

Perversion of the Course of Justice

On the 28 November 1995, six months after my arbitration, I received evidence confirming that the Government owned carrier (the defendants in my arbitration) had actually carried out two separate investigations of my EXICOM TF200 touch-phone, two weeks apart, and that the second test report dated between 24 and 26 May 1994, proved that the first one, which had been provided to the arbitrator, was not a true account of the testing process at all but was a total fabrication. Photos and graphs (see Exhibit AS 1 and 2 attached below) show laboratory staff proved that, when wet beer was introduced into a TF200 phone it dried out completely in forty-eight hours. My phone, however, was collected from my business on 27 April 1994 and not tested until 10 May – a gap of fourteen days.

It is alarming to note that the defendants arbitration TF200 EXICOM report discusses various stages of the testing process from between 10 May and 20 June 1994, and clearly shows that even though the defendants knew their 24 to 26 May 1994 second investigation had proved the first arbitration report dated between 10 and 12 May 1994, was more than fundamentally flawed, they still submitted this *first* flawed report to the arbitrator as their true findings.

The arbitrator allowed the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman (who was also the administrator of my arbitration process) to bring the arbitrator's wife into play when the arbitrator used a perfectly innocent telephone call that I made to his home at 8.02 pm (the first and only time I ever telephoned the arbitrator at his home), six months after the end of my arbitration. I made that call on 28 November 1995, because I had finally received, from the defendants, various Freedom of Information (FOI) documents that had originally been withheld from me during my arbitration by the defendants. This fresh evidence proved that the defendants had knowingly submitted, to the arbitrator, only one of two technical reports that had been prepared, two weeks apart, one saying that the EXICOM TF200 touch-phone collected from my premises was very dirty when it was received at the defendant's laboratory, (see Exhibit AS 3 and AS 4) and that a sticky substance (labelled as beer) had been spilt into the phone, causing the ongoing lock-up problems with my service lines. The second version of the report was prepared because one of the defence liaison officers did not believe the first version: the second version noted that beer could not have been the cause of the problems because it would have dried out within 48 hours of any spillage into the phone and that photos taken when the phone was originally received clearly show that it was perfectly clean when it arrived at the laboratory (see Exhibit AS 5 and AS 6).

Eventually the arbitrator found in favour of the defendants regarding this 'wet and sticky' beer issue without, as the technical findings in his award show i.e. NO investigating regarding my claims that the new installed TF200 EXICOM was still locking-up was ever undertaken.

If the defendants had submitted the second report (dated June 1994) as part of their 12 December 1994 arbitration defence, then the arbitrator would have ordered his technical unit to investigate, and they would then have learned that, even though the defendants had installed a brand new TF200 EXICOM phone at my business, still the problems continued. They would have also uncovered various other reports and documents that show that (1) this particular brand of phone, manufactured after April 1993, was known to lock-up in moisture-prone areas like Cape Bridgewater Bay – where moisture is prevalent – and (2) that the then-government-owned telecommunications carrier had redeployed some 350,000 of these phones back into circulation see (Exhibit AS 7) leaving their technicians to decide where they should be deployed. If the arbitrator's technical advisors had known this about the TF200 phone, surely they would have immediately demanded a phone from a different manufacturer? Because of the defence's disgraceful submission of false evidence however, this second TF200 phone remained in my office until I was forced to sell my business in December 2001, because no-one from the TIO's office would investigate my continuing

complaints; not just the ongoing lock-up problems but also all the other telephone problems, including incorrect accounts, that continued after the end of my arbitration, on all my business phone lines.

On the 12 May 1995 on the very day that the arbitrator was writing his letter to explain to the TIO that there were serious problems "...which had revealed themselves during the Smith arbitration", the TIO was busy sending out a media release announcing the successful conclusion of the "... first COT case arbitration". According to this official release, the TIO noted that:

"... the arbitration process had been run in accordance with principles of natural justice".

And was there ever an announcement to the public regarding the arbitrator's assessment that the process used to arrive at this conclusion was itself faulty? No, of course not. And did I ever get the opportunity to let the public know that THE TF200 beer-in-the-phone report – had been fraudulently manufactured? No, of course not. And did this announcement make any mention of the fact that, regardless of the findings, the faults continued to plague my business? No, of course not!

After I raised this TF200 alleged found 'sticky wet beer' in my telephone with the Institute of Arbitrators Australia the arbitrator responded in his own letter of 23 January 1996, to the TIO under the heading Institute of Arbitrators - Complaint by Alan Smith noting

"...I enclose copy letters dated 18 and 19 January 1996 from the Institute of Arbitrators. I would like to discuss a number of matters which arise from these letters, including "...the cost of responding to the allegations and the implications to the arbitration process if I make a full and frank disclosure of the facts to the President"

Even worse if that is at all possible, among documents I received in 2001/2 from the TIO's office was a copy of a letter dated 13th February 1996, from the arbitrators project manager to my case asserting that the Victoria Police Brighton CIB were about to question me in relation to criminal damages to his property. Letter's held by the TIO office confirms that the Victoria Police Brighton CIB never considered me to be a suspect in relation to any crime committed in Brighton or any location in the State of Victoria, or for that matter, in Australia.

These false allegations were then sent by the arbitrator to the then the President of the Institute of Arbitrators Australia, thereby stopping the President from investigating my valid claims against the appalling way in which my arbitration had been conducted.

If there was criminal damage to arbitration project manager's Brighton residence as he alleged, then surely the Victoria Police Brighton CIB would have eventually informed him that I was not interviewed – or even considered to be a suspect.

