

stances. He contends, among other things, that Ideal has not attempted to negotiate with American Benefit to obtain its agreement to a sale of Builders to a third party and the substitution of the proceeds of the sale for the Builders' stock involved in the current American Benefit litigation. The director further states that it is evident respondent has not exhausted the possibilities in offering indemnification terms to prospective acquirers to induce them to purchase Builders.

The issue here goes not to the substance of the order, but to the time for compliance under the order. Respondent concedes that it does not seek to be relieved of the obligations of divestiture. Thus, we have here a question which concerns the subject of compliance and appropriately should be disposed of through regular compliance procedures. Furthermore, there is no showing of changed conditions of fact or law or considerations of public interest such as would justify a reopening of the proceeding. In the circumstances, we will deny respondent's request.

ORDER DENYING PETITION TO REOPEN PROCEEDINGS

This matter having come before the Commission upon respondent's petition, filed May 8, 1972, pursuant to Section 3.72(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, requesting that this proceeding be reopened for the purpose of modifying the order issued by the Commission on May 19, 1966 [68 F.T.C. 762], and upon the answer of the Director, Bureau of Competition, in opposition to such petition; and

The Commission, for the reasons stated in the accompanying opinion, having determined that the petition should be denied:

It is ordered, That respondent's petition requesting that this proceeding be reopened for the purpose of modifying the order issued by the Commission May 19, 1966, be and it hereby is, denied.

ASH GROVE CEMENT COMPANY

Docket 8785. Order, June 29, 1972

Order denying respondent's application for review of hearing examiner's order denying cement cost subpoena *duces tecum*.

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

This matter is before the Commission upon the submission by respondent, filed June 6, 1972, entitled "Respondent's Appeal From The Examiner's May 11, 1972, Order Denying Cement Cost Sub-

poenas Duces Tecum.”¹ Complaint counsel, on June 13, 1972, filed an answer in opposition thereto.

Respondent has not attempted to demonstrate nor does the record show that its application comes within the Commission's rule on interlocutory appeals (Section 3.23 published in the Federal Register March 17, 1972, Vol. 37, No. 53, p. 5608, and effective fifteen days thereafter on April 1, 1972). This rule provides that an interlocutory appeal may be made only at the discretion of the Commission upon an application for review and limits any such appeal to the four categories listed in Paragraph (a) of the rule and to those instances in which the hearing examiner makes a determination of justification as required in Paragraph (b) of the rule. There is no showing that the instant submission comes within either category.

Instead, respondent contends, that the rules governing the proceedings were changed in the course of the hearings which hearings have not been completed, and that the Commission rule applicable for an interlocutory appeal in this matter is the rule in effect at the time of the issuance of the complaint. Specifically, it contends that former Rule Section 3.35(b) applies to its submission.

Respondent cites *Union-Bag Camp Paper Corporation*, Docket No. 7946, 66 F.T.C. 1542 (1964), in support of its position. In that case the Commission determined that pending cases would be governed by rules in effect prior to the date of the rule changes made in that period. The holding there dealt with a different situation and is not a precedent for the changes made effective April 1, 1972. The Federal Register in connection with the announcement of the April 1, 1972, rule changes contains the following statement:

These amendments are effective 15 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER and will govern all proceedings initiated on or after the aforesaid effective date and the remaining procedures in all proceedings pending on the aforesaid effective date.” (Emphasis supplied.) (Federal Register, Vol. 37 No. 53, March 17, 1972, Page 5608)

Thus, it is apparent that the amended rules are to apply to pending proceedings as well as all new matters. Commission orders applying the rule changes effective April 1, 1972, to pending proceedings include *Missouri Portland Cement Company*, Docket No. 8783 (April 28, 1972) [p. 1035 herein] and *Eaton, Yale & Towne, Inc.*, Docket No. 8826 (May 3, 1972) [p. 2036 herein].

¹ The submission herein termed an appeal is not timely filed under either the Commission's present rules or its previously effective rules since both state that the filing of the appropriate document with the Commission be within five days after notice of the hearing examiner's ruling.

