

CAV
CHTONOLOGY
LGE

Exhibit 1150 to 1169

Analysis of 055 267 267 Problems.

b Started: 24/7/1992

Original Customer Complaint:

Incoming Callers report Recorded Voice Announcement (RVA) "The number you have called is not connected, Please check the number before calling again!". Various origins were mentioned. The most recent were Public Telephones at Station Pier. Test calls were made from these PT's by Kieth Mc Intie of Payphone services on Friday 24th July and calls were steered through the Digital trunk exchanges

The PT's at Station pier are:

646 2461	Cabinet 646 003
646 3698	Cabinet 646 004
646 5420	Cabinet 646 012
646 5438	Cabinet 646 014
646 5440	Cabinet 646 015
646 5447	Cabinet 646 017
646 5501	Cabinet 646 432

Previous compliants were:

30/6/92 057981622 was calling 055267275 & couldn't get them therefore contacted 267267 for assistance. [No Fault Found]

16/4/92 Callers from Greyhound Bus terminal melbourne got RVA. [No Fault Found when tested]

17/3/92 Melbourne callers got RVA when calling 055 267 XXX [MELU exchange routing data was incorrectly set].

Other problems:

28/9/92 Congestion incoming due to a Silent EM fault in Portland AXE where by the HMOX-PORX and PORC-PORX routes were autoblocked. [Fault rectified locally]

2/9/92 a customer at HEYWOOD ARK (Mrs. Savill, 055 271 660) reported RVA on calls to 055 267 267. Other customers in the area reported similar RVA problems. [Testing by Portland staff found an intermittent fault in the Digit storage section of Register 34 at Portland ARF. This resulted in customers occasionally getting RVA or wrong numbers. This would have affected all PORC customers, as well as any customers in ARK's served by PORC. Fault was rectified 7/10/92].

Analysis of Individual reported problems

28th September: 8:31 PM, call from Austel representative (03 4288866) received STD pips then "nothing" on two calls.

CABS data for the A party shows:

03 4288866 A 4 PRBL 9 OCT 92 LIVE P 3
MISS A E DAVIS CONN DATE 3 NOV 89 ACCOUNT NR: 03 4288866 011
14 BLOOMBURG ST LAST BILL 10 SEP 92 PER 1
ABBOTSFORD 3067 REG STMTS
ITEMISED & MULTI-METERED CALLS

STD 28 SEP 92 8.29P	Cape Brdgwtr 055267267	0:10 N	0.25
STD 28 SEP 92 8.30P	Cape Brdgwtr 055267267	0:10 N	0.25
STD 28 SEP 92 8.31P	Cape Brdgwtr 055267267	2:11 N	0.50

CCAS data for the B party shows:

Day	Date	Time	Type	No.	Wait Time	Conv. Time	Rate
MON	28/09/92	20:28:43	IA		5	25	0
MON	28/09/92	20:29:30	IA		2	2	0
MON	28/09/92	20:29:59	IA		2	2	0
MON	28/09/92	20:30:20	IA		2	46	0
MON	28/09/92	20:31:29	IA		1	133	0
MON	28/09/92	20:33:57	ONU	013	192	0	L 0

1150

RO1444

92/0596(8)

2 February 1994

Mr S Black
Group General Manager - Customer Affairs
TELECOM

Facsimile No: (03) 632 3241

Dear Mr Black

**REQUEST FOR FILE DOCUMENTATION CONCERNING CAPE BRIDGEWATER
HOLIDAY CAMP**

AUSTEL's Direction of 12 August 1993 concerning the "COT" Cases requested that the following documentation be produced to AUSTEL:

(g) all files, correspondence, memoranda, minutes or notes in Telecom's possession relating to any of the eight persons referred to in Attachment A


A range of documentation concerning the service provided to Mr Alan Smith of Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp does not appear to have been provided to AUSTEL. Could the following three Telecom files be provided:

0607921	(see Attachment A)
HA - AC 4/1/18	(see Attachment B)
XS13/2	(see Attachment C)

I have also included a copy of a letter to Mr Smith from the Warrnambool Customer Operations Group. (Attachment D). Could you please produce to AUSTEL the file from the Warrnambool Customer Operations Group from which this document originated, and any other files from this area which pertain Mr Smith's service problems.

Can these files please be made available by 9 February 1994 under the same viewing arrangements as the other "COT" documentation, and Bruce Matthews (Ph. 828 7443) notified when they are available.

Yours sincerely



John MacMahon
General Manager
Consumer Affairs

1151



Telecom Australia

Minute

File 0607921 **Subject** Problems with Cape Bridgewater Customer
055 267267

Phone (053) 334411 **From** MIKE ROBINS

95 / 0603 - 01

To
Graeme Davies

75

Graeme,

It is my understanding of the sequence of events:-

- Aug 91 - Cutover from RAX to RCM when? - approx 7/8 mths. 50% maxime
- Customer Complaints re N.R.R.
- 16/3/92 - Customer Complaints can't be called
- 17/3/92 - Problem found at MEL U which would have caused any customer parenting or trunking through MEL U (where digital trunking was used) to have a call failure Customer 053 267267 would not have been able to be rung.

The trunking arrangements for Vic and Interstate is such that MEL U is only one of these major trunk exchanges, other's are Bendigo, MEL Q, Ballarat, Morwell or Moolap (Geelong). If the call was switched via any of these other exchanges, it would have been successful.

The problem does not appear, as first thought, to be a data production error, rather a fault condition quite specific in nature, causing a problem to this code only.

.../2

1151

SERVICE DIFFICULTIES

- Fault History - registered re 1709's
- Check with Peter post 12/16
- Cutover to Rcon when? - Likely length of MELU problem

Chris Doodly

- Likely via MELU path
- Destination that go via MELU every one in vic.

Mark Ross 370211

- Compensation why? reimbursement
- odd hours? how much? legal support services.
- the same receipts for about 6/1000
- more only used the ones from
- the time of Ross's service.
- the aspect. Mark regarding

Mark Ross spoke with Bruce Nelson
 re: legal support services.

APPENDIX 51

HAMILTON HIGH SCHOOL

2024

ONE 72 1466
72 1622
X 72 5811
a Code 055



85 Stephen Street
Hamilton 3300

To whom it may concern,

I wish to acknowledge in writing the repeated difficulty I have had contacting Alan Smith at the Cape Bridgewater Convention Centre by Telephone. In the week March 1st - 5th, I made 5 or 6 attempted phone calls to Alan but I was unable to get through, indeed the line was 'dead'. This was extremely frustrating and had I not been aware of Alan's phone problems I would have used another camp site. This must be affecting Alan's business as many teachers are planning camping programs at this time of the year.

Yours Sincerely,

Terry Speed.

Yr 7 Co-ordinator.

Hamilton High School.

1152

CUSTOMER COMPLAINT FORM

0282

Name : CAPEBRIDGEWATER RESORT
 Phone : (055) 267267
 Date Init : 02/02/93
 Controlled By: BRT
 Source : General Manager
 Category : SD
 File Location: Customer Complaints
 Status : O (O = Open, C = Closed)
 Cost : \$ 0.00
 Date Closed : / /

NOT FILE
SEP 15

Notes:

CONTACT: ALLAN SMITH

Allan Smith called this morning to report he had been c/o during conversation on a call to 0175. He is also worried that there has been no response to an advertising campaign he is running in the Ballarat Courier in the past three weeks although there was a good response in the first week. He asked me if there may be a Network problem that may be effecting traffic between Ballarat and Cape Bridgewater. I am unaware of any problems, but told Mr. Smith I would look into it for him. I contacted Gordon Hansen at Network Ops [Country] and gave him a list of areas Mr. Smith has been expecting calls from. He shall investigate and get back to me.

B.P 2/2/93

Allan Smith called me this afternoon, he has been trying to call 3 numbers in Ballarat and been experiencing No Progress. He is very disturbed that people in the Ballarat area may be experiencing the same problem trying to call him. I contacted [redacted] and gave him the 3 Ballarat Numbers provided to me by Mr. Smith. He shall carry out some testing and get back to me.

B.P 2/2/93

[redacted] called back the three numbers provided by Mr. Smith on the initial lines off the same PABX. About 50% of the calls he attempted failed. It appears that the problem is between the Exchange and the PABX. Telecom Staff at Ballarat are working on the problem. Gordon Stokes shall contact me when the problem is resolved. I have informed Allan Smith of the progress so far.

B.P 2/2/93

[redacted] [Austel] called this morning Allan Smith has been in contact with her. She said he is very upset with the service he is receiving and he is unsure that Telecom are taking his problems seriously. I informed her that we take all reports and requests from our customers very seriously and told what steps had been taken in the way of a safeguard to Mr. Smith's complaints and that I would keep her informed of the progress.

B.P 3/2/93

[redacted] called Gordon Stokes for a progress report on Allan Smith's problems calling the PABX in Ballarat. The Ballarat Customer Operations Group currently have a shortage of staff with PABX expertise and have not yet attended the the PABX.

B.P 4/2/93

[redacted] spoke to Allan Smith after he called [redacted] wanting to contact Roseanne Pittard. He received one burst of ring at 1.15 pm and 5.05 yesterday, when he picked up the receiver he heard dial tone. His problem occurs intermittently through-out the Network and

1153

1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975

1976
1977
1978
1979
1980

Bridgewater from public telephones at Terang and Colac a further call was tried from Geelong via a mobile phone but the call dropped out whilst ringing due to a flat battery. This I explained to Allen when I recontacted him on arrival in Melbourne.

