimum and a comparable surcharge, the same 152 consignments would cost roughly $8,860–$10,570. That is an indicative saving of $8,400–$10,100 a year.

The rate card is the wrong shape

With almost a third of volume below half a pallet's typical weight, a per-pallet-only rate card does not fit this freight profile. Two options: add a sub-100 kg per-kg tier to the FreightCo agreement, or tender that band separately to a courier network.

What to do next

1. Send FreightCo the claim schedule and ask for credit notes totalling $3,431.66 ex GST — adjustment notes, for GST purposes — against the invoices referenced.
2. Stop it recurring: instruct FreightCo in writing to remove tail lift from the service profile, confirm the fuel surcharge at 14.5%, and confirm the current rate card loading. Check the July 2026 invoice against all three.
3. Ask for SLA clause 11 and the delivery performance data, to test for service-failure credits.
4. Add a three-point check to monthly invoice approval: rate against card, surcharge percentage, duplicate consignment scan. It takes two minutes.
5. Decide on the courier band — worth $8,400–$10,100 a year.

WHAT THIS LOOKS LIKE ON YOUR INVOICES

Start with one month. Not twelve.

Send a single month of carrier invoices and I will tell you on the spot whether there is anything worth chasing. If there is, I audit the full twelve months line by line against your contracted rates, free, and you get this report and this claim schedule — on your data.

> **THE COMMERCIAL TERMS, IN FULL**
>
> My fee is 30% of what your carrier actually pays back. Not 30% of what I claim — 30% of what lands.
>
> If nothing is recoverable, you never see an invoice. There is nothing to approve, no purchase order to raise and no budget line to find: this sits outside the budget entirely.
>
> Lodge the claim yourself — the schedule is built to be submitted as it stands — or hand it to me and I will run it with your carrier through to the credit note.
>
> Your invoices are seen by one person. Not a team, not an offshore processing centre, not a machine. Me.

Luke Ashwood

20+ years running logistics from the buyer's side — Transport Manager ANZ at Syngenta, Retail Logistics Manager at Ampol, and terminal operations at GrainCorp and Vopak across fuel, chemicals, FMCG and agriculture. Brisbane-based, working with clients across Australia.

0431 980 777 · luke@audity.com.au · audity.com.au