Furthermore, respondent has made no showing that the change in the Commission's rule on interlocutory appeals will work an injustice for it or will affect its substantive rights.

Respondent's appeal, treated herein as an application for review, will be denied, not on the merits of the appeal which have not been considered, but on the ground that respondent has not satisfied the requirements for appeal under applicable Rule Section 3.23 of the Commission's Rules of Practice. Accordingly,

It is ordered, That respondent's appeal, treated as an application for review, be, and it hereby is, denied.

ADVISORY OPINIONS WITH REQUESTS THEREFOR*

Establishment of an information pool which would serve as a conduit for referral of complaints by members and responses by manufacturers. (File No. 723 7005)

Opinion Letter

JANUARY 7, 1972.

DEAR MR. FELLMAN:

This is in response to your request for an advisory opinion concerning a proposal of The Section to establish a pool of information regarding members' experiences with equipment they use in their operations and to serve as a conduit for referral of members' complaints and the manufacturers' responses.

In brief, it is the Commission's understanding The Section has devised forms which its members will be invited to fill in showing the make and model of machines they use in their operations and to describe their experiences with regard to installation, maintenance, and operation of the machines.

Manufacturers of the equipment would be apprised of the plan before it is put into effect.

Some of the forms would be used to describe a member's complaints and would be submitted to the manufacturer via The Section. Manufacturers would be encouraged to respond via The Section.

*Prior to October 29, 1969, in conformity with the policy of the Commission, advisory opinions were confidential and available to the public only in digest form. Digests of advisory opinions were published in the Federal Register. The policy was changed on October 29, 1969, to provide for publication of advisory opinions and requests therefor, including names and details, when rendered, subject to any limitations on public disclosure arising from statutory restrictions, the Commission's rules, and the public interest. The policy was again changed on December 22, 1971, to provide for the placement in the Commission's public record of advisory opinions and requests therefor, including names and details, immediately after the requesting party has received the Commission's advice, subject to any limitations on public disclosure arising from statutory restrictions, the Commission's rules, and the public interest.

In the case of requests for advice concerning proposed mergers, the requests together with supporting materials are placed on the public record as soon after they are received as circumstances permit, except for information for which confidential classification has been requested, with a showing therefor, and which the Commission, with due regard to statutory restrictions, its rules, and the public interest, has determined should not be made public. Any advice given under Section 1.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice concerning proposed mergers, together with a statement of supporting reasons, are published when given.

None of the forms would contain information regarding the price which the member had paid for the equipment, service charges or the like.

The filled-in forms would be placed in folders in The Section's offices in Arlington, Virginia, and would be available, after the names of complaining members had been deleted, to members participating in the plan and to prospective entrants into the industry. Manufacturers of the equipment also would have access but only to the folders pertaining to their own equipment and not to that of other manufacturers.

It is the Commission's opinion, based on the available information, that initiation of the plan, in and of itself, would not be violative of Commission administered law. However, the Commission is of the view that great care must be used in implementing the plan to avoid its becoming illegally coercive either on members who choose not to participate or on manufacturers against whom complaints are lodged or regarding whose equipment information is maintained. Special care must be used to prevent the program being used to boycott or intimidate particular manufacturers.

Participation by members must be completely voluntary and The Section may not deny access to the information in the folders to any affected party, including members of the industry, although a reasonable fee may be charged for such access.

With regard to the manufacturers and their equipment, The Section only may perform a reportorial service. It may not evaluate particular equipment and make recommendations regarding its use or prepare lists of "approved" manufacturers or equipment. The reason is that for The Section, or for members collectively, to do so in the context of the plan would suggest that an illegal boycott or blacklist had been established.

Lastly, you are advised that the Commission intends to examine the operation of the program after a reasonable period of time to determine whether it has been the vehicle for any anticompetitive actions stemming from abuse of the plan.

By direction of the Commission.

Supplemental Letter Relative to Request

AUGUST 25, 1971.

DEAR MR. DUFRESNE:

In response to your inquiry of August 26, 1971 with regard to the subject matter, we wish to advise you that the SIC number for cold type composition equipment manufacturers is: 3555. The SIC number for members of the cold type composition industry is: 2791.