12/02/93

tried to ring from RCM before going to measure line current, but got no answer. On arrival at the premises he was met by Mr Smith who stated he was having problems with his Telecom cordless phone. found the switch on the phone was not operated correctly, preventing the phone from ringing. Mr Smith also had his LSA turned off and therefore would not have heard any incoming calls whilst he was out of the office. measured the line current at 42 ma for the fax, answer machine and phone. Mr Smith also mentioned he was very pleased as he had 38 calls since my visit and not one complaint of not getting through. visited on 18/02/93.

19/02/93

Had a call from to say a Ballarat customer of A Smith had put a fault in via 1100 indicating she could not get through. suggested he may be able to move Mr Smith out of this system into another. I attempted to ring Mr Smith when the ring tripped I received a noise similar to "carrier noise" and a very faint "hello" after waiting a while the person at the other end hung up. I then

rang the Portland depot to have a message passed to . After approx a half hour I rang 267267 again and this time got through ok. Allan assured me he had only his normal phone and cordless phone plugged in. He stated several people had rung and reported the same problem from and

rang back and I organised him to change both Mr Smiths lines into separate systems . 267267 in sys 3 ch 16 267230 in sys 2 chan 28. and Myself then made several test calls to 267267 all of which worked ok. 267230 does not have a Fax connected at the moment as it has been returned to the point of purchase as it has gone faulty.

24/02/93

Rang Mr Smith this morning still having breaking up of transmission problems. OIC rang and was asked to ring to request assistance in monitoring the rcm bearers .

25/02/93

I made several calls to A Smith over the weekend whilst on a personal visit to Ballarat via a mobile phone and pay phones all calls were successful. Also received advice from pair gains area they would visit Cape Bridgewater today or tomorrow.

2/3/93

from pair gains support rang to advise me he had found several problems with the RCM system Mr Smith was previously connected to. The major problem was caused by faulty termination of resistors on the bearer block protection another problem was caused by non modified channel cards, a full report will be submitted by Len in the next week. I have notified of the results of the investigation and will follow up her suggestion of now having asycall connected to Mr Smith's line. This follows comment that Mr Smith made many outgoing calls thus preventing people calling him. I will notify Mr Smith of the results and talk to him regarding Easycall.

5/3/93

rang Capebridgewater but Mr Smith was out, his assistant stated she had received several calls where on lift off all she heard was dial tone, this is after we shifted 267267 and 267230 into sys3 in the RCM. I believe this may be tried up with the axe network problem which gives only 1 burst of ring and the calling party gets busy tone.

9/3/93

Smith returned my call from yesterday, I explained the results of our investigation and the axe problem. He once again mentioned the

1153


DATA SPECTRUM

HF

printed: 30 Jan 1994 15:01:29

K01398

ATTENUATION referred to 1700.0 Hz



1154

**AUSTEL**

AUSTRALIAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY

9 June 1993

Mr Dennis Hambleton
Director, Regulatory
Telstra

Facsimile No: (03) 634 8880

Dear Mr Hambleton

You are probably aware of the case of Mr Alan Smith, one of the "COT cases" and proprietor of the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp. Mr Smith last year agreed to settle his claims against Telecom on the basis that a service of normal network standards would be guaranteed.

Since that time Mr Smith claims to have been constantly plagued by faults ranging from no ring, short ring, ringing out, engaged, recorded message and now claims to be subject to charging anomalies. He has had very frequent contact with AUSTEL on these matters.

In addition, he alleges that he was misinformed at the time of settlement (and subsequently) and led to believe that the problems he was experiencing were unique in the area. He now claims to have copies of Telecom network investigation working documents which clearly indicate that these problems in the network were far more widespread in the area. He claims that he was also advised that the problem whereby callers had been confronted with a recorded voice had occurred only over a period of two days - later said to be no more than three weeks. He now claims that Telecom records show this to be six weeks and possibly much longer.

Further he claims that the Telecom documents contain network investigation findings which are distinctly different from the advice which Telecom has given to the customers concerned.

In summary, these allegations, if true, would suggest that in the context of the settlement Mr Smith was provided with a misleading description of the situation as the basis for making his decision. They would also suggest that the other complainants identified in the folders have knowingly been provided with inaccurate information.

I ask for your urgent comment on these allegations. You are asked to immediately provide AUSTEL with a copy of all the documentation which was apparently inadvertently left at Mr Smith's premises for its inspection. This, together with your comment, will enable me to arrive at an appropriate recommendation for AUSTEL's consideration of any action it should take.

1155


09 JUN '93 17:19 AUSTRAL MELB 61 3 8203021

P.3 3

As to Mr Smith's claimed continuing service difficulties, please provide a statement as to whether Telecom believes that Mr Smith has been provided with a telephone service of normal network standard since the settlement. If not, you are asked to detail the problems which Telecom knows to exist, indicate how far beyond network standards they are and identify the cause/causes of these problems.

In light of Mr Smith's claims of continuing service difficulties, I will be seeking to determine with you a mechanism which will allow an objective measurement of any such difficulties to be made.

Yours sincerely



John MacMahon
General Manager
Consumer Affairs

024 P01

CAPE-BRIDGEMATER

93-06-09 17:04 055 267230

1155

Draft for Discussion

**IN-SERVICE TEST PERFORMANCE
FOR THE TELECOM AUSTRALIA
PUBLIC SWITCHED TELEPHONE SERVICE
(PSTS)**

TELECOM CONFIDENTIAL

The performances tabulated below have been formulated to aid in dispute investigation and resolution. The information contained herein is for internal Telstra Corporation use only and must not be released to any third party, particularly AUSTEL.

Parameter	Conditions	Acceptable
CALL SET-UP TESTS		
1. Access Loop	Normal operational power conditions: <i>Seize Test</i> - 300 ohm resistance termination <i>Hold Test</i> - 500 ohm resistance termination <i>Loop Current</i> - 500 ohm resistance termination.	Obtain Dial Tone Retain Dial Tone ≥ 20 mA
2. Delay to Dial Tone	For the exchange operating within its designed traffic capacity: <i>95 out of 100 of call attempts</i> <i>99 out of 100 of call attempts</i>	≤ 2 s ≤ 10 s
3. Digit Recognition	DTMF: <i>Level per frequency</i> , offset by $\pm(1,5\% + 2\text{Hz})$ <i>Twist</i> Decadic: <i>Make</i> <i>Break</i>	-5 & -16 dBm 0 & -4 dB wrt to f_h 28 & 42 ms 58 & 72 ms

DNF

DNF

CALL QUALITY TESTS

8. Call continuity/ Dropouts	For 500 established calls (including both originating and terminating) each of 120s duration	≤ 2 calls drop out
9. Transmission Loss - <u>Bcs 3</u>	The 820 Hz insertion loss for end to end connection, when measured between 600 ohm resistive measuring terminations: <i>IEN from MDF to MDF for 95% of established connections</i> <i>Access Loop MDF to NTP</i>	≤ 12 dB $\leq 6,5$ dB
10. Impulsive Noise	15 minutes at threshold of -28 dBm for an established call	18 counts/15 min at a -28 dBm threshold
11. Continuous Random Noise <u>Bcs 4</u>	For an established call	≤ -47 dBmp
12. Insulation Quality	Measured with the physical access line isolated from the line circuit or any feedbridge: <i>Insulation Resistance,</i> wire to wire each wire to ground <i>Foreign Battery,</i> each wire to ground All of the above values are provisional and currently under review!	> 50 kohm > 50 kohm < 40 V
CALL CLEAR-DOWN TESTS		
13. Clear-down Time for established calls	For 95 out of 100 calls: <i>Originating calls (A-party clear)</i> <i>Terminating calls (B-party held by A-party)</i>	$250 \text{ ms} \leq t \leq 1 \text{ s}$ $85 \text{ s} \leq t \leq 180 \text{ s}$

~~test~~
DNF

<p>4. Set-up Accuracy: Probability of Connection to the correct number</p> <p><u>BCS 1</u></p>	<p>Calling pattern must be typical of the user concerned. <i>Local Calls</i> <i>Standard Business period Trunk Calls,</i> but not Discount tariff period Trunk Calls</p>	<p>For each class of call, 980 calls out of 1000 call attempts will be set-up to the correct destination</p>	<p>DNF</p>
<p>5. Service Tones: Accuracy</p> <p>Tone Characteristics (Dial, Busy, Congestion, and Ring tones)</p> <p>Ring Tone Disconnect</p>	<p>Applicable tone/RVA relevant to B-party line state</p> <p>For all Tones generated by PSTN exchanges, <i>Level into 600 ohm</i> <i>Cadence</i> <i>Frequency</i></p> <p>Time till cut-out for PSTN destinations</p>	<p>980 out of 1000 call attempts receive correct indication</p> <p>> -30 dBm +/-20% +/-20%</p> <p>> 85 s</p>	
<p>CALL DELIVERY TESTS</p>			
<p>6. Incoming Ring Signal</p> <p>Voltage</p> <p>Cadence Frequency</p> <p>Time till cut-out</p>	<p>Normal operational power conditions and at maximum traffic load. <i>across 3 REN load</i> This Voltage is provisional and subject to further investigation!</p> <p>For the standard cadence (DR0)</p> <p>From PSTN origins only</p>	<p>45 Vrms</p> <p>+/-20% In the range 14,0 to 27,5Hz > 85 s</p>	<p>DNF</p> <p>X</p>
<p>7. Incoming-call Accuracy: Probability of connect to the correct number</p> <p><u>BCS 2</u></p>	<p>Terminating traffic pattern must be typical of the customer concerned. <i>Local Exchange Calls</i> <i>Local Network Calls</i> <i>Standard Business period Trunk Calls</i> but not Discount tariff period Trunk Calls</p>	<p>For each class of call, 980 calls out of 1000 call attempts will be terminated correctly</p>	<p>DNF</p>

This facsimile from 60 minutes dated 18 June 1993 is self explanatory.

