



Thursday, 6 October 2011

Dear,

I am writing to you on a matter that is rapidly becoming a concern for us and by association must now be addressed by the Insurance Industry For a number of years the Vehicle Security suppliers have adhered to a "Star Rated" programme which as a founding member I helped develop in my capacity as the representative for Dynatron. From the outset the committee specifically set requirements that relied unequivocally upon AS/NZ, South African and British Thatcham Standards. The process was unambiguous and simply required a product to be "tabled" and to then have adequate and complete testing data to show compliance and finally, a Certificate of Compliance from a reputable and Accredited Testing Laboratory.

This process operated smoothly in the early years and only started to get into trouble once the process of "product revisions" began to creep into the market and when incomplete testing was conducted by Laboratories that were ill equipped and not accredited. As an "originator" of the Star Rated programme I was alone in my criticism of these subtle changes and when I dared to question these serious breeches, threatened with legal action from the offending suppliers.

Faced with what I considered to be unacceptable compromises of the "Star Rated" programme I tendered my immediate resignation in writing from the committee, citing my serious concerns and disassociated my Brand from what I saw as a "tainted chalice". Over the ensuing 8 years since Dynatron has continued to "pay its dues" by remaining a member of the NZSA and because of this Dynatron product has always been "Star rated", that is up until now. As of mid 2010 Dynatron resigned as members of the NZSA, simply because by association we were guilty of agreeing to remain a part of what I regard as simply a conspiracy to defraud the public and insurers. Being a party to this and paying for the privilege was not something I was going to tolerate any longer. The reaction by the "committee" which is comprised of a conclave of my commercial competitors – has been to circulate and publicly declare that Dynatron is no longer "Star Rated" and not insurance approved.

As you can understand this is so far from the truth that if it wasn't serious, it would be laughable. Let me explain.

1. The "Star Rating" system was designed to simplify the 3 different international standards and put them into three easily understood and separate categories.
2. The "Star Rating" system relies on these International Standards for their validity.
3. A Product to be "Star Rated" must FIRST and foremost have a certificate of Compliance issued BEFORE it can be "Star rated".

4. "Star Rating" may not be a compulsory but TO BE Star Rated a product SHALL have a Certificate of Compliance.
5. A "Star Rated" product shall not differ from the product tested and approved in the original Certificate.
6. If any major or minor changes are made, then these SHALL be retested in accordance with the 'provisions for a retest' as prescribed in the "Standards document" and a new certificate issued.

Not rocket science, yet somehow all this has been lost in translation. I believe the NZSA or at the very least their representative Committee have stepped over the mark on so many issues that the "Star rating" programme is now totally corrupt. The fact that we HAVE to pay thousands of dollars in subscriptions and fees for our company and installers to remain members and to then have the "Star Rating" is illegitimate and I would hazard a guess – illegal. The NZSA could charge us a fee to use the "Star Rating" logo, which the law allows and we'd simply have to present a Certificate of Compliance to validate our right to publicise the fact? That I believe is totally legitimate –but compelled to join the "club" when I know it is morally corrupt is not an option.

Harsh language you think? I am furious when I see companies now changing their products and continuing to say these are star rated, based on tests done 15 years ago on products that bear no resemblance to the products sold today. We in contrast have not changed any components from the day our products were tested and Certified to today. We are laughed at for having to pedal the same technology – only the remote has changed and it remains standards certified.

Brands have been tested by Laboratories here in NZ that have no Accreditation and cannot do the all important and critical RF testing. These products have 3; 4 and 5 Star Ratings and yet 60% of the testing was never done. Other products have submitted to this cheap and cheerful solution and its all cosy. I know where a 3 star product has been tested to the Immobiliser only standard, then with a siren and glassbreak it suddenly has a 4 star rating; add a battery backup siren and it's now suddenly a 5 Star! This is patently wrong and at no time does an Immobiliser only product get to be approved as if it was fully tested to the AS/NZS 4601 Immobiliser alarm standard – unless it's "Star rated" – of course you can!

My suggestions are:

1. The "Vehicle Security Committee" at the NZSA be immediately disbanded and disassociated from the NZSA
2. That the NZSA institute a programme not unlike the "Kiwi Made" logo and "invite" Certified product to "apply for use of the "Star rated" logo on a "User pays" proviso.
3. That an application to be "STAR Rated" would see the product and certificate be "rechecked" and verified by an independent person or body (MTA?)
4. The supplier shall be required to sign a "statutory Declaration" affirming that the product tested is the exact same product referred to in the Certificate.

5. Declare that the Testing has been fully completed in accordance with all the Standards testing requirements
6. No changes have been made subsequent to the Certificate that would constitute a major revision requiring a retest as defined by the document of fact.

I have resisted any involvement in the NZSA subsequent to the threat to sue simply because I just didn't want to go down that path. Now that these issues have become public and tantamount to commercial blackmail, I am angry. I am told that insurance companies are now "hearing" we are not "Star rated" and know that this is starting to affect our Brand loyalties and hurting us commercially. Only yesterday a large dealership advised us that they would no longer promote or sell our product because it was not "Star Rated" and they "didn't want to be liable" if our product was no longer insurance approved? They got all this directly from one of our competitors who is also a member of the NZSA Committee. His product has now replaced all ours and the loss to us in into the tens of thousands of dollars and could affect our supplier relationships with Key accounts and here we are talking hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The fact is that to be "Star rated" a product must first and foremost be "Standards Certified" The NZSA Committee have got this about face – they now regard "Star Rating" as being exclusive to a subscription and membership formula and that's forcing us to join a compulsory organisation or suffer commercially? This is akin to every car insurance underwriter having to pay to join the "Motor Committee" just to say they can insure motor vehicles?

In closing, we need to address this urgently and if not then I will be forced to seek an injunction against the NZSA and committee. If "Star Rating" relies on a Certificate that is issued in respect to a "Standard" then we, having that Certificate untainted – by definition have achieved the requisite "Star rating".

I await your reply.

Best regards

## Ron Campbell

**DYNATRON**  
Ron Campbell  
Managing Director  
Dynatron NZ Ltd.  
09 4155686.