In reviewing our letter of July 2, 1971 to the Commission, we find that there is a possible ambiguity on Page 4 of the letter. In the last sentence of the first paragraph on Page 4, we refer to a situation wherein CTC may receive no response from a manufacturer in connection with this program. We state:

In the event that the manufacturer does not cooperate with CTC and does not respond to our member's complaints, this fact will also be noted.

This sentence should read:

In the event that a manufacturer chooses not to participate in the CTC program and does not respond to the member's complaints, this fact will also be noted as indicated in Form VIII by the sentence: "The manufacturer does (does not) respond to the member complaint forms"

We also wish to clarify the reason that the names of complaining parties will be excised from the material on file that is available for industry members' inspection. It has been our experience that unless a complaining party is assured of some anonymity, he may be extremely reluctant to send in his complaint. For this reason, the complaining party's name will not be included in the public file. This in no way changes the fact that the name of the complaining party will obviously be submitted to the manufacturer in question so that the manufacturer is able to answer the complaint.

If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

COUNIHAN, CASEY & LOOMIS.
/s/ STEVEN JOHN FELLMAN.

Letter of Request

JULY 2, 1971.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

We are writing to you on behalf of our client, the Cold Type Composition Section of Printing Industries of America, Inc., in request for an advisory opinion as to whether the operation of a proposed Maintenance Referral Service would violate the laws administered by the Commission. The Printing Industries of America is a national trade association which is composed of state and area printing industry associations and certain national sections, dealing in specifically limited areas of trades.

The Cold Type Composition Section of PIA is one of such national sections. Its membership is primarily composed of those persons and firms who do composition work using either direct impression or photo composition equipment or both.

Many of the firms which are members of the Cold Type Composition Section are small to medium sized firms. The cold type equipment which they must purchase in order to enter this area of competition is extremely expensive and highly sophisticated from a technical standpoint. During the past several years, many members have reported that they have run into substantial difficulty in that expensive machinery did not operate in accord with expectations. Specifically, the main area of concern involved maintenance problems. The expense of this machinery is such that the average firm cannot afford to have excess capacity available. Thus, if a machine is out of order, the company's operations are seriously curtailed. It therefore is of extreme importance to be able to evaluate a prospective purchase of new equipment on the basis of accurate information as to the reliability of the equipment and the availability of prompt and efficient maintenance service. It is with the goal of providing the cold type composition industry with such information that the Cold Type Composition Section of Printing Industries of America wishes to establish a Maintenance Referral Service. It is our expectation that the operation of this service will have the important additional benefit of enabling manufacturers to identify promptly areas which are causing problems with the result that immediate corrective action may be taken to the betterment of the entire industry.

Enclosed herewith are eight forms that have been prepared as samples of what would be used by the Section in operation of the Service. As can be seen from an examination of these forms, the basic purpose of the Service is to obtain from industry members a record of actual experience with various types of equipment. This record would then be made available to other industry members who are considering the purchase of new equipment. The Association will be serving as a central source through which anyone will have the opportunity to submit information and in the same vein, any one who submits information will have the opportunity to obtain information.

Let us examine each form in detail.

The first form involves information as to the user's experience with regard to installation and operation under the warranty period. It is of extreme importance that our members know whether equipment will be delivered on time as promised, and whether equipment can be made operational within a reasonable time after delivery. This form provides information identifying the machine, the buyer, delivery data, warranty data, production downtime, and furthermore, indicates whether or not complaints are handled to the satisfaction of the purchaser.

Form 2 identifies the purchaser and the equipment purchased, and then provides specific information with regard to maintenance experience.

All industry members will be requested to fill out Form 1 within six months of the purchase of a new piece of machinery. Thereafter they will be requested to fill out Form 2 on a periodic, probably annual, basis.

Form 3 is a combination of Form 1 and Form 2. At the outset of this program, there will be no data available, so CTC intends to obtain information concerning past experience both regarding installation and maintenance via the combined experience form, Form 3.