60
minutes

60 MINUTES FACSIMILE

To: ...MR. ALAN SMITH.....
.....(055) 267 230.....
From: ...JULIAN CRESS.....
Date:JUNE 18TH 1993..... No of pages ..1.....

DEAR ALAN,


JUST A NOTE TO LET YOU KNOW THAT I HAD SOME TROUBLE
GETTING THROUGH TO YOU ON THE PHONE LAST THURSDAY.
PRETTY IRONIC CONSIDERING THAT I WAS TRYING TO CONTACT
YOU TO DISCUSS YOUR PHONE PROBLEMS

THE PROBLEM OCCURRED AT ABOUT 11AM. ON THE "008" NUMBER
I HEARD A RECORDED MESSAGE ADVISING ME THAT "008" WAS
NOT AVAILABLE FROM MY PHONE AND ON YOUR DIRECT LINE IT
WAS CONSTANTLY ENGAGED.

AFTER ABOUT HALF AN HOUR I CONTACTED SERVICE DIFFICULTIES
IN SYDNEY. THEY CALLED THE LOCAL OPERATOR IN YOUR AREA
WHO REPORTED BACK THAT YOU WEREN'T ON THE PHONE BUT THAT
THE LINES IN YOUR AREA WERE CONGESTED AT THE TIME.

I'M AWARE THAT YOU HAVE BEEN HAVING PROBLEMS LIKE THIS FOR
SOME YEARS NOW AND WISH YOU THE BEST IN SORTING THEM OUT.

YOURS SINCERELY,



Time Networks Australia Limited (A.C.B. 049 071 167)
24 Arnamon Road Wilsborough 2244
PH: (02) 438 3433 FAX: (02) 936 0527

1157

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS' *news*

P.O. Box 193, North Balwyn, Victoria, 3104

Phone (03) 859 2059 Fax (03) 819 7095

11 June, 1992

Alan Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp & Convention Centre
RMB 4408
Cape Bridgewater Vic 3306

Dear Alan,

As you are aware, Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp and Convention Centre advertised in our February/March and April/May issues

Both advertisements were a third page in size at a rate of \$534.00 each.

The earlier paper included a full page of editorial and photographs, and the advertisement in the more recent edition was part of a special feature on school camp destinations.

Other 'school camp' advertisers that I have spoken to have reported a high enquiry rate together with firm bookings and it is my opinion that Cape Bridgewater should have received at least an equal response to the advertisements and editorial.

The lack of response reported by Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp is most obviously explained by the difficulties you have described with your telephone system.

Kindest regards,



Anne Edmonds.
EDITOR.

1157

A second letter from Wally Rothwell, written on 29 March 1996, further compounds the mystery of the missing White Pages listings. Not only would we "be flogging a dead horse trying to extract more", but who signed the directory listing form?

29 March, 1996

Our Ref: D/95/36

Mr Alan Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
Blowholes Road
RMB 4408
CAPE BRIDGEWATER VIC 3306



Telecommunications
Industry
Ombudsman

John Pincock
Ombudsman

Dear Alan


We spoke on the phone on 20 March about the closing of your case with the TIO and you asked me to continue to seek from Telstra its final word on your White Pages, which I undertook to do, even though we had closed your case here.

I subsequently spoke to the Ombudsman about your request, before I got down to writing, and it was his view that we had received all that we were going to get from Telstra on the White Pages issue and we would be flogging a dead horse trying to extract more.

Clearly, Telstra is unable to give any reason why your service was not included in the other eighteen directories, in 1993, because it lacks any records. Telstra has also said all it is going to say about the matter of your business name. And it would appear that pursuit of the issue of the signature on the directory listing form, while it may be of interest in your book, is a tenuous one for us.

For this reason, we are unable to pursue the matter further and so I must walk back on my undertaking to you, with apology for misleading you.

Yours sincerely


WALLY ROTHWELL
DEPUTY OMBUDSMAN

"... providing independent, just, informal, speedy resolution of complaints."

TIO LTD ACN 057 634 787
National Headquarters
315 Exhibition Street

Box 18098
Collins Street East
Melbourne 3000

Telephone (03) 9277 8777
Facsimile (03) 9277 8797

1158

Thursday, 6 May 1993

2008

Alan Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
RMB 4408
Cape Bridgewater 3306



CAMPING ASSOCIATION
OF VICTORIA INC.

332 BANTULI ROAD
VIEW BANK VICTORIA 3034
TELEPHONE (03) 457 5434
FACSIMILE (03) 457 5438

Dear Alan,

I am writing to confirm our involvement in the continuing problem you have establishing the impact of a deficient telephone system on your business.

Since the issue was uncovered and reported to us by you some two or two and a half years ago, we have had occasion to explain to many people that they should persist telephoning or even write to you to make contact. It has been clear that several have wanted to make contact but been unable; they have rung us to find out why.

Ten thousand copies of the Resource Guide (in which you had your last advertisement) were direct mailed to schools and given away. Virtually all other major advertisers, with advertisements such as yours, experienced an increase in enquires and bookings. It is clear to me that the malfunction of the phone system effectively deprived you of such gains in business.

We have had, even this year, people still asking why they cannot get an answer from your phone number. We have tried to explain to them that you want their business but are hampered by an inadequate phone system. However I'm not sure that they do persist. The phone for most campsites is the first line of business and enquiry; any promotion is wasted if people cannot reach you to pursue their interest in hiring your site.

I wish you well in your efforts to convince the authorities that your business has suffered to the extent I believe it has.

Yours sincerely,

Don MacDowall
Executive Officer

1159

12th April

10, Colorado Get
Hermitree Gully
Vic 3156

Dear Alan,

how are you all down, at the camp. We wonder if any thing was wrong, as on ~~several~~ several times in the past month we have tried to ring you with not much success, the phone is either engaged or out of order, & when we try the 008 No we are told by the operator that the No is not connected, or you do not have a 008 No.

How do you run a Business if the phones do not work right. It is not as if you are in the middle of a desert or the great ocean, but even out there you would get better service, HA-HA-HA

Melbourne, August. 12 - 1993

Dear Mr Smith.

I tried to ring you in order to confirm our stay at your camp site. However when I did this I found it impossible to get through since it was engaged for several hours.

I tried to ring again later but encountered the same signals, on the 10th of August around 7 P.M. to 8.30 P.M. -

I believe you have a problem with the exchange and strongly advise you contact Telecom

Do you remember the same problem happens on April and May?

I apologise but I have made arrangements with another camp.

Yours sincerely

Jilã Espinoza..

Telecom

Cape Bridge Water
Holiday Camp

Dear Sirs,

This letter is to say that the phone in the main hall is in need of replacement repair.

I've rung a Melbourne No 03 798-3542. I placed \$1.70 in the phone. On answering the phone dropped to \$1.40 without warning or a further drop in price the phone went dead. I went to get more change as the call was of a serious nature.

The phone refuse to take any of the money. I then wondered if the LED for the money was faulty and attempted to ring through. I then tried ringing through using the follow on button etc.

Fortunately enough eventually the money did fall out of the slot and I was able to ring through to Melb.

The call was made on the Mon or Tues. I have lost track of time during my stay. It is now Sat.

