

From: [Joe Piers](#)
To: [DHA Tribunal](#)
Subject: Honours and Awards Appeals submission
Date: Tuesday, 2 August 2022 11:42:18 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am confirming, as part of the Tribunal RCB submission review, my previous submission input for follow on/included recognition of/to Airfield Defence Guards (ADG) and Ground Defence Officers (GRDEFO) who were posted to Butterworth in that same review period ending 1989, as suggested by the RCB. My contention is based on the facts of the case that the Ground Defence Section provided an Operations Control Centre for all Officer Commanding tasks given to the Butterworth Rifle Company, and that that was done via the Senior GRDEFO of the Ground Defence Section. Part of the Ground Defence Section duty was to directly support the RCB and to be part of the Base Command and Control for the RCB tasking as well as other operational or Base tasking. And, in addition, the Ground Defence Section, was the only element at Butterworth, other than an "event" possibility of the Iroquois Search and Rescue (SAR) helicopter element and associated Medical staff, who actually went into, or close to, the Southern border of Thailand, adjacent to Butterworth i.e. of Kulim (Malaysia) and the Betong salient (Thailand). The purpose of those Ground Defence section regular visits, particularly to Kulim (Malaysian Police Field Force HQ for that area) was to obtain direct Intelligence from the Malaysian Field Police Kulim and the Thai equivalent in Betong, as to potential CPM threat to the Base and early warning of such. The secondary purpose for those visits was to liaise, coordinate and interface with relevant national elements, to be known, seen and trusted.

During it's 3 month tour of duty, the RCB remained in the close Butterworth area and was required to provide a quick reaction force element (QRF) at all times on call as part of the primary base security undertaken by Malaysian service elements. The RCB also undertook one major exercise training activity with the Malaysian Army at the Malaysian army field training area Johor, south of KL, occasionally accompanied by one GRDEF person, and usually towards the end of it's Butterworth duty period. A small element of the RCB remained at the Butterworth Base during that exercise period. The Company was also involved with IADS Air Defence exercises, when held, (every two years) training/practising Air Base protection/other roles in conjunction with Malaysian Defence Force elements.

A staff member of the Ground Defence Section was rostered to be on 24 hour call as part of Base security protocol and section requirement in support of the RCB and the Australian Officer Commanding.

The Ground Defence Section also controlled the Armoury, ammunition, the weapon firing range and the back-up HF Communications in support to the Australian element of the Butterworth Base and to the RCB. The posting period of the Ground Defence staff to Butterworth was 2 years + compared to the 3 months of the Rifle Company.

So, if the Tribunal Review finding accepts and supports the issues pertaining to the RCB contention and for the recognition of such, then, in my opinion, it is appropriate that the

recognition extends to, and includes the GRDEF element posted to Butterworth in the same period. There