Form 4 is a complaint form. Any industry member who has a complaint concerning maintenance or service of a cold type machine will have the option to fill out a complaint form and submit it to CTC. This form contains a description of the complaint and identifies the purchaser and the equipment involved. CTC will obligate itself to submit all complaints submitted to the manufacturer of the piece of equipment involved. This will be done without any evaluation on the part of CTC through the use of a form letter as set forth in Form 5. When the manufacturer replies to a complaint, a copy of the reply will be forwarded to the complaining member and the matter will be automatically considered closed unless we hear from the complainant to the contrary within ten days. This will be accomplished via Form 6.

In the event that the complaining member is not satisfied with the manufacturer's reply and forwards a written response objecting thereto, said written response will be forwarded to the manufacture in accord with Form 7. All the complaint files will be maintained at the offices of the Cold Type Composition Section. Any industry member who is willing to provide CTC with his experience in purchasing machinery (if he has purchased machinery) or any firm that seriously is considering entry into the market, will have access to all the information in the CTC files regardless of whether that firm is a member of CTC. All information reported to members by CTC shall be reported via Form 8.

This form identifies the model and manufacturer of the machine, the number of machines that are in operation to our knowledge, the number of reports that we have had on the machine and reports the experiences on record with regard to delivery, warranty, service, operation, and handling of complaints. In the event that the manufacturer does not cooperate with CTC and does not respond to our member's complaints, this fact will also be noted.

Finally, all records of the Cold Type Composition Section will be available for detailed inspection by any industry member who wishes

to come to the CTC headquarters. Thus, in addition to Form 8, an industry member will have the opportunity to sit down and examine the material on file at the CTC offices in Arlington, Virginia. The only material that will be excluded from the file will be the identification of complaining parties.

The system set forth above has been designed to insure that the operation involved will be fair to both manufacturers and industry members. Prior to the implementation of such a program, manufacturers will be given the opportunity to sit down with CTC and learn about the program.

It is felt that by providing the means for an exchange of information of this nature, CTC will be promoting competition in the cold type composition industry by enabling the small manufacturer and the small buyer to obtain some of the market information of vital importance that has heretofore been unavailable.

Naturally before the Commission can make a decision in this matter it will be necessary to consider information concerning the economics of the industry involved.

The term cold type composition basically refers to the practice of generating type composition by printers by any means other than traditional hot metal casting. Specifically, these processes include "strike on", or direct impression methods similar to typewriting; "photocomposition", whereby a character image is exposed to film or paper; "electronic composition", whereby characters are generated on the face of a cathode ray tube and then exposed to film or paper; plus a variety of miscellaneous operations including manually assembled type.

Prior to the advent of cold type composition, the great majority of type in the United States was created on hot metal casting machines. These machines were costly (approximately \$50,000), difficult to operate, and of such size and complexity that the great majority of all composition work was done in composition trade shops which served several firms.

Today, the technology of the cold type composition machine has brought a significant change in the internal printing industry markets. The costs of cold type composition machines range from \$2,000 to \$20,000 for standard direct impression units and \$10,000 to \$50,000 for standard photomechanical composition units. The speed of operation provided by these highly sophisticated machines has enabled many non-printers to adopt and utilize cold type machinery to meet their own printing needs. Although many cold type machines are installed in printing firms and traditional trade shops, as represented by the Cold Type Composition Section of Printing Industries of

America, a much larger percentage of total production, especially of the typewriter-like, lower cost units, have been purchased or leased by the traditional non-printer customers of the printing industry. All in all, the members of the Cold Type Composition Section of P.I.A. represent a rather small percentage of the total number of cold type users in the United States.

The United States Department of Commerce estimates that there are some 38,000 printers in the United States. Industry sources believe that approximately one-third of these comprise the potential market for cold type equipment.

Thus, there are at least 12,500 potential customers for cold type equipment in the printing industry. Since printers comprise a small percentage of the total market, it is estimated that the total market consists of more than 40,000 potential buyers. The entire membership of the P.I.A. totals only approximately 6,000 firms of which only approximately 125 firms are active members of the Cold Type Composition Section. It can be seen that the Cold Type Composition Section of P.I.A. contains only a small portion of the total market for cold type composition equipment.