FEB 1993

Yours Truly,

Steve A Bartlett

1161

053-48-3079

Daylesford

Office Use

Itemised Call Details *continued*

008 - National Direct Dialed calls *continued*

	Date	Time	Origin	Destination	Rate	Min:Sec	\$
	Termination point 055267267			<i>continued</i>			
9-2	18 Aug	03:05 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:07	0.05
9-3	18 Aug	03:06 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
9-4	18 Aug	03:06 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
9-5	18 Aug	03:07 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:04	0.03
9-6	18 Aug	03:07 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:04	0.03
9-7	18 Aug	03:10 pm	02267	055267267	Day	0:12	0.08
9-8	18 Aug	03:12 pm		055267267	Day	0:12	0.06
9-9	18 Aug	03:18 pm	?	055267267	Day	0:07	0.04
9-10	18 Aug	03:18 pm	?	055267267	Day	0:04	0.03
9-11	18 Aug	03:18 pm	.	055267267	Day	0:08	0.03
9-12	18 Aug	03:18 pm		055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
10-1	18 Aug	06:14 pm	03680	055267267	Day	0:16	0.08
10-2	18 Aug	08:32 pm	03668	055267267	Night	0:30	0.10
10-3	19 Aug	08:06 am	03668	055267267	Day	3:43	1.14
10-4	19 Aug	10:10 am	01850	055267267	Day	1:28	0.23
10-5	19 Aug	11:13 am	03680	055267267	Day	0:32	0.11
10-6	19 Aug	12:34 pm	03668	055267267	Day	0:17	0.09
10-7	22 Aug	02:01 pm	05	055267267	Economy	0:14	0.03
10-8	22 Aug	02:06 pm	03650	055267267	Economy	0:09	0.02
10-9	22 Aug	04:06 pm	08280	055267267	Economy	0:40	0.11
10-10	22 Aug	04:48 pm	05336	055267267	Economy	0:09	0.02
10-11	22 Aug	05:09 pm	08280	055267267	Economy	0:30	0.08
10-12	22 Aug	06:25 pm	08280	055267267	Economy	0:46	0.12
11-1	22 Aug	07:16 pm	05336	055267267	Economy	0:12	0.03
11-2	22 Aug	07:40 pm	05	055267267	Economy	0:40	0.09
11-3	22 Aug	07:55 pm	05336	055267267	Economy	0:11	0.02
11-4	22 Aug	08:24 pm	05336	055267267	Economy	0:06	0.01
11-5	22 Aug	08:40 pm	05336	055267267	Economy	0:08	0.02
11-6	22 Aug	09:08 pm	05336	055267267	Economy	0:07	0.01
11-7	23 Aug	12:04 pm	05339	055267267	Day	0:10	0.05
11-8	23 Aug	12:25 pm	05339	055267267	Day	0:05	0.02
11-9	23 Aug	01:12 pm	05	055267267	Day	0:16	0.08
11-10	23 Aug	01:13 pm	08280	055267267	Day	0:31	0.21
11-11	23 Aug	02:33 pm	06330	055267267	Day	0:09	0.04
11-12	23 Aug	03:40 pm	05339	055267267	Day	0:06	0.03
12-1	23 Aug	04:34 pm	05339	055267267	Day	0:06	0.03
12-2	23 Aug	05:12 pm	05339	055267267	Day	0:07	0.03
12-3	23 Aug	06:00 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:08	0.03
12-4	23 Aug	06:38 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:08	0.03
12-5	23 Aug	06:51 pm	05	055267267	Night	0:26	0.09
12-6	23 Aug	06:53 pm	03489	055267267	Night	0:31	0.11
12-7	23 Aug	07:00 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:09	0.03
12-8	23 Aug	07:22 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:07	0.02
12-9	23 Aug	08:28 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:07	0.03
12-10	23 Aug	09:00 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:07	0.02
12-11	23 Aug	09:26 pm	05339	055267267	Night	0:04	0.01

Continued page 5

1162

Itemised Call Details *continued*

008 - National Direct Dialed calls *continued*

Date	Time	Origin	Destination	Rate	Min:Sec	\$
Termination point 055267267 <i>continued</i>						
18 Aug	02:26 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:17	0.09
18 Aug	02:27 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:10	0.05
18 Aug	02:27 pm	03663	065267267	Day	0:06	0.03
18 Aug	02:28 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:07	0.04
18 Aug	02:28 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:05	0.02
18 Aug	02:28 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:29 pm	03663	055267287	Day	0:03	0.01
18 Aug	02:29 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:02	0.01
18 Aug	02:29 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:30 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:30 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:09	0.05
18 Aug	02:31 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:31 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:05	0.02
18 Aug	02:31 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:05	0.02
18 Aug	02:32 pm	03663	055267267	Day	0:08	0.04
18 Aug	02:34 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:26	0.13
18 Aug	02:34 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:06	0.03
18 Aug	02:35 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:36 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:38 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:05	0.02
18 Aug	02:38 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:05	0.02
18 Aug	02:38 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:07	0.04
18 Aug	02:38 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:08	0.04
18 Aug	02:40 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:23	0.12
18 Aug	02:41 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
18 Aug	02:41 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:06	0.03
18 Aug	02:42 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:07	0.03
18 Aug	02:42 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:10	0.05
18 Aug	02:43 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:06	0.03
18 Aug	02:43 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:44 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:44 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:06	0.03
18 Aug	02:45 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:03	0.02
18 Aug	02:45 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:04	0.02
18 Aug	02:45 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
18 Aug	02:46 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
18 Aug	02:50 pm	05221	055267267	Day	0:10	0.05
18 Aug	02:53 pm	02231	055267267	Day	1:13	0.50
18 Aug	03:02 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:07	0.03
18 Aug	03:03 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:08	0.03
18 Aug	03:03 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:07	0.04
18 Aug	03:03 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:06	0.04
18 Aug	03:04 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
18 Aug	03:04 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
18 Aug	03:04 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:05	0.03
18 Aug	03:05 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:03	0.02
18 Aug	03:05 pm	02231	055267267	Day	0:04	0.03

Continued Overleaf

K03433

2 of 2

0.1180-N 1

BT3A - 27
 25.
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31.

STD PIPS.
NO.

CAN SWISSER KUL
✓

NO.

✓

NO.

✓

NO.

✓

NO.

✓

57

58

59

60

61

62

NO

✓

63.

NO

✓

C 40332

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50

ONE

dests calls

unsuccessful.

did not hear 310 p4
on any calls is
dest no.

The TETOI command
would not work cause
on the outbox 2

I gave up tests.

I notified asr

1/162

Date:

Wednesday, 21 April 1993 1:40PM

GREG,

I ACCEPT YOUR ARGUMENT. I GUESS I REACT FROM FRUSTRATION.

DON

From: Newbold, Greg
To: Pinel, Don
Cc: Wood, Don; Campbell, Ian; Pittard, Rosanne
Subject: RE: COT cases latest
Date: Wednesday, 21 April 1993 1:39PM

Don, thank you for your swift and eloquent reply. I disagree with raising the issue of the courts. That carries an implied threat not only to COT cases but to all customers that they'll end up as lawyer fodder. Certainly that can be a message to give face to face with customers and to hold in reserve if the complainants remain vexacious.

Other than that, I've got no probs with your suggestion except that to say we're happy to co-operate for a speedy resolution is not borne out by the COT case history and will be deriding mercilessly by the media. The briefer we are, the more likely we are to get a run on our own terms. However, the wording is clearly something for you guys to agree to with Ian Campbell. My main concern is about the overall strategy ie: not actively pushing the matter in the media.

Hindsight tells me that with Graeme Schorer we should have negotiated an agreed media statement with him as part of the settlement. It may be something to consider for future settlements. That way, we can go positively into the media with a resolution agreed to by all parties. This will make it very hard for COT case members to revisit the matter once a settlement has been reached and publicised.

Regards,

Greg.

C04094

From: Pinel, Don
To: Beattie, Ken; Wood, Don; Pittard, Rosanne; Newbold, Greg
Cc: Campbell, Ian; Anderson, Keith; Benjamin, Ted
Subject: RE: COT cases latest
Date: Wed, Apr 21, 1993 1:13PM
Priority: High

GREG,

THANKS FOR THE NOTES. I FEEL THE MEDIA RESPONSE IS A BIT TOO ABRUPT AND DEFENSIVE. CANT WE INCLUDE THAT:

THIS IS A DISPUTE BETWEEN BUSINESSES AND THE APPROPRIATE PLACE TO HAVE IT RESOLVED IS IN THE COURTS. WE ARE HAPPY TO COOPERATE TO ENSURE A SPEEDY RESOLUTION. IN ADDITION TELECOM HAS OFFERED AN ALTERNATIVE PROCESS TO RESOLVE USING AN INDEPENDANT ASSESSOR (AS SUGGESTED BY AUSTEL) BUT THIS PROCESS HAS NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE OTHER PARTIES.

THERE MAY BE OTHER POSITIVE MESSAGES THAT WE CAN INCLUDE.

DON

1163

F.O.I. document AO3254 shows an internal TELSTRA letter from Don Pinel to Jim Holmes written on 28 September 1993. It indicates that a few weeks before TELSTRA agreed to a fast track settlement proposal they believed that "our best option is still to force these cases down a legal, structured path."

Holmes, Jim

From: ✓ Pinel, Don
To: Holmes, Jim
Cc: Parker, Harvey
Subject: Letter to Schorer
Date: Tuesday, 28 September, 1993 7:39PM

Jim,

Your proposed reply to Schorer is good although I assume it is more legalistic than Ian would like. I do not know of anyway to soften it without raising expectations.

One point not covered that you may like to consider is the question of "duress". This has been raised in a number of places and requires rebuttal.

Similarly the question of Telecom's regulatory and contractual protections from suit dont get a mention (it may not be necessary to raise these at this stage as they are certain to be provocative provided we dont allow expectations to from that we will relinquish such protection)

I also think that your section 2 sends conflicting messages. In one para you correctly identify the constraints on discussing a particular case with other than the specific customer . You do imply, however, that teh customers could give schorer some form of authority to act on their behalf. I am not sure that these two messages are consistent. Would a power of attorney, for example, allow disclosure to Schorer of settlement details covered by our form of release? I dont think so.

Perhaps I am getting too legalistic and defensive but we cant afford to let anything get away. However, our best option is still to force these cases down a legal, structured path.

Don

Page 1

A03254

1164

Extracts from F.O.I. documents A00999, A01000 and A01004 state: "The whole process would be expeditiously handled, and would take ten-fifteen working days", there would be "a few days to report on each case and seek agreement", and that "Speed is of the essence"



CAPE BRIDGEWATER Holiday Camp

RMB 4408
Cape Bridgewater
Toll Free 008 816 522

Host - Alan Smith
Ph. 055 267 267
Fx. 055 267 230

*Country
Get - Always
Historical Portland
Victoria's first permanent settlement*

11th April, 1994.

Ms. Denise MacBurnie,
Freehill, Hollingdale & Page,
Barristers & Solicitors,
101 Collins Street,
Melbourne, 3000.

Dear Ms. MacBurnie,

Accompanying this letter are three documents (copies of Telecom Minutes) which I received under the F.I.O. agreement. I have been told by Telecom management that other similar documents have been lost. From the documents which I have managed to squeeze out of Telecom, however, it would appear that your client displays different Corporate faces to suit differing circumstances.

