

AUSTRALIAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY

92/596 (6)

7 September 1993

Mr_____Corporate Secretary
Teletra Corporation Ltd

Fax 632 3215

Dear Mr Holmes

COT CASES MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS

Your "two bob each way" letter of 31 August 1993 outlining how Telecom is to monitor the COT Cases' services in response to AUSTEL's direction of 12 August does little to inspire confidence in Telecom's approach to the issue.

The offer to provide in two weeks hence a "... critique of the technical aspects of ... [the] ...direction, including the test call program specified" might be interpreted as nothing more than an attempt to lay a foundation for discwning the tests if they appear to support the COT Cases. Why when we first asked for the tests over two months ago (MacMahon's letter to a first asked for the tests over two months ago (MacMahon's letter to a first asked for the tests over two months ago (MacMahon's letter to a first of 30 June 1993), does it take another two weeks to come up with a critique of the monitoring proposals? This is the very lack of the pro-active co-operative attitude which prompted the direction of 12 August 1983.

I have similar concerns about you seeking AUSTEL's approval of the monitoring equipment so long after we first asked tests to be done. There are concerns by some of the customers Telecom is to monitor about the effectiveness of the monitoring equipment. These concerns have been inspired, at least in part, by comments made by Telecom employees to those customers and, of course, the problem experienced by Mr Smith when testing/monitoring equipment caused additional problems for him. The advantage of having independent endorsement of the equipment prior to its installation and the production of test data seems obvious to me. Instead, we are still liaising to obtain details of the specification and capability of the equipment to be deployed after its installation in four of the cases and within days of the proposed installation in the other cases.

It is clearly in the interests of all concerned to ensure that the monitoring pursuant to AUSTEL'S direction is conducted in the most timely and efficient manner. Please liaise with Mr Cliff Mathleson, AUSTEL's Specialist Advisor - Networks, (03 828 7389) re approval of the monitoring equipment.

5 QUEENS ROAD, MET BOURNE, VICTORIA POSTAL: P.O. BOX 7443, ST KILDA RD. MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, 3004 TELEPHONE: (03) 828 7.HXI FACSIMILE: (03) 820 3021 **26** R10690

Draft conditions for installation of equipment

The draft list of conditions for installation of monitoring equipment in the customers' premises only serve to reinforce my view that your letter is an attempt to have "two bob each way" - if the testing does not favour Telecom, you have laid a foundation for claiming that it is due to customer Interference. I have already conveyed to you my concern that Telecom is unable to come up with tamper proof monitoring equipment for installation on the customers' premises.

Subject to you removing the endorsement "Telecom in confidence" on the top of the draft conditions, I am prepared to have them conveyed to the customers. I should, however, point out that they reflect little credit on Telecom If its intention were to produce a document that endeavours to provide the customers with any explanation or reasoning for the conditions.

Technical complexities

We look forward to receiving the technical and operational submission foreshadowed in you letter. The timing of about three weeks would seem appropriate. A decision whether, as suggested in your letter, it is desirable to engage an independent technical expert will be taken after receipt of your submission. If that is necessary, AUSTEL would be looking to Telecom to meet the costs involved.

Access to file and documents

While I understand that the arrangements for file examination are proving adequate, there was an agreement to list all files by 19 August and I understand that only some 60 files have been identified to AUSTEL to date. Please provide a comprehensive listing by the end of this week (10 September 1993).

is it possible to provide parking for AUSTEL's officers who are attending Telecom's premises to inspect the files? This would result in a significant cost saving to AUSTEL's personnel who currently have to make use of commercial parking.

Yours sincerely

Robin C Dayey Chairman

R10691 26