It should also be noted that there are approximately 3,000 newspapers being published in the United States. Every newspaper is a potential user of cold type composition equipment and many newspapers have been using such equipment for some time. Newspaper publishers belong to either the American News Publishers Association or the Publishers Auxiliary or other such trade associations. Very few, if any, newspaper publishers are members of P.I.A. or the Cold Type Composition Section of P.I.A.

The Cold Type Composition Section of P.I.A. has a membership that has been traditionally made up of firms which are small and medium size cold type trade shops. Many of these firms have as few as five employees and do an annual volume of business of \$150,000 and up. The majority of these firms have installed some printing equipment such as multiliths but still have an annual volume of business which is often under \$1,000,000. Our members also include composition departments of basically printing firms. These firms may have an annual volume of business of between \$2,000,000-\$3,000,000 under typical conditions but actual composition work represents only 10% or less of this amount. The printing industry is unique among general manufacturers in that it is composed of a large number of small firms. Among P.I.A. as a whole, the average member has twenty employees and enjoys a volume of business of approximately \$600,000. P.I.A. has less than 400 members in the United States which have one hundred or more employees.

By contrast, the manufacturers of cold type equipment are large companies. We estimate that there are approximately twenty firms who manufacture this equipment. Among the five largest firms are International Business Machines, Inc.; Harris Intertype Corporation, Intertype Division; Varityper, a Division of Addressograph-Multilith; Photon Compographic Corporation and Mergenthaler Linotype Division, ELTRA Corporation.

As can be readily seen, the membership of CTC can have only insignificant economic effect on companies of this nature individually or collectively and therefore the need to collect this trade information becomes important as a means of maintaining competition through essentially an educational endeavor.

We wish to make it clear that the operation of the maintenance referral service is expected to take only a minimum amount of time. It is anticipated that not more than five hours per week of clerical time will be devoted to the operation of the service at a cost of approximately \$1,000 per year. Another \$1,000 per year of staff executive time will be required plus an additional \$500 for facility usage.

The Cold Type Composition Section presently has dues revenue budget at \$10,000. Thus from a practical standpoint it becomes difficult to readily envision a complicated program requiring more time. Under such circumstances we would not wish to consider utilizing the services of an outside accounting firm or other consultant to operate the maintenance referral service. To do so would require an expenditure of monies which are not presently available.

We wish to make it clear that the chances of this service turning into a means of unintentionally boycotting any supplier are nonexistent. The disparity in economic power between the seller and the buyers are such that the entire membership of the Cold Type Composition Section could stop buying from all manufacturers without a substantial effect on the total market of any manufacturer.

We would appreciate your providing us with the Commission's views on this program as soon as possible.

In the event that there are any questions concerning the program's operation, we will be glad to provide whatever information is necessary.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

COUNIHAN, CASEY & LOOMIS,
/s/ STEVEN JOHN FELLMAN.

MAINTENANCE REFERRAL SERVICE

INSTALLATION AND WARRANTY EXPERIENCE DATA FORM 1

Purchaser data:

Individual name_____ Title _____
Company name_____ Phone _____
Address_____

(Street, City, State, ZIP Code)

Equipment data:

Manufacturer_____

Machine model No._____ Serial No._____

Date acquired_____ New ☐ Used ☐

How acquired: Purchased ☐ Leased ☐ Rented ☐

Delivery data:

Number of days between the time you signed the contract to acquire the equipment and the time of physical delivery of the equipment:

Actual: _____ days. Promised: _____ days.

Number of days between the time of physical delivery of equipment and completion of installation by manufacturer's representative in such a manner as to make the machine operational under your normal operating conditions:

Actual: _____ days. Promised: _____ days.