So far there have been three separate investigations into the failure of the arbitration process, starting with the Institute of Arbitrators Australia in 1996 (with no findings ever handed down) and ending with a third investigation by the IAMA, starting in July 2009, but still without any findings being released (see my LinkedIn 12-page Summary.

26/5/94.

Residue in Touchphone 200.
for Doug Kitchin


Beer residue beerres.dt
(dried overnight)
at RT

256 scan
on diamond (single)
100 x 100 pm area
Av. purge.

Beer residue beereslg.dt
not completely
dried

bram, viscous liq.
in phone

foinehg.dt



beeresgl.dt = beerresin + glycerol + H₂O

glycerol = glycerol.dt

coffee.dt 1 + 1 kaspom coffee + sugar
(sucrose).
- white

Exhibit AS 1

copy from original
Laboratory notebook
of Doug Kitchin
24/5/95

A64535

UTM-MicroZ Display - Spectrum7




Exhibit AS 2

A64559




Photo 5. Close-up of label stuck to case above keypad

Keypad Very Dirty ?




Photo 3. Close-up of keypad indicating dirty condition and showing customer's number

Keypad Very Dirty ?

Exhibit AS 4




Photo 1. Front view of COT TF200

Keypad Quiet Clean

Exhibit AS 5




Photo 5. Close-up of label stuck to case shown.

Keypad Quiet Clean

Exhibit AS 6

EDCOM TELEPHONES.

With the onset of the "wet" season in Northern Australia it has become apparent that we are having a significantly higher fault rate with T 200 telephones that would have been normally expected. The problem was first apparent in Darwin but it has been closely followed by Cairns and Townsville. Over the past weeks the problem has reached Southern Queensland.

The most common fault is line looping which can either be permanent or intermittent. A related problem is that the phone loops the line after a single burst of ring. The called party has not answered but the phone is off the hook and sometimes the calling party can hear all activity at the called end. In this case the call would also appear on the billing record as a short duration call. Breakthrough Billing have been informed of this possibility.

Tests were carried out by TRL and the problem isolated to the Edcom flexible keypad circuit layers which were manufactured after week 7 of 1993. Edcom are the sole supplier of Serial 550/141 "tropicalised" telephones which are treated with conformal coating and these phones are deployed in areas of high humidity. High humidity is the specific condition most likely to bring about the fault. Therefore in areas of high humidity we have a potential major fault problem.

DEPLOYMENT.

Whilst I do not have the total deployment of Edcom phones available it has been assessed that there is approximately 450,000 phones with potential faults. Of these there are 325,000 Serial 550/141 phones deployed in areas of high moisture. Approximate deployment of the Serial 550/141 phones since April 1993 is:

Queensland	225000
Darwin	9000
Western Australia	90000

In these areas virtually all T200's installed or used as replacements during maintenance have a potential problem. In addition there are some 125000 in other areas.

IMPACT.

Darwin.

The problems in Darwin have been addressed. Since December no more Edcom phones have been used. All supplies have been sourced from Alcatel and whilst these do not have the conformal coating tests indicate that they are performing satisfactorily. Whilst there are still phones in-situ with potential defects the situation is considered manageable.

Queensland.

The Queensland situation is very serious. The situation has progressively worsened as the wet has moved south. It has significantly worsened over the past two weeks as cyclone Raza has moved off the Queensland Coast and brought with it very heavy storm activity and high moisture conditions. The effect in Queensland is that in January we are experiencing the need to replace phones at the rate of 12000 a month compared to the expected 8500. Under the present Union agreements each of these replacements require a visit by field staff.

In Queensland we have taken the following actions:

1. Following the success of the trial of the Alcatel phone in Darwin, supplies of Edcom phones to Queensland have ceased and all further phones used will be sourced from Alcatel. Because of the supply problems Edcom phones will still have to be deployed in areas of lower moisture risk.
2. We still have a heavy backlog of work due to the impact of Cyclone Raza. Staff have been recalled on duty and over the weekend we have loaned all available staff from G & G, Pay phones, CED to work with the SCU to replace telephones. Whilst this may overcome the present problem it does not offer a sustainable long term solution.

Internal Memo

To

From David Polson
Technical Manager

Subject Cape Bridgewater RCM's

Date 24 March 1994

File

Attention

Consumer CAN Design and
Construction Tas/Vic
CAN Technologies

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

Australia

Telephone 053 334499
International 61 53 334499

Facsimile 053 332539

Mobile 018 503 892

Pager 016 530 726

K00942

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 consistent 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

Exhibit AS 8

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

Daniel Tolson- CAN Technology - Ballarat

Tim: Anderson - Service Delivery - Portland

30/8/93

2.50 Julie Owen Ph 611333

Warranbrool College

Availability of camp

4.35 Paul Haer

4.42 Alan

4.52 Alan

5.20 Alan

5.22 Alan

6.45 Colin Turner 018311888

WORK 5554000 TOMORROW

WANTS TO TAKE OVER A FEW

THINGS. HAS HEARD NEWS...

WILL NOT DISCUSS SOME ISSUES
ON THE PHONE.

8.15 Alan

8.50 Alan

31/5/93

10.50 Amanda

12.08 Peter Bartlett's Secretary

12.15 Alan

12.31 Alan

12.40 Neil Williamson Gnu Farm

1.30 Julie Owen Mng again 3.30pm

2.45 Canadian Technical Consultant

2.50 Keith Simmins for Amanda