These documents, though only a small sample, would indicate that your client, Telecom, has misled us both — particularly so when read in conjunction with your letter of 28th January, 1994, to the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp. Other internal documents of Telecom, which I have in my possession, show a similar trend of deception and misleading conduct.

It is hard to reconcile the advertisements, seen all over Australia, of this Corporate Giant, Telecom, the largest company in Australia, with the actions of its management team, which has tried to force me into legal court battles on several occasions. Let me make it clear that I am not questioning the integrity of Freehill, Hollingdale & Page. You were only acting on the information which you received. However, in this case, I feel that information was a blatant conspiracy to mislead and deceive a Telecom customer, namely the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp.

I am writing to you, Ms. MacBurnie, in an endeavour to set the record straight. There have been many occasions over the past months when I have been instructed by Mr. Campbell, General Manager Commercial Telecom, to deal through Freehill, Hollingdale & Page. My reluctance to do so was due to the impression that you felt I was overly imaginative in the concerns I expressed regarding Telecom management. The enclosed documents, along with others, do, I feel, clearly vindicate those concerns.

You may well be taken aback by these findings. I was as were others who have been treated in a similar manner. It is now for the assessor and the public in general to pass judgement of the facts which have been presented.

It was never our aim to cause hurt to your client, but we were forced to take action to prevent Telecom from hurting us. In doing so, however, I fear we have


000555

1165

uncovered much which would have been better left buried. Unfortunately it was Telecom's choice which led us along this path. It is most regrettable that a few people within Telecom management felt it preferable to try and protect their own personal positions rather than face up to the truth in so far as it concerned their clients.

I thank you for your patience whilst dealing with me, as a person, and say again, we have both been hoodwinked by your client. We, C.O.T., have learned, through bitter experience, to live with this deception and I trust that your firm can do the same, without sustaining too much hurt.

Sincerely,



ALAN SMITH.

cc Senator Richard Alston
Shadow Minister for Communication.
Senator Ron Boewell
Leader in the Senate. National Party.

000556

Mr Alan Smith
28 January, 1994

COPY

Page 3

- unanswered calls include calls encountering engaged numbers (busy), various Telecom tones and Recorded Voice Announcements as well as calls that "ring out" or are terminated before or during ringing.

(5) Paragraph 5

As Telecom has previously advised to you, the incident referred to in this paragraph relates to the use of Malicious Call Trace (MCT) that was placed on your line as part of the testing of your service. MCT resulted in the line being "held busy" for 90 seconds after the actual call was terminated. Consequently, the first call was made, answered and terminated, and the following five calls, all made within the 90 second period received a busy tone. Subsequent to this incident, MCT was removed.

(6) Paragraph 6

- (i) As you have noted in your letter the Elmi Tape which was retained by you from a brief case inadvertently left at your premises by a Telecom employee was apparently returned by you to AUSTEL. Telecom has been unable to locate that tape and has instructed us that it received a different tape from AUSTEL than the one to which you refer in paragraph 6(i) of your letter.

Consequently, Telecom is unable to comment or provide any opinion of the tape to which you refer at this stage. Telecom is currently endeavouring to confirm with AUSTEL the location of the tape to which you refer. It is also Telecom's opinion that it is not appropriate for Telecom to comment on this piece of material at this time and it would be more appropriate for Telecom's comment to be conveyed during the Fast-Track arbitration procedure.

- (ii) Prior to receipt of the letters provided by you to Telecom, Telecom had had reason to investigate the matters referred to in those letters and had completed those investigations without a fault being found. Telecom did not consider it necessary to conduct such investigations again when they had already been completed. Mr Campbell's statement of "each of which have been investigated without fault" in his letter to Mr Hawker was therefore correct.

- (iii) As noted above in Telecom's response to the questions raised in your paragraph 2, Telecom has not found any evidence of network faults applicable to and which could affect your service during the period to which you refer.

Yours faithfully
FREEHILL HOLLINGDALE & PAGE
per:

Denise M Burnie

Denise McBurnie
Solicitor

FHPMELC4\94025008.1

1165

Mr Alan Smith
28 January, 1994

COPY

Page 2

K01161

(2) Paragraph 2

An examination of the fault history for telephone number 055 267 267 indicates that you made a total of nine reports to Telecom's Fault Report Services during the period 1 January 1993 until 9 August 1993. As a result of testing conducted into these reports the following results were obtained:

- In January 1993 two reports resulted in:
 - (i) on 6 January 1993, a handset was replaced at your premises.
 - (ii) on 13 January 1993, a printed circuit board at the Portland Telephone Exchange associated with your telephone equipment was replaced.
- On 18 February 1993 your report was referred to the Customer Operations Group in Ballarat. This report involved the repair of a fault that was found on another customer's PABX located in Ballarat.
- Testing associated with the remaining six reports occurred between 20 May 1993 until 9 August 1993 and resulted in the fault reports being cleared as "No Fault Found" or "No Fault Found, but additional network testing to be undertaken". This additional testing found no evidence of any network faults.

(3) Paragraph 3

Telecom has recently had in place equipment to monitor your service at the Portland Exchange. This equipment is involved in passive line potential monitoring and does not "register" fault conditions as such, but provides a report on the line status experienced, for example, incoming call, outgoing call, time of call. Interpretation of the output of this monitoring is required in conjunction with other information and testing to allow Telecom to determine the overall performance of a customer's service.

Other forms of service monitoring which can be used by Telecom are AXE Test System and Common Channel Signalling Monitoring. Again, these systems both produce data that requires analysis and cross referencing with other materials. It is therefore not possible to provide the information as requested in paragraph 3 of your letter. A detailed analysis of your service occurs as an ongoing process and any anomalies detected during that time are acted upon directly.

(4) Paragraph 4

As the information provided originally in your letter dated 12 November 1993 was of a limited nature, no specific response was possible to your allegations concerning over charging and short duration of calls. However, Telecom does have clearly defined policies and principles for call charging and billing. These principles are:

- customers will be charged only for calls which are answered.
- unanswered calls are not charged.

FREEHILL
HOLLINGDALE
& PAGE

COPY

28 January, 1994

F.01160

Mr Alan Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp

By facsimile
No. 055 267 230

Dear Mr Smith

Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
DLM:001660539

We refer to your letter dated 4 January 1994 to Denise McBurnie.

We also refer to your telephone conversation with Denise McBurnie on 25 January 1994 and confirm that Telecom wishes to establish Mr Steve Black and Mr Paul Rumble of Telecom, as your point of contact for requests for information from our client. Any further requests for information which you have for our client should therefore be directed to Mr Black or Mr Rumble.

In response to your request for information we provide below our client's responses to the questions raised in paragraphs 1-6 of your letter. In your letter you requested answers to the questions raised in paragraph 1-7. Your letter did not contain a paragraph 7 and we were unable to ascertain any further questions from your letter. Our client has instructed us to respond to the questions raised in paragraphs 1-6 of your letter as follows:

(1) Paragraph 1

Telecom has previously advised both yourself and AUSTEL that it did locate the names of two employees who made the calls referred to in this paragraph. These employees are involved in investigating reported faults and testing customer services by making a number of calls each day. Given the elapse of time between the making of the two test calls in question and the time you requested release of the caller's name, it would be difficult to determine any detailed information regarding the discussions which took place during those test calls. It is Telecom's position that it will not release the names of employees unless Telecom considers the release of such information to be reasonable and proper in all the circumstances.

BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
101 COLLINS STREET
MELBOURNE 3000 AUSTRALIA
GPO BOX 128A MELBOURNE 3001
TELEPHONE (03) 288 1234 FACSIMILE (03) 288 1567
TELEX AA33004 DX 240 MELBOURNE

SYDNEY MELBOURNE PERTH CANBERRA BRISBANE LONDON SINGAPORE

1165


On purchasing a hand set from Retravision a Telecom model 2000, hand held, this equipment and its faults was experienced by 2 Telecom Technical personell, Mr. Ray Morris from Melbourne and Mr. Gordon Stokes from Portland. This hand set would not switch off when completing telephone conversations. Both Telecom employees found this fault to be prevalent on many occasions while testing this equipment. The fault was that the off button would not activate sometimes on the first try. Sometimes it took the operator of this equipment as many as 5 or 6 times before the set switched off. This would have allowed the line to be free for other incoming calls. This equipment was ONE week old. I then re-purchased another. A new hand set on the advice of Ray Morris, Melbourne Commercial Division, Telecom. This same equipment did the same thing again, here at Cape Bridgewater. I then contacted Telecom Commercial Suppliers of this equipment and told them of the malfunction. I then took the equipment back to my supplier. I have not been game to buy a third (this equipment is supplied by Telecom and GUARANTEED by Austel!!)

On answering the second reference of my private equipment, my answering machine. While in Melbourne, which was not a common occurance, Telecom's Mr. Ray Morris rang a Margaret Reefman who was working and staying at my premises, looking after my camp. As she was living on the premises, she did not have the answering machine connected. While having a shower and attending to her normal daily toiletries, she activated the answering machine with the incoming call from Mr. Ray Morris, Telecom, believing this non-answered call was a fault. FACT.

In summary I would like Freehill Holingdale & Page to send me answers to the above questions, namely paragraphs 1 through 7.


This request will enable me to gain the information that is required to further my claim re the fast track proposal.

In closing however, I would like to ask again of Mr Campbell, does he really believe or expect me to believe that in paragraph 9 of his letter, that I have been kept fully informed of all matters and conditions of his service? I would appreciate his reply in writing.