Describe the reason for any difference between the actual and promised times set forth in the questions above:_____

Warranty data:

Was the machine covered by a warranty: Yes ☐ No ☐

If covered by a warranty, for how many days: _____

If covered by a warranty, did the warranty include only parts ☐
or both parts and labor ☐

During the warranty period (after the machine was placed in production operation) how many hours of downtime* per week did you experience:

1-5 hours ☐ 5-10 hours ☐ 10-20 hours ☐ over 20 hours ☐

If complaints were made to the manufacturer during the warranty period, were the complaints handled to your satisfaction:

All of the time_____ ☐
A majority of the time_____ ☐
Less than the majority of the time_____ ☐
We had no complaints_____ ☐

What was the number of planned production hours per week for the piece of equipment during the warranty period: _____

*Note: Downtime is referred to as the number of planned production hours per week lost due to machine malfunction and does not include preventive maintenance.

MAINTENANCE REFERRAL SERVICE

SERVICE PERFORMANCE EXPERIENCE DATA FORM 2

Purchaser data:

Individual name----- Title-----
Company name----- Phone-----
Address-----
(Street, City, State, ZIP Code)

Equipment data:

Manufacturer-----
Machine model No. ----- Serial No. -----
Date acquired----- New ☐ Used ☐
How acquired: Purchased ☐ Leased ☐ Rented ☐

Maintenance data:

Since the expiration of the warranty, what has been the average number of hours per week that you have operated the machine: -----.

Since the expiration of the warranty, what has been the average number of hours per week downtime* you have experienced in connection with the operation of this machine: -----.

If service requests have been made to the manufacturer after the expiration of the warranty, have such requests been handled to your satisfaction:

All of the time----- ☐
A majority of the time----- ☐
Less than the majority of the time----- ☐
No requests for service made----- ☐

Since the expiration of the warranty, has this machine been covered by a maintenance contract: Yes ☐ No ☐

Since the expiration of the warranty, has the machine been covered by a time and materials agreement, rather than a maintenance contract: Yes ☐ No ☐

*Note: Downtime is referred to as the number of planned production hours per week lost due to machine malfunction and does not include preventive maintenance.

MAINTENANCE REFERRAL SERVICE

COMBINED EXPERIENCE DATA FORM 3

Purchaser Data:

Individual name----- Title -----
Company name----- Phone -----
Address -----
(Street, City, State, ZIP Code)

Equipment data:

Manufacturer -----
Machine model No. ----- Serial No. -----
Date acquired----- New ☐ Used ☐
How acquired: Purchased ☐ Leased ☐ Rented ☐

Delivery Data:

Number of days between the time you signed the contract to acquire the equipment and the time of physical delivery of the equipment:

Actual: ----- days. Promised: ----- days.

Number of days between the time of physical delivery of equipment and completion of installation by manufacturer's representative in such a manner as to make the machine operational under your normal operating conditions:

Actual: ----- days. Promised: ----- days.

Describe the reason for any difference between the actual and promised times set forth in the questions above: -----

Warranty data:

Was the machine covered by a warranty: Yes ☐ No ☐

If covered by a warranty, for how many days: -----

If covered by a warranty, did the warranty include only parts ☐ or both parts and labor ☐

During the warranty period (after the machine was placed in production operation) how many hours of downtime* per week did you experience:

1-5 hours ☐ 5-10 hours ☐ 10-20 hours ☐ over 20 hours ☐

If complaints were made to the manufacturer during the warranty period, were the complaints handled to your satisfaction:

All of the time ----- ☐

A majority of the time ----- ☐

Less than the majority of the time ----- ☐

We had no complaints ----- ☐

What was the number of planned production hours per week for the piece of equipment during the warranty period: -----

Maintenance data:

Since the expiration of the warranty, what has been the average number of hours per week that you have operated the machine: -----

Since the expiration of the warranty, what has been the average number of hours per week downtime you have experienced in connection with operation of this machine: -----

If service requests have been made to the manufacturer after the expiration of the warranty, have such requests been handled to your satisfaction:

All of the time ----- ☐

A majority of the time ----- ☐

Less than the majority of the time ----- ☐

No requests for service made ----- ☐

Since the expiration of the warranty, has this machine been covered by a maintenance contract: Yes ☐ No ☐

Since the expiration of the warranty, has the machine been covered by a time and materials agreement, rather than a maintenance contract: Yes ☐ No ☐

*Note: Downtime is referred to as the number of planned production hours per week lost due to machine malfunction and does not include preventive maintenance.

