

attached message on the 28th March. The attached message indicates that the problem did lie in the RCM and has been fixed. This was confirmed in a subsequent conversation with [REDACTED] ...

K00941

[REDACTED]  
From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC  
Date: Monday, March 28, 1994 5:11PM  
Priority: High

Grant,  
Do you want any more on this RCM problem? [REDACTED] seems to have solved the problems and whilst the poor setting up of the supervisory system is a worry, I doubt if many new systems will be installed on copper bearers.

[REDACTED]  
From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: CAPE1.DOC  
Date: Monday, March 28, 1994 3:04PM  
Priority: High

Please find attached the results of testing of problems with Cape Bridgewater RCM system . This is additional information to that provided by Mark Hooper on 23-3-94.

I hope this assists.

<<File Attachment: CAPE1.DOC>>  
[REDACTED]

Pendlebury, Bruce

From: ~~Gamble, Peter~~  
To: ~~Pendlebury, Bruce~~  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC  
Date: Tuesday, 26 April 1994 3:12PM

K00940

Bruce, for information.

Following a call from Alan Smith, I have just had a discussion with ~~Les Churcher~~ re a complaint that Alan Smith lodged earlier today (Leopard No 364 608). I described to Les more accurately what the problem is and he will discuss my comments with Alan Smith.

~~Date:~~

From: ~~Gamble, Peter~~  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]; Black, Stephen; Rumble, Paul; [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: CAPE1.DOC  
Date: Tuesday, 26 April 1994 2:33PM

John, thanks for the response.

I should have chased it up earlier, but I was on leave.

I am concerned to note that heat may be part of the problem. I had occasion earlier this year to get involved in another "ongoing" case involving an RCM with a heat problem at Murrumbateman (just outside Canberra). Although the problems experienced by the customer were different, as was the nature of the technical problem, the root cause seems to have been the same - viz heat.

I do note, however, that one of the symptoms from the Murrumbateman case was "Not Receiving Ring", something Alan Smith at Cape Bridgewater has been complaining about for some time.

~~Peter:~~

From: [REDACTED]  
To: ~~Gamble, Peter~~  
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC  
Date: Tuesday, 26 April 1994 1:09PM  
Priority: High

~~Peter:~~

Please see reply from ~~Bob Brown~~. I dont know why you did not get a copy but I will follow up

Do you need anything else.

Regards

From: [REDACTED]  
To: ~~Gamble, Peter~~  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC  
Date: Tuesday, April 26, 1994 12:40PM  
Priority: High

~~Peter,~~

Reference your Mail message enquiring about the status of the DNF at Cape Bridgewater, I sent the

Internal Memo



To [Redacted]

Consumer CAN Design and Construction Tas/Vic  
CAN Technologies

From David Polson  
Technical Manager

PO Box 115 Ballarat Vic 3353  
122 Armstrong St Sth Ballarat 3350

K.00942

Subject Cape Bridgewater RCM's

Australia

Date 24 March 1994

Telephone 053 334499

International 61 53 334499

Facsimile 053 332539

File

Mobile 018 503 892

Attention [Redacted]

Pager 016 530 726

Following a request from Service Delivery for assistance at Cape Bridgewater late on 19-3-94 I arrived at Portland early Sunday morning on the 20-3-94. There was a problem with RCM system no 1 between Portland and Cape Bridgewater the previous day. Ongoing problems were experienced by customers since 8-3-94 on RCM number 1. The problems were normally of a very short duration and had often cleared by the time staff arrived on site.

It appeared that the line system was intermittently failing for short periods of time (15 seconds or so) and then coming back up. The systems are all on copper bearers with 10 regenerators on them. The RCM's are fitted with auto power feed restart cards, and the alarms are inputted to AMS. Occasionally on a failure the channel cards would loose their programming and flash. No alarm indication is given for this. The SCU fail light at Cape Bridgewater and AIS at Portland would also be up, although this was not constant for a long period of time. The SCU and all common cards had previously been changed by local staff.

We were able to duplicate the SCU fail light coming up with a short bearer break on a test model, and was assumed we were experiencing intermittent line system failure on the system. The original installation was for 2 RCM's with 9 regenerators and supervisory filters for each direction of transmission. When a third system was required, considerable difficulty was experienced in getting the third system working, to such an extent that an additional regen was installed between locations 8 & 9.