- (i) I would also like Telecom to be pro-active in forwarding their opinion of the tape which clearly shows short incoming registered calls. This Elni tape has monitored calls from the 13th, 14th, 15th, 18th, 19th and 20th May 1993. Telecom has at the side of these incoming calls, their own tick marks as to the assumption that these calls were not received at the destination intended. We also have outgoing unanswered registered discrepancies. Would Telecom please supply me with their own interpretation of this tape and discrepancies (if any). I might add, I have had this tape independently viewed by a Technical Communication Consultant and would like to marry up Telecoms opinions with those of the Communications Consultant.
- (ii) Re letter addressed to David Hawker MP Federal Member for Wannan, signed Mr. Ian Campbell, Managing Director, Commercial Business, dated 23rd August 1993. Re paragraph 7. Mr. Campbell has written stating that several letters from the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp clients had supported my claims of an inadequate telecommunications service. I quote "Mr. Smith has provided several letters from his clients supporting his claims. Each of which have been investigated without a fault being found". I would like now for Mr. Campbell to forward me or perhaps to Mr. Hawker MP the number of persons Mr. Campbell checked by way of this paragraph.
- (iii) Re paragraph 8. Does Mr. Campbell still maintain that I have had no known communication faults as mentioned in this paragraph and I quote "no network fault has been found over the last few months".

With reference to paragraph 8, no network fault has been found over the last few months although 2 problems with Mr. Smith's private equipment have been identified including misoperation of his answering machine. I would like to add to Mr. Campbell's statement of 2 problems with Mr. Smith's private equipment.



3. Written confirmation by Telecom that the testing equipment that they had monitoring my lines (not the equipment I had on my premises) registering telecommunication faults. I would like clarification of the faults registered. Up to date, Telecom have not supplied this information.
4. I have not had to date any correspondence regarding the sample of bills to which I sent to your office re letter Denise MacBurnie dated the 12th November 1993. I still have not received any information regarding these questions ascertaining to the overcharges and short duration of calls. My own phone bills show similar discrepancies, so therefore this information I am seeking is part of my claim re settlement proposal.
5. Re letter sent to Denise MacBurnie 18th October 1993. I did not ask for only the originals and locations re paragraph 3. What I asked for is a clarification that the sort duration calls (test calls) were actually made to my premises. Those test calls came in, 6 in all, 5 registered engaged from Horsham exchange. I have already spoken to Mr. Peter Penny from the Horsham exchange on that evening. He has confirmed that each 5 calls came in as busy. The first call registered O.K. by which we had a conversation. I ask again of Telecom for confirmation of these 5 busy tone calls that did not reach this premises in letter form.
6. As you are aware Austel have in their possession documentation regarding the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp. They have information regarding my communication faults over a certain duration. This briefcase having been inadvertently left by the Melbourne Network Support Group (Telecom).





CAPE BRIDGEWATER Holiday Camp

Host - Alan Smith
Ph. 055 267 267
Fx. 055 267 230

RMB 4408
Cape Bridgewater
Toll Free 008 816 522

*Country
Get - Aways
Historical Portland
Victoria's first permanent settlement*

4th January 1994

Ms D. MacBurnie,
Freehill Hollingdale & Page,
101 Collins Street,
MELBOURNE 3000

Dear Ms. MacBurnie,

I am writing this letter to confer with you or your Associate, seemingly you are on holidays, regarding the many letters and conversations I have had with you in reference to the faults and requests of these faults re Telecom.

In point form again to ask for your help, Freehill Hollingdale & Page, again for the information which has not been supplied either by yourself or from Telecom to yourself.

1. Person or persons who supposedly contacted me on the 18th August 1993 at 9.16 a.m. having a conversation with me at Cape Bridgewater 055 267267 for 6 mins and 52 seconds, and again on the same day in the afternoon at 2.15 p.m. for 11 mins and 14 seconds. I have repeatedly asked for this request. The fact that I have not got this information is hindering my claim under the fast track proposal we have mutually accepted, both Telecom and COT (Casualties of Telecom).
2. Confirmation by Telecom that we have had faults on our line as late as August 1993. I ask or request for this confirmation.

1165

1944

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

FREEHILL
HOLLINGDALE
& PAGE

COPY

16 December 1993

K00737

Mr Alan Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
RMB 4408
CAPE BRIDGEWATER VIC

By facsimile

Dear Mr Smith

Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
Our Ref: RAB:DLM:1660539

I refer to your letter of 6 December 1993 and to our subsequent telephone conversation. In your letter you asked for information concerning recent testing of your 008 number undertaken by Bell Canada International (BCI) at the request of our client, Telecom Australia.

With respect to your first question, our client has informed us that BCI's testing of your 008 service was conducted from the central database. A 008 services works by providing a translation of the 008 number to an ordinary telephone number. When a call is made to a 008 number, that call is switched through to the central database system. At this point, the 008 number called is checked in the database and the appropriate number that it translates to is determined. From this point the call is then switched to the translated number.

With respect to your second question, BCI did not test your 008 number from locations other than the central database system.

With respect to your comment concerning a customer from Mount Gambier, South Australia who has reported to you that he had difficulty contacting you on your 008 service, if you are able to provide our client with more details (such as the caller's telephone number) our client may be able to investigate and comment further on the problem which this customer has reported to you.

Yours faithfully
FREEHILL HOLLINGDALE & PAGE
per:

Denise M. Burnie

Denise McBurnie
Solicitor

BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
101 COLLINS STREET
MELBOURNE 3000 AUSTRALIA
GPO BOX 1284 MELBOURNE 3001
TELEPHONE (03) 299 1254 FACSIMILE (03) 299 1507
TELEX AAAAAA 00X 2-10 MELBOURNE

Commercial Vic/Tas

540 Springvale Rd
Glen Waverley
3150
AustraliaTelephone (03) 550 7397
Message Bank
Facsimile (03) 562 1926

8 December, 1993

K00740

Denise McBurnie
Freehill Hollingdale & Page
43/101 Collins St
Melbourne 3000

Dear Denise,

Mr Smith - Cape Bridewater Holiday Camp
Our Ref: VSC/45

Further to our conversation of the 6/12/93 relating to the request from Mr. Smith as to testing Bell Canada had done in relation to his 008 service.


As far as can be ascertained Bell Canada had not tested specifically Mr. Smith's 008 number from locations other than Melbourne.

A 008 service works by providing a translation of the 008 number to an ordinary telephone number. The process is that a call to a 008 number is made and the call is switched through to a database system. At this point the number called (the 008 number) is checked in the data base and the appropriate number that it translates to is determined. From here the call is then switched to the translated number (ie Mr Smith's phone).

The tests that were conducted by Bell Canada were from the location of the data base to Mr. Smith.

As far as Mr Smith's concern regarding a caller from Mt Gambier, if Mr Smith could provide us with more details such as the callers telephone number we may be able to comment further on the problem he had.

Yours sincerely


Trevor Hindson

DRAFT

Page 2

18 October 1993

K00866

Our client has instructed us to tell you that if you still dispute having booked an early reminder call it is prepared to credit your account with the charges incurred for this early reminder call.

5. Paragraph 6 - our client apologises for the letters demanding payment which were inadvertently sent to you. There is another Mr Alan Smith located in your area and our client's debt collection agency inadvertently sent letters meant for the other Mr Smith to you. Our client's debt collection agency have been instructed to make sure that it does not happen again.
6. Paragraph 8 - with respect to the error referred to in this paragraph as being reported as 3 weeks and 6 weeks, this discrepancy relates to an inadvertent error made by Mr David Stockdale when compiling the final report on these errors. The interim report compiled by our client and which formed the basis of the settlement negotiations undertaken with you correctly stated that the likely period that data was incorrectly set was for 3 weeks. This interim report was the most accurate information and post dated some research which had indicated that the error was present for a possible 6 week period. When Mr Stockdale compiled the final report he incorrectly consulted the earlier research regarding the 6 week period. The discrepancy between the two reports was caused by human error.

Please contact Ms Denise McBurnie if you have any further queries regarding the information or explanations given above.

Yours faithfully
FREEHILL HOLLINGDALE & PAGE
Per:

Denise McBurnie
Solicitor

DRAFT

Our ref: RAB:DLM
CO23555

K00865

18 October 1993

Mr A Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
RMB 4408
CAPE BRIDGEWATER VIC

By facsimile - 055-267 230

Dear Mr Smith

Telecom Australia

We refer to your letter to Ms Denise McBurnie received by this office on 4 October 1993 by facsimile transmission and to your subsequent telephone conversations with Ms McBurnie.

In your letter you have requested information and explanations from our client, Telecom Australia. We have been instructed to respond to your requests as follows:

1. Paragraph 1 - the billing errors to which you refer in this paragraph have been rectified.
2. Paragraphs 2 and 3 - our client has been unable to determine the name of the staff members who made the calls to you referred to in these paragraphs. [~~Our client confirms that these calls were made as test calls.~~]
3. Paragraph 4 - our client confirms that the five short duration calls referred to in this paragraph were made as test calls from the Horsham exchange. The fact that no origin of location was listed on your bill for these five calls is not indicative of a fault. Insufficient Calling Line Information was available for these calls.
4. Paragraph 5 - our client's records indicate that on 8 May 1993 a reminder call was actually made to your 055-267267 number and that this number was charged with a 55¢ fee for that call. This indicates that a call was booked on the previous day and that a \$1.20 booking fee was incurred. Our client's records also indicate that your account for the number 055-267267 was later credited with \$1.20 which indicates that the booking fee was inadvertently charged twice.