MAINTENANCE REFERRAL SERVICE

COMPLAINT REPORT FORM IV

Complaint No. _____

Date _____

Purchaser data:

Individual name _____ Title _____

Company name _____ Phone _____

Address _____

(Street, City, State, ZIP Code)

Equipment data:

Manufacturer _____

Machine model No. _____ Serial No. _____

Date acquired _____ New ☐ Used ☐How acquired: Purchased ☐ Leased ☐ Rented ☐

Average number of hours per week that machine has been in production operation: _____

Explanation (if necessary) _____

Is complaint under warranty: Yes ☐ No ☐ If so, give warranty number _____, or send a copy of warranty.Is complaint under maintenance or rental contract: Yes ☐ No ☐ If so, give maintenance contract No. _____; rental contract No. _____

Describe complaint: _____

MAINTENANCE REFERRAL SERVICE

MANUFACTURER ADVICE REQUEST FORM V

Complaint No. _____

Date _____

DEAR MANUFACTURER:

The National Cold Type Composition Section of PIA operates a Maintenance Referral Service. We have asked our members to report to us information with regard to maintenance experience on various types of machinery. In order to maintain fairness to all parties, we try to get both sides to every experience report.

Enclosed is a complaint submitted to us with regard to one of your products. The model number, serial number, and purchaser of the product are clearly indicated.

We would appreciate your evaluation of this complaint. In the event that affirmative steps will be taken to eliminate what may be a misunderstanding, we would appreciate your advice so that we may include such information in our files.

Very truly yours,

MEMBER RESPONSE ONE

FORM VI

Complaint No.-----
Date -----

DEAR MEMBER:

Enclosed is the reply we received from the Manufacturer regarding your complaint.

Please advise us if you consider this reply satisfactory. Unless we hear from you within ten days, we will assume that this matter is closed.

Very truly yours,

MANUFACTURER ADVICE REQUEST TWO

FORM VII

Complaint No.-----
Date -----

DEAR MANUFACTURER:

Enclosed is our member's reply to your letter of _____. We would appreciate your advice as to your position with reference to this reply.

Very truly yours,

MAINTENANCE REFERRAL SERVICE

MEMBER REPORT FORM VIII

DEAR MEMBER:

The following information is submitted in response to your recent request:

Equipment data:

Manufacturer -----

Machine model No.----- Serial No.-----

Our records indicate that the basic model of this machine was introduced in year _____, and that there have been _____ modifications since that time.

Approximately _____ hundred of said machines have been installed within the last years.

We have had _____ reports on the specific model that you have inquired about.

Our reports indicate that delivery time for this machine has ranged from _____ to _____ days, and deliveries have been from _____ to _____ days of the promised delivery time.

This machine is (is not) covered by a warranty which includes parts or parts and labor and lasts for a period of _____ days.

During the warranty period, our members have experienced an average of _____ hours downtime* per week and operated this equipment for an average of _____ hours per week.

*Note: Downtime is referred to as the number of planned production hours per week lost due to machine malfunction and does not include preventive maintenance.

After the expiration of the warranty, the equipment has been run by our members for an average of between ----- and ----- hours per week, with a down-time range of between ----- and ----- hours per week.

Service requests made to the manufacturer during the warranty period were handled satisfactorily :

All of the time----- ☐
A majority of the time----- ☐
Less than the majority of the time----- ☐
No requests were made----- ☐

Service requests made to the manufacturer after the warranty period were handled satisfactorily :

All of the time----- ☐
A majority of the time----- ☐
Less than the majority of the time----- ☐
No requests were made----- ☐

Since the expiration of the warranty, -----% reporting have this machine under a complete maintenance agreement, -----% reporting have this machine under a maintenance agreement including parts only, and -----% have this machine under a straight time and materials agreement.

We have received ----- complaints from members during the last ----- months regarding this piece of equipment. ----- of these complaints were handled to the satisfaction of our members.

The manufacturer does (does not) respond to our member complaint forms.

All of our records with regard to this piece of equipment are available for your inspection. To arrange an appointment for such an inspection, please contact -----