With a suspect line system we proceeded to do a trios test when all traffic was off, after having advised Network Management. We could not see any regens. Suspecting faulty supervisory pairs a regen was opened and pairs tested, only to find the regen housings were connected to pairs 5 & 6 and the terminal supervisory connected to pairs 11 & 12. This explained our failure to find any regenerators. With this changed at the terminals to pairs 5 & 6 we could see all regens except the extra one installed between 8 & 9. On investigating this cause the supervisory pairs at this location were on pairs 11 & 12. This was rectified enabling the testing of each regenerator. If the line system failed we should now be able to localise the fault. The original

11

acceptance test results show filter testing at Portland (location 00) and Cape Bridgewater (location 10). In our testing no reading was obtained at 00 and the reading for location 10 was the regenerator and not the Cape Bridgewater terminal as shown on the test sheets. RCM terminal regenerators do not have the TX and Rx monitor points extended for supervisory filter purposes. All of this added to the difficulties in identifying the fault with the supervisory system.

It must be noted that the faulty supervisory system does NOT effect the bearer performance but is used as a maintenance tool if the line system is faulty.

During the Sunday and Monday that I was in attendance the system did not fail, although it was out of service for short periods (approx 1-2 minutes) for trios testing.

With further investigation it appeared one of our problems may be more temperature related, as when the remote end was not opened for some time, that appeared to be when we had the failures. This would also explain why no failures occurred when I was there with the door open for a large proportion of the time on Sunday and Monday. Another SCU was obtained and installed in system 1 on 23-3-94. The unit replaced has obviously been repaired and may indeed be suspect. Further testing will be done on this unit, especially with elevated temperatures.

Additional testing has confirmed that the replaced SCU was indeed faulty. No other problems have been experienced since the SCU was replaced on the 23-3 94

Danid Polson- CAN Technology - Ballarat

Ross Anderson - Service Delivery - Portland

: - DOES NOT EXIST  
 :CUS - CUSTOMER  
 SOLUTION = 10/05/94 CSR: ZV333FIELD EMPLOYEE: E767 ~~TONY WATSON~~  
 IN HAND ~~TONY WATSON~~  
 10/05/94 I reported this incident in LEOPARD on 055217777 and notified ~~Chris Doody~~. We were able to duplicate the incident during testing; 217777 was diverted to 236101 with easycall and when 236101 was busy, a call to 217777 would return one burst of ring then busy.  
 11/05/94 ~~Chris Doody~~ called me this morning and said the incident is caused by AXE104 system limitation, that is the incident is normal and the customer is aware of that.  
 11/05/94 09:25, Mr Alan Smith was notified of the result.

SOLUTION = 11/05/94 10:33 ZV333  
 Chris Doody is sending a report on the incident.  
~~Tony Watson~~

| DATE                       | START | END   | SYMPT | CAUSE | ACT'N | EMP  |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 10/05/94                   | 13.47 | 13.48 | NF    | WJ    | YT    | E767 |
| ***** NO PART DETAIL ***** |       |       |       |       |       |      |

ORDER = S6701981 STATUS = CL  
 CUSTOMER = 259289 TELEPHONE = 055 267267  
 CAPE BRIDGEWATER HOL. CAMP ALAN SMITH  
 BLOWHOLE RD  
 CAPE BDWTR VIC 3306

CALL IN = 04/05/94 14.03  
 CLOSED = 04/05/94 14.04  
 DESCRIPTION = 27/04/94 13:30 Visit to Alan Smith by ~~Ross Anderson~~.....  
 NARRATIVE = 4/05/94 13:48 ZV333  
 27/04/94 13:30 Apointment for ~~Ross Anderson~~ to visit Alan Smith to investigate the report of 267230 possibly holding up, after the phone was hung up.  
 :BNU - BUSY NOT IN USE  
 : - DOES NOT EXIST  
 :CUS - CUSTOMER

SOLUTION = 4/05/94 CSR: ZV333FIELD EMPLOYEE: E767 ~~TONY WATSON~~  
 This fault report was initiated by ~~Peter Campbell~~. ~~Peter~~ was doing some testing with Alan Smith and apparently they were able to hang up Smith's phone and while ~~Peter~~ was still listening at his phone he could hear Mr Smith talking in his office. In fact Mr Smith counted to 10 then picked up his phone again and ~~Peter~~ had been able to hear the count to 10.  
 On the 27/04/94 at 13:30 ~~Ross Anderson~~ visited the premises to investigate these claims. ~~Ross~~ called ~~Peter Campbell~~ on 03 5507309 and made 10 test calls, ~~Ross~~ was hanging up then counting to 10 and picking the phone up again, each test call was released ( that is line was heard to drop out ) at