URGENT

FREEHILL
HOLLINGDALE
& PAGE

URGENT

Melbourne Office

K00864

To:	Ann Law	From:	Denise McBurnie
At:	Telecom Australia	Direct line:	(03) 288 1383
		Switch:	(03) 288 1234
To fax:	562 1926	From fax:	(03) 288 1567
		Date:	18 October 1993
Phone:	550 7626	Matter No:	1660539 Pin No: 274
Page 1 of 3		Approval:	<i>DMS</i>

The information in this facsimile is privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, copying or use of the information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately telephone us (we will accept reverse charges) on:

(03) 288 1341 Fax (03) 288 1567 (International phone codes + [61 3]) or Telex A433004
and return the original facsimile to
Level 43, 101 Collins Street, Melbourne Vic 3000 Australia

Dear Ann

Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp

I now enclose my draft response to Mr Smith. Could you please check the letter and call me in order to confirm its contents.

I have spoken to Mr Smith earlier this morning and told him that I hoped to have a letter to him by midday today. In our conversation this morning, Mr Smith also raised an issue about some information he has regarding Telecom's overcharging of not only himself, but certain of his clients. Could you please also call me so that we can discuss these other allegations.

Kind regards.

FREEHILL HOLLINGDALE & PAGE
Per:

Denise McBurnie

Denise McBurnie
Solicitor

Enc

CO23558/CO



CAPE BRIDGEWATER Holiday Camp

RMB 4408
Cape Bridgewater
Toll Free 008 816 522

Host - Alan Smith
Ph. 055 267 267
Fx. 055 267 230

*Country
Get - Aways
Historical Portland
Victoria's first permanent settlement*

12 NOV 93 11: 5

Attention Ms Denise MacBurnie
Freehill Hollingdale & Page.

November 12th 1993.

Dear Ms MacBurnie,

On trying to fax you the information you recieved this morning, I had quite some difficulty in getting all the pages through at a given time. Note the page errors which I enclosed.

I have just experienced my fax trying to recieve an incoming message, at three seperate occasions.

And still that company you represent, deny I have had telecommunicati problems. And I am still experiencing them today.

Regards,

Alan Smith.

K00820

PS/

I have at 11:24 recieved four names and addresses of Telecom customers in some way having communication faults, I am yet to determine how bad these faults are, untill I further talk with the interested parties.

1165



AUSTRALIAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY

95 / 0594 - 01

141

93/507

9 December 1993

Mr Ian Campbell
Managing Director - Commercial Business
Telecom

Fax 634 3876

Dear Mr Campbell

BELL CANADA INTERNATIONAL REPORT

This letter is to convey to you advice to the effect that while AUSTEL was -

- consulted on the terms of reference for the Bell Canada International (BCI) audit of Telecom's testing and fault finding capability, and study of its network, to determine if there is a fundamental network fault
- of the view that the proposed testing would provide a useful *snapshot* of current network functionality and that the terms of reference allowed for sufficient flexibility to produce results relevant to a consideration of issues raised by *COT Cases* (without drawing conclusions on an individual customer's complaint),

on a preliminary analysis the report fails to live up to the expectations raised by the terms of reference.

Findings must be qualified

The BCI study concluded that "...customers served from the test originating and test terminating exchanges receive a grade of service that meets global network performance standards..." (sixth paragraph of the Executive Summary). Any findings to that effect must be qualified by the fact that the BCI audit focused on only one part of what is commonly called "the network", namely Telecom's exchange-to-exchange operations. BCI's audit did not extend to an equally significant part of "the network", namely the customer access network.

To put it another way, the tests conducted by BCI neither were nor purported to be "end-to-end" testing, but involved testing of part of the network only - the inter-exchange network. The tests were not applied in a manner designed to check complete end-to-end network performance from a customer's perspective. They were made from exchange equipment to exchange equipment and, except in one case, did not traverse customer lines or use customer premises equipment. The conclusions which may be drawn from the

5 QUEENS ROAD, MELBOURNE, VICTORIA
POSTAL: P.O. BOX 7443, ST KILDA, MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, 3004
TELEPHONE: (03) 828 7300 FACSIMILE: (03) 820 3021

1166

study cannot go beyond the inter-exchange network. The findings cannot be presented in the way they were in the Executive Summary to suggest that they embrace the network as a whole, including the customer access network.

Test call patterns not typical of COT Cases

The test calling patterns adopted apparently reflected the main network traffic streams relevant to the exchanges currently providing services to the COT Cases and related customers, but did not necessarily reflect typical traffic patterns experienced by those customers. While the results can be considered indicative of the general switched public network performance of the exchanges involved, they cannot be guaranteed to be representative of calling performance from typical client locations to the exchanges serving the COT Cases and related customers.

Also for whatever the reasons, such as time constraints, the testing undertaken by BCI appears very narrowly focused. For example, in Melbourne BCI undertook test calling from only seven exchange localities out of the 100 or more in the Melbourne metropolitan area, with only selective test calling from the Western suburbs. This is particularly disappointing in that both of the Melbourne businesses included in the testing claim to have experienced difficulties with respect to calls from Western suburbs based clientele.

Testing of PBX ("rotary") search facility

Particular concern has been expressed by COT Cases dependent on older (cross bar) exchange technology, in relation to periodic faults of the rotary search facilities which are designed to allow calls dialled to a single number to be offered to a group of access lines appearing in the customer's premises.

With the benefit of hindsight, exchange-to-exchange network integrity tests for COT Cases traffic cannot be considered comprehensive without the inclusion of testing of this facility in the terminating exchanges serving the relevant COT Cases.

I understand that BCI is currently undertaking further testing to redress this shortcoming in its report.

008 services

Also with the benefit of hindsight, given the concerns expressed by certain of the COT Cases the realistic testing of network performance should have included test calling via any relevant 008 number.

Retrospectivity


The report itself highlights the fact that the tests provide only a *snapshot* which does not necessarily reflect the problems that COT Cases have experienced in the past - see paragraph 5.00 of the report which "... recognises that the tests performed by BCI ... look at the network at a specific point in time. The results therefore, may be completely different from those obtained at some other point in time. Furthermore, as troubles are cleared when found, it is unlikely that the same trouble conditions will show up in subsequent tests".

1166

In summary

Having regard to the above, I am of the opinion that the BCI report should not be made available to the assessor(s) nominated for the COT Cases without a copy of this letter being attached to it.

Yours sincerely



Cliff Mathieson
Specialist Advisor - Networks

1166

DRAFT

Commercial & Consumer

15 December 1993

Level 5
242 Exhibition Street,
MELBOURNE VIC 3000
Australia

Telephone (03) 634 6
Facsimile (03) 634 6

VIA FACSIMILE

Mr R. Davy
Chairman
AUSTEL
Jetset House, 5 Queens Road
MELBOURNE, Vic. 3004

Dear Mr Davy,

I refer to the following events involving AUSTEL officers in recent days regarding the Bell Canada International (BCI) report.

- A letter of 9 December 1993 from Mr Mathieson to me.
 - Comments attributed to Mr MacMahon on 10 December 1993 in the "Australian Financial Review".
- Advice to Telecom is that the comments attributed to Mr MacMahon are, in substance, accurate.
- A letter reported in the same article from Mr MacMahon to the CoT spokesperson, Mr Schorer.

The conclusion to be reasonably made from these events is that AUSTEL publicly judges the BCI report "fails to live up to expectations raised by the terms of reference", has inadequacies, and raises concerns. Further, AUSTEL publicly agrees with CoT views along these lines.

Reasonable inferences might be drawn about deficiencies in the competence, professional standing and integrity of BCI, and the competence and integrity of Telecom and myself in the conduct of the study and representation of the findings.

We can argue about matters of detail, but in substance these events are of concern and disappointing to Telecom.

A00404

1167

PERSPECTIVE

Before stating Telecom's position, I point out the considerable efforts Telecom has made to assist AUSTEL in its investigation of CoT cases. Telecom has gone well beyond the usual responses to AUSTEL's directions, to actively support AUSTEL in an attempt to achieve as thorough and objective an assessment as possible of the issues in the limited time available, in some cases at considerable risk to its own position.

It would be difficult to conceive of any significant, practical additional action Telecom could have taken to support AUSTEL, given resources were already stretched, to respond to AUSTEL's directions.

In Telecom's view, AUSTEL may criticise Telecom at times for shortcomings in competence or judgement, but in no way can AUSTEL claim lack of co-operation, obstruction or bad faith during the investigation in what has been a difficult period for both parties.

Indeed, Telecom hopes AUSTEL's view is the reverse.

TELECOM'S POSITION.

Telecom's position regarding the recent events concerning the BCI report are as follows:

1. *The BCI study was conducted professionally by BCI and Telecom, and in the limited time available, achieved the objectives discussed and agreed with AUSTEL.*

The findings are reassuring to Telecom and ought to be reassuring and welcomed by AUSTEL and telephone users around Australia - at least for the test period there appears no evidence that there is a fundamental problem in the inter-exchange and local exchange network and that the network performed within specification.

You will recall the study arose following (unsubstantiated) allegations that a fundamental problem in Telecom's network may be preventing a large number of calls being delivered by the network to the terminal exchanges to which those customers were connected.

The basic aim of the BCI study was, in the short time available, to test the network and assess related operating procedures for fault detection and restoration.

