attached message on the 28th March. The attached message indicates that the problem did lie in the RCM and has been fixed. This was confirmed in a subsequent conversation with [redacted]

[redacted]

K00941

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC
Date: Monday, March 28, 1994 5:11PM
Priority: High

Grant,
Do you want any more on this RCM problem? [redacted] seems to have solved the problems and whilst the poor setting up of the supervisory system is a worry, I doubt if many new systems will be installed on copper bearers.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: CAPE1.DOC
Date: Monday, March 28, 1994 3:04PM
Priority: High

Please find attached the results of testing of problems with Cape Bridgewater RCM system . This is additional information to that provided by [redacted] on 23-3-94.

I hope this assists.

<<File Attachment: CAPE1.DOC>>

[redacted]

Pendlebury, Bruce

K00940

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc:
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC
Date: Tuesday, 26 April 1994 3:12PM

Bruce, for information.

Following a call from Alan Smith, I have just had a discussion with [redacted] re a complaint that Alan Smith lodged earlier today (Leopard No 364 608). I described to Les more accurately what the problem is and he will discuss my comments with [redacted].

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]; Black, Stephen; Rumble, Paul; [redacted]
Subject: RE: CAPE1.DOC
Date: Tuesday, 26 April 1994 2:33PM

John, thanks for the response.

I should have chased it up earlier, but I was on leave.

I am concerned to note that heat may be part of the problem. I had occasion earlier this year to get involved in another "ongoing" case involving an RCM with a heat problem at Murrumbateman (just outside Canberra). Although the problems experienced by the customer where different, as was the nature of the technical problem, the root cause seems to have been the same - viz heat.

I do note, however, that one of the symptoms from the Murrumbateman case was "Not Receiving Ring", something Alan Smith at Cape Bridgewater has been complaining about for some time.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC
Date: Tuesday, 26 April 1994 1:09PM
Priority: High

[redacted]

Please see reply from [redacted]. I dont know why you did not get a copy but I will follow up

Do you need anything else.

Regards

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: CAPE1.DOC
Date: Tuesday, April 26, 1994 12:40PM
Priority: High

[redacted],
Reference your Mail message enquiring about the status of the DNF at Cape Bridgewater, I sent the

Internal Memo

Telecom AUSTRALIA

To [redacted]

From David Polson
Technical Manager

K00942

Subject Cape Bridgewater RCM's

Date 24 March 1994

File

Attention [redacted]

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

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 consistant ar for a long period of time. The SCU and all common cards had previosly 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