

# Arbitrators Copy

## RESOURCE UNIT TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT

Mr. Alan Smith of Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp

30 April 1995

---

### Introduction

This document is DMR Group Inc.'s (Montreal, Canada) and Lane Telecommunications Pty Ltd's (Dulwich, South Australia) Technical Report on the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp COT case.

It is complete and final as it is. There is, however, an addendum which we may find it necessary to add during the next few weeks on billing, i.e. possible discrepancies in Smith's Telecom bills.

To establish the context for our technical evaluation, we preface it with our positions on three specific details in Telecom's Service History. This is followed by a statement about other documentation which has been provided by both parties. And we provide a characterisation of the level of service such a customer as Mr Smith could reasonably have expected.

Sections 1 and 2 itemise problems with Telecom's service to the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp in the period from February 1988 to October 1994. There were several different problems, sometimes more than one at a time, with several different causes. These are summarised in the Timeline at the end of the Introduction. They include:

- congestion
- low capacity
- exchange fault
- transmission equipment (RCM) faults
- calls wrongly directed to RVA (Recorded Voice Announcement)
- sundry reports with "no fault found" at the time
- Telecom testing
- programming error
- uncompleted 008 calls
- others.

Section 3 addresses the issue of problems with CPE (Customer Premises Equipment). It is not always clear to the customer where to draw the line between CPE and proper Telecom responsibilities, and Telecom did not succeed in making it clear to Mr Smith.

47A

## Arbitrators Copy

Sections 4 and 5 are an impact assessment and summary. We have ascertained that there were times when the service provided by Telecom to Mr Smith, quite aside from problems with CPE, fell below a reasonable level. These times ranged in duration from years in some cases, to 18 months in one case, to an estimated 70 days in one case, to shorter times in other cases. These durations of poor service were, in our judgement, sufficiently severe to render Mr Smith's service from Telecom unreliable and deficient.

### Cape Bridgewater Documentation

The "Fast Track" arbitration proceedings are "on documents and written submissions". More than 4,000 pages of documentation have been presented by both parties and examined by us. We have also visited the site. Not all of the documentation has real bearing on the question of whether or not there were faults with the service provided by Telecom. We reviewed but did not use Mr Smith's diaries (Telecom's examination of Mr Smith's diaries arrived in the week of 17 April 1995). Like Telecom, we separate the problems caused by Mr Smith's CPE from those in Telecom's service and concentrate only on the latter. A comprehensive log of Mr Smith's complaints does not appear to exist.

The Technical Report focuses only on the real faults which can now be determined with a sufficient degree of definiteness. We are not saying anything about other faults which may or may not have occurred but are not adequately documented. And unless pertinent documents have been withheld, it is our view that it will not be feasible for anyone to determine with certainty what other faults there might or might not have been.

One issue in the Cape Bridgewater case remains open, and we shall attempt to resolve it in the next few weeks, namely Mr Smith's complaints about billing problems.

Otherwise, the Technical Report on Cape Bridgewater is complete.

A key document is Telecom's Statutory Declaration of 12 December 1994. Without taking a position in regard to other parts of the document, we question three points raised in Telecom's Service History Statutory Declaration of 12 December 1994 (*Ref B004*).

### "Bogus" Complaints

First, Telecom states that Mr Smith made "bogus" complaints (*B004 p74, p78, Appendix 4, p10*). What they mean is his calls in June 1993 from Linton to test Telecom's fault recording. As others have indicated (see Coopers and Lybrand Review of Telecom Australia's Difficult Network Fault Policies and Procedures, November 1993, p6) "Telecom did not have established, national, documented complaint handling procedures [...] up to November 1992," and "documented complaint handling procedures were not fully implemented between November 1992 and October 1993." Furthermore, [p7] "fault handling procedures were deficient." Smith's June 1993 calls from Linton were, as he has stated, to test Telecom's fault reporting procedures, because people who had been unable to reach him told him that Telecom did not appear to be doing anything when they reported problems. We find Smith's tests in this instance to be unlikely to effect any useful results, but the term "bogus" does not apply.

A7A

**Alan's Copy****RESOURCE UNIT TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT****Mr. Alan Smith of Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp****30 April 1995****Introduction**

This document is DMR Group Inc.'s (Montreal, Canada) and Lane Telecommunications Pty Ltd's (Dulwich, South Australia) Technical Report on the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp COT case.

It is complete and final as it is.

To establish the context for our technical evaluation, we preface it with our positions on three specific details in Telecom's Service History. This is followed by a statement about other documentation which has been provided by both parties. And we provide a characterisation of the level of service which a customer such as Mr Smith could reasonably have expected.

Sections 1 and 2 itemise problems with Telecom's service to the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp in the period from February 1988 to October 1994. There were several different problems, sometimes more than one at a time, with several different causes. These are summarised in the Timeline at the end of the Introduction. They include:

- congestion
- low capacity
- exchange fault
- transmission equipment (RCM) faults
- calls wrongly directed to RVA (Recorded Voice Announcement)
- sundry reports with "no fault found" at the time
- Telecom testing
- programming error
- uncompleted 008 calls
- others.

Section 3 addresses the issue of problems with CPE (Customer Premises Equipment). It is not always clear to the customer where to draw the line between CPE and proper Telecom responsibilities, and Telecom did not succeed in making it clear to Mr Smith.

47B

Sections 4 and 5 are an impact assessment and summary. We have ascertained that there were times when the service provided by Telecom to Mr Smith, quite aside from problems with CPE, fell below a reasonable level. These times ranged in duration from years in some cases, to 18 months in one case, to an estimated 70 days in one case, to shorter times in other cases. These durations of poor service were, in our judgement, sufficiently severe to render Mr Smith's service from Telecom unreliable and deficient.