SOLUTION = 5/05/94 9:10 ZV333  
 ✓ within 1 second of hanging up. ~~Ross~~ was able to hear Ross count 1 then the line released.  
 I spoke to ~~Ross~~ whilst he was on site and we made further test call ( 18 calls of which 2 were from 267267 ), during these test calls we obtained the same result as previous, that is the line released within 1 second. We also tried the T200 from 267267 on 267230 and it released immediately on hanging up. We then tested the suspect T200 on 267267 and it displayed the same symptom on this different line. This T200 is an EXICOM and the other T200 is an ALCATEL, we thought that this may be a design "fault???" with the EXICOM so ~~Ross~~

SOLUTION = 5/05/94 9:27 ZV333  
 tried a new EXICOM from his car and it worked perfectly, that is, released the line immediately on hanging up. We decided to leave the new phone and the old phone was marked and tagged, ~~Ross~~ forwarded the phone to FM&D.  
 I was speaking to Mr Smith the next day ( 28/04/94 ) and he said he has witnesses to prove that his phone used to hold up for over 10 seconds. He wants a letter to say nothing else has been fixed prior to the visit by Ross that could

K00944

FILE NOTE

5:30pm - 6:00pm

CAPE BRIDGEWATER - ALAN SMITH

I called Alan Smith in response to a message left by him. He believes his fax line 055 267230 is locking (probably) caused by the machine as he indicates a voice can be heard to the I/C caller even when the phone is unplugged.

He has been doing some sort of check with ~~Peter [REDACTED]~~, but I am unable to contact Peter at this time. I shall arrange for someone to go to the premises tomorrow 27/4/1994.

~~Eric [REDACTED]~~

Difficult Network Faults Manager

26/4/94

1914

April 17th 1914

Dear Mr. [Name]

I have received your letter of the 14th and am glad to hear that you are interested in the [Project].

I am sure that your [contribution] will be most valuable to the [Organization].

Sincerely,  
[Name]

Doody, Chris

K04604

From: ~~Chris Doody~~  
To: ~~Michael Hew~~  
Subject: Request for information on failure of CCAS monitoring Equipment  
Date: Wednesday, 4 May 1994 4:00PM

Hew,

The question has been asked by staff from the Commercial Customer Response Unit, as to the reason for the change in the monitoring equipment of Mr A Smith's lines from CCAS to Smart 10. I have given them a brief note on the reasons, ie. modifying the CCAS to operate on AXE lines and the possibility of corrupted data. The CRU wants a more comprehensive report as to the reasons for the discrepancies in the reports. In particular, they require an explanation of the long held calls (as interpreted from CCAS data) as well as the reason for the "1" that often appears on the start of these long held periods.

~~Chris Doody~~ gave me an abridged version of the reasons over the telephone, however I believe that we will require something a little more substantial, particularly if the issue is raised during the arbitration process.

Could I please get from you a description of the reasons for this incorrect CCAS data. Looking back through the CCAS reports, it seems that the incidence of the long held periods started about November 1993.

If you require any additional info, please don't hesitate to give me a ring.

Cheers



1870

1870

1870

(106)

**FILE NOTE** 28/4/94 5.35pm K00932

**Alan Smith - Cape Bridgewater**

Rang Alan Smith in response to message from [redacted]. Alan was concerned about the outcome of an investigation into a fault condition on his telephone service 267230 whereby after initiating a call, and then hanging up, the called party was still connected. Thus when the handset was picked up again the called party was still there. This would last for up to 10-12 seconds.

Alan had discussed this problem with Cliff Matheson from AUSTEL and [redacted] from the Customer Response Unit.

Local technician, [redacted], visited Alan's premises to investigate the situation. According to Alan, he was there for over an hour and a half, however Alan believes during this time, [redacted] returned to the Depot in Portland and returned again. Alan, could not be sure of this as he in fact went into Portland after [redacted] arrived, and when he returned, [redacted] was still in attendance.

[redacted] apparently replaced the handset, but according to Alan told Alan "there was no problem with the phone". Alan advises that the service has worked correctly since [redacted] visited the premises.

Alan's concern is, what was the problem. Was the phone faulty, or was it a network problem?

I advised him I would give him the fault details of the fault and the rectification procedure.

Alan went on to complain about sending faxes to Austel, 3 separate faxes, that Austel claim they did not receive, but in fact received blank papers. According to Alan, Austel's fax log recorded received of the three faxes.

Alan is concerned as to what happened in this case, and went on to say that he had had previous trouble in both sending and receiving faxes. That is, messages had not been received when he sent them or he had not received messages sent from other areas.

[redacted]

1944

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954