

Mr Hughes indicated that one party can ask for documents once the arbitration has commenced. Mr Hughes advocated this course of action as more effective and that as arbitrator, he would not make a determination on incomplete information.

Mr Schorer asked Mr <sup>TIO COUNSEL</sup> why the FOI law was not as broad as the discovery procedure.

Mr Bartlett did not answer this question directly but confirmed that he believed it was wider and that documents would not be partially deleted as was claimed by Mr Schorer.

Ms Garms stated she had three concerns about the Rules as drafted:

- (1) causal link;
- (2) flow on effects of treatment by Telecom - adequately compensated; and
- (3) Telecom's liability amended to give assessor the right to make recommendations.

#### Causal Link

In relation to this matter, Ms Garms stated that it was agreed that there would not be a strict application of legal burdens of proof, etc., in relation to the proving of the loss suffered by the Cot Claimants. Reference was made to discussions with ~~TELSTRA~~ and two Senators. Ian Campbell admitted that Telecom had been remiss. Ms Garms stated that Telecom was in a difficult position and queried the current drafting of the Rules in relation to a requirement that the strict causal approach be applied.

|| Mr Schorer stated that Telecom was in a difficult position because a lot of the relevant documents either did not exist or had been destroyed.

Mr <sup>TIO</sup> referred to clause 2(c), (f), and (g) of the FTSP in relation to the causal connection. Ms Garms had received advice from R Davey that there was a difference between the FTSP and the old rules that had previously been prepared by Telecom, (not the ~~Rules~~ Rules).

ARBITRATOR.

Mr Schorer accepted that <sup>TIO</sup> had been appointed as administrator. <sup>TIO</sup> had invited the Cot Cases to talk to the TIO and had requested input in relation to the rules beforehand. Mr Schorer was disturbed that once Mr <sup>TIO</sup> was in place, there was a document prepared by Telecom of proposed rules for the arbitration. Mr Schorer considered Telecom was already moving away from the spirit of the FTSP.

<sup>TIO COUNSEL</sup> <sup>ARBITRATOR</sup>

Mr <sup>TIO</sup> and <sup>ARBITRATOR</sup> both stated that they had not received this document and had not read it and that it was irrelevant.

Ms Garms returned to discussion about causation which was her point no. 1.

4