#### Cape Bridgewater Documentation

The "Fast Track" arbitration proceedings are "on documents and written submissions". More than 4,000 pages of documentation have been presented by both parties and examined by us. We have also visited the site. Not all of the documentation has real bearing on the question of whether or not there were faults with the service provided by Telecom. We reviewed but did not use Mr Smith's diaries (Telecom's examination of Mr Smith's diaries arrived in the week of 17 April 1995). Like Telecom, we separate the problems caused by Mr Smith's CPE from those in Telecom's service and concentrate only on the latter. A comprehensive log of Mr Smith's complaints does not appear to exist. ↙

The Technical Report focuses only on the real faults which can now be determined with a sufficient degree of definiteness. We are not saying anything about other faults which may or may not have occurred but are not adequately documented. And unless pertinent documents have been withheld, it is our view that it will not be feasible for anyone to determine with certainty what other faults there might or might not have been.

A key document is Telecom's Statutory Declaration of 12 December 1994. Without taking a position in regard to other parts of the document, we question three points raised in Telecom's Service History Statutory Declaration of 12 December 1994 [Ref B004].

#### "Bogus" Complaints

First, Telecom states that Mr Smith made "bogus" complaints [B004 p74, p78, Appendix 4, p10]. What they mean is his calls in June 1993 from Linton to test Telecom's fault recording. As others have indicated (see Coopers and Lybrand Review of Telecom Australia's Difficult Network Fault Policies and Procedures, November 1993, p6) "Telecom did not have established, national, documented complaint handling procedures [...] up to November 1992," and "documented complaint handling procedures were not fully implemented between November 1992 and October 1993." Furthermore, [p7] "fault handling procedures were deficient." Smith's June 1993 calls from Linton were, as he has stated, to test Telecom's fault reporting procedures, because people who had been unable to reach him told him that Telecom did not appear to be doing anything when they reported problems. We find Smith's tests in this instance to be unlikely to effect any useful results, but the term "bogus" does not apply.

There were occasions when Mr Smith mistook problems with his own CPE for Telecom faults, but this is a normal occurrence in the operation of any multi-vendor system, which the end-to-end telephone system increasingly is. Telecom takes pains to separate these CPE problems from the legitimate faults, which they acknowledge.

47B

# ARBITRATORS COPY

## Sources of Information

The information provided in this report has been derived and interpreted from the following documents:

- Smith - Letter of Claim (SM1)
- Smith - George Close Report dated 5/7/94 (SM8)
- Smith - George Close Report dated August 1994 (SM9)
- Smith - Telecom Defence Witness Statements
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Service History
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 1
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 2
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 3
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 4
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 5
- Smith - Telecom Australia - Ref 1 Statutory Declaration of Ross Marshall. Ref 2 An Introduction to Telecommunications in Australia. Ref 3 Telecom Australia's Network Philosophy. Ref 4 Glossary of Terms
- Smith - FOI Material 19 December 1994 (SM44)
- Smith - George Close & Associates Report 20 January 1995 - Reply to Telecom's Defence (SM50)
- Smith - Samples of FOI Telecom Documents (SM49)
- Smith - Appendix C Additional evidence (SM48)
- Smith - Summary of TF200 Report (SM47)
- Smith - Bell Canada International Inc. Further information (SM46)
- Smith - Additional information (SM45)

A site visit was conducted on Wednesday 4th April 1995 covering:

- inspection of the Cape Bridgewater RCM exchange
- inspection of the CPE at the Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
- inspection of the exchange equipment at Portland (RCM, AXE 104, ARF)
- discussions with Mr Alan Smith, accompanied by Mr Peter Gamble of Telecom Australia.

47c

# TELSTRA & ALAN SMITH'S COPY

## Sources of Information

The information provided in this report has been derived and interpreted from the following documents:

- Smith - Letter of Claim (SM1)
- Smith - George Close Report dated 5/7/94 (SM8)
- Smith - George Close Report dated August 1994 (SM9)
- Smith - FOI Material 1994 (SM44)
- Smith - George Close & Associates Report 20 January 1995 - Reply to Telecom's Defence (SM50)
- Smith - Samples of FOI Telecom Documents (SM49)
- Smith - Appendix C Additional evidence (SM48)
- Smith - Summary of TF200 Report (SM47)
- Smith - Bell Canada International Inc. Further information (SM46)
- Smith - Assessment Submission (SM2)

- 1-200 ←
- 200 - 400 ←
- 400 - 600 ←
- 600 - 800 ←
- 800 - 1,000 ←
- 1,000 - 1,289 ←
- 2,001 - 2,158 ←

NUMBERING SYSTEM  
USED IN THESE PARTICULAR  
CLAIM DOCUMENTS

- Smith - Reply 18 January 1995 (SM53) ←
- Smith - Reply - Brief Summary January 1995
- Smith - Further Examples of Additional Evidence Two Volumes (SM16) ←
- Smith - Further FOI Material (SM17) ←
- Smith - Cape Bridgewater Par 1 & 2 (SM 20 & 21) ←
- Smith - Additional information (SM45) ←
- Smith - Telecom Defence Witness Statements
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Service History
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 1
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 2
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 3
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 4
- Smith - Telecom Defence B004 Appendix File 5
- Smith - Telecom Australia - Ref 1 Statutory Declaration of Ross Marshall. Ref 2 An Introduction to Telecommunications in Australia. Ref 3 Telecom Australia's Network Philosophy. Ref 4 Glossary of Terms
- Smith - Telecom Defence Principal Submission
- Smith - Telecom Defence Legal Submission
- Smith - Telecom Supplement to Defence Documents

47D  
M34219

Telstra FOI Number