

RECEIVED

- 3 NOV 1994

AUSIEL

COMMONWEALTH & DEFENCE FORCE
OMBUDSMANPrudential Building, cnr London Circuit & University Avenue, Canberra City
GPO Box 442, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601, Australia
Tel: (06) 276 0111; Fax: (06) 249 7829; Int. Fax: + 61 6 249 7829

27 October 1994

281.

C/94/195

M. Wynack

Mr John MacMahon
Australian Telecommunications Authority
PO Box 7443 St Kilda Road
MELBOURNE VIC 3004

Dear Mr MacMahon

As I promised during the interview on 22 September 1994, enclosed is a copy of a transcript which was made by AUSCRIPT from the audio tape of the interview. I have enclosed a copy of the tape in case you wish to confirm the accuracy of the transcript.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours sincerely

John Wynack

John Wynack
Director of Investigations

4

**TRANSCRIPT
OF PROCEEDINGS**



95/0600-01

9

ACT and Southern
NSW Region
Level 1
Melbourne Building
West Row
Canberra ACT 2601

GPO Box 476
Canberra ACT 2601

Phone (06) 249 7322
Fax (06) 257 6099

**COMMONWEALTH AND DEFENCE FORCE
OMBUDSMAN**

**RECORD OF INTERVIEW
CONDUCTED ON
THURSDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 1994**

INTERVIEWERS:

**JAMES HINDS, Senior Investigation Officer
JOHN WYNACK, Director of Investigations**

INTERVIEWEE:

MR JOHN McMAHON

McMahon 22.9.94
tape 1 of 1

If I could just depart from that for the moment, has AUSTEL been involved in seeking to speed up the provision of documents by Telecom by any means or is that just - once the agreement was reached did you bow out then?

MR McMAHON: I think there have been a number of occasions on which we have mentioned to the Telecom personnel that the COT cases were alleging they were having difficulty in getting it and my recollection is we probably made reference to that in one or two letter to Telecom. But again because we were - it was outside our jurisdiction you know we didn't make a big issue of it and indeed when the - when some of the COT cases have complained to us you know we've said, "Well, there's a very limited amount that AUSTEL can do about it. It's not within its power but you could well take the case to the Ombudsman's office."

MR MATTHEWS: Can I add a comment to that as well, and that is in our report - one of the recommendations in our report that goes to Telecom's treatment of FOI applications and I think the recommendation said something along the lines that Telecom should increase the resourcing of its FOI area and improve the treatment of FOI applications, so in a sense that's a general pressure that we put on Telecom to hurry up the process.

MR WYNACK: What was the date the report was issued, the AUSTEL report?

MR MATTHEWS: The final report was April - I can't remember the date in April, but April 1994. The draft report was produced in March 1994 and Telecom received their copy of that at that time.

MR WYNACK: So that observation was made by AUSTEL notwithstanding that there was in place then, or about to become in place, an arbitration process which enabled the arbitrator to make directions that Telecom provide documents?

MR MATTHEWS: It was a general statement. It didn't necessarily apply to the four COT cases. It was just a general statement.

MR McMAHON: But, yes, I mean to say you know some of the suggestions made were that FOI was not dealt with when the - when the person with that responsibility went on holidays. You know, nobody filled in for him. Whether that's right or wrong I don't know, but that was the suggestion made and I've never heard it denied. So you know - and I think that's part of the background to the recommendation that Bruce identified there.