Alleged failures in the letter of 9 December, such as exclusion of the CAN and exclusion of "end-to-end" testing, were not necessary to be included to achieve the aim of the study, were specifically excluded (with the agreement of your officers),

A03405

1167

- 3 -

were not included and were never purported to be included either in the findings or subsequent presentations of the findings.

The terms of reference and conduct of the BCI study were discussed on a number of occasions with your officers, and they raised no concerns of substance. Indeed, on several occasions, they apparently considered the basis of the study sufficiently sound to suggest a number of additions to the testing programme (e.g. Portland and Devlin's Bridge), and these were accepted.

My understanding is that AUSTEL further requested testing in customers' premises, but then decided that this was a duplication of the service monitoring programme directed by AUSTEL, would serve little purpose, and risked disruption of the customers' services.

You will recall in the presentation of the report to you I particularly pointed out the limitations of the study, and this was done in presentations to the Minister's office, Senators Boswell, Alston and Bourne, the media, and CoT members present at a videoconference.

In summary, the BCI study proceeded as discussed with AUSTEL, reported as directed, and the findings ought to be regarded as reassuring and welcome.

Briefly, an acceptable conclusion would have been along the lines of the previous sentence, but with a qualification that to obtain a complete assessment of the performance of a particular customer's service, "end-to-end" testing would need to be done which included the customer access network.

2. Telecom is concerned about several other aspects of these events. For example;

- (a) AUSTEL reached a conclusion about Telecom without giving Telecom the opportunity to comment.

In this case, the position was advised to others and made public before Telecom was advised.

In an investigation of Telecom, it would seem reasonable that Telecom be given such an opportunity.

- (b) AUSTEL allows (an unfair) position to be made public which appears to support other parties in a civil suit against Telecom.

In Telecom's view, the task of a regulator in investigations of this nature is to form conclusions and decide related recommendations and intended actions on an issue and, after due discussion with the parties, publish these in its report.

A00406

1167

B

We believe AUSTEL risks its reputation if, during an investigation, it appears to take sides in civil proceedings between parties - in this case, arbitration, but court proceedings in the future on matters under investigation are possible.



- 3. Considering the above circumstances, Telecom cannot agree to attach a copy of AUSTEL's letter of 9 December to the BCI report if the latter is made available to the assessor(s) nominated for the CoT cases.

Accordingly, Telecom requests AUSTEL to confirm Telecom's view of the BCI report, and to consider how our concerns might be addressed.

I am available to discuss the above matter at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

→ Since there is a multitude of inaccuracies.

Ian Campbell

— This is a threat to claim of AUSTEL that we (T) will not provide assessor with all the relevant facts

A00407

1167

FOI RECEIVED
26/5/95

- As Mr G. Kealey and Mr R. Baltas intended to travel to Portland exchange (via Warrnambool exchange) on Friday afternoon 5/11/93, they ensured that a TRT run from Richmond had finished and that a run from the South Yarra TRT had commenced satisfactorily before they left Melbourne at approximately 12.45 that day. They also arranged for test calls to begin from Bendigo exchange that afternoon, and made a call from Warrnambool exchange to South Yarra exchange late in the afternoon to ensure the South Yarra TRT had completed its test run program and stopped.
- No staff recalls or attendance were recorded or required at either South Yarra or Richmond exchange to attend to TRT's on Friday 5/11/93 or the weekend 6/11/93 & 7/11/93.

A complete examination of the times of the test calls from all the exchanges to the test lines at Cape Bridgewater and Devlin's bridge over the period from 3/11/93 to 9/11/93 shows that the only time the test run from the Richmond digital test line to the Cape Bridgewater 055 267 211 test answer base could have been made, without clashing with other test calls to the same test number, was between the afternoon of 3/11/93 and about midday of 4/11/93.

It appears that the details for the test run from the Richmond digital test line (03 428 8974) to Cape Bridgewater RCM (055 267 211) should have been recorded as beginning at approximately 4.18 pm on 3/11/93 (rather than 12.45 pm on 5/11/93) and finishing at about 12.45 pm on 4/11/93 (rather than 4.18 pm on 5/11/93), with other aspects of the test run remaining the same as previously recorded. These timings fit in with other test runs from the Richmond TRT line and with other test runs from other exchanges to the same line at Cape Bridgewater. They also provide a logical sequence in the overall test program and a reasonable average test call interval (43.9 sec. per call).

A table has been drawn up to show the test calls made over the period and is attached, showing the test run between the Richmond digital test line and the Cape Bridgewater test line in this logical time-slot within the overall test run program.

Could you please confirm whether or not this interpretation of the sequence of test runs matches with your recollections and personal notes, or whether there is any other way to correct the records of the test runs shown in the report.

N00006

Alan Humrich
GENERAL MANAGER
CENTRAL AREA

1168

FOI RECEIVED
26/5/95

Telecom
AUSTRALIA

6 September 1994

Central Area
Network Operations
6/171 Roma Street
Brisbane
Australia

Ph (07) 837 3212
Fax (07) 236 4247

Mr G. Kealey
Bell Canada International
Suite 800, 1 Nicholas Street
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1N 9M1

9B

Gerry,

N00005

As you have been made aware through discussions with Mr K. Dwyer, an anomaly has been found in the test call records contained in the report "Bell Canada International Inc. REPORT TO TELECOM AUSTRALIA 1 NOVEMBER 1993".

Specifically, the start and finish times for the test run from Richmond digital exchange (RCMX), test line 03 428 8974, to Portland exchange, Cape Bridgewater RCM (CBWR) number range, test line 055 267 211, (detailed in section 15.23 of the report) are impracticable. The number of calls made during the test run could not have been completed within the time span shown and the test run would have clashed with other test runs performed within those times.

An examination of the test result summary forms filled out after the test runs (a copy of the relevant record forms is enclosed) reveals that the report details have been correctly derived from the summary forms.

This inconsistency in recording of times for a test run is not a fundamental flaw in the test results or the conclusions of the report, but the proper times of the run should be recorded if at all possible.

Discussions with a number of people assisting with the test call program during that period confirmed that considerable care was taken to avoid clashes of test calls to test answering bases and to ensure that test calling devices originated calls only to a single terminating test code during any test run.

From their recollections of events several points regarding the sequence of events have been brought together:

- The tests were initiated to provide extra data from test calls into the number ranges of the CoT customers connected to Devlin's Bridge exchange and Portland exchange. The data was to be added as an addendum to the report dated 1 November 1993.
- Testing began Wednesday 3/11/93. Traffic Route Testers (TRT's) in the NIB test room 7/35 Collins Street Melbourne originated calls, via test lines connected to Richmond exchange, to test answering bases at Portland exchange and Devlin's Bridge exchange. A portable TRT at South Yarra exchange was also used to originate calls to the same exchanges.

1168

03-1995 14:47

FROM CAPE BRIDGE HDAY CAMP

TO

032778797

P.13

03 '95 03:01PM EMPLOYMENT CENTRE OTT

F.O.I. RECEIVED P.S.
26/5/95

AH

Humrich, Alan

From: Dwyer, Kevin
 To: Humrich, Alan; Gamble, Peter
 Cc: Baltais, Rudi; Killeen, Paul
 Subject: re: Smith's query on BCI Tests
 Date: 23 August 1994 10:03
 Priority: High

Mr Smith is correct in the suggestion implied in his query that the test results recorded in the 'Addendum - Additional Tests' part of the BCI report to Telecom, 1 November 1993, are impracticable.

Specifically the tests:

from - Richmond Digital, RCMX, 03 428 [redacted] T
 terminating to - Cape Bridgewater 055 28 [redacted] shown in section 15.23 of the report is impractical as the number of calls recorded could not have been made within the times shown and would have clashed with other test runs performed during those times.

Unfortunately the TRT run results tabulations filled out by the BCI reps. following the tests, from which the report was prepared, have the same times and dates and run results as are printed in the final report. The error in recording must have occurred in the transcription from the rough notes to the test results data tabulation forms. None of the original rough notes which may have been made by the various people involved are now available.

I have spoken to Gerry Kealey, the Bell Canada International representative, Paul Killeen, and Rudi Baltais of NNI, and to staff at South Yarra exchange to determine the actual sequence of testing during that period. Each had similar recollections of beginning the series of tests to Portland Exchange (the Cape Bridgewater RCM code range) and Devlin's Bridge exchange from TRTs connected to Richmond and South Yarra lines on Wednesday 3/11/93. As Rudi and Gerry intended to go to Portland to see the Exchange and RCM, travelling on Friday afternoon 5/11/93, they ensured that a TRT run from Richmond had ceased and that a run from South Yarra had commenced with no troubles before they left Melbourne at about 12.45 that day. They made a call from Warrnambool exchange to ensure the run from South Yarra was terminated, but have no notes to confirm the date and time of the call.

It appears that the TRT run details for the run from Richmond (428 [redacted] T) to Cape Bridgewater RCM range (055 28 [redacted]) should have been recorded as beginning approximately 4.18 pm, on 3/11/93 and finishing at approximately 12.45 pm, on 4/11/93, other aspects of the run remaining the same as recorded.

These timings would fit in with the other test runs from the Richmond TRT line and with other test runs to the same terminating line at Cape Bridgewater. They also provide a logical test run sequence and a reasonable average test call interval (43.9 sec. per call).

A detail record of the test runs performed during the extended test period is shown in the table (BCINOV.DOC) below:

<< File Attachment: BCINOV.DOC >>

Kevin Dwyer
 657 3003

N00037

ht COT

BCI report
 (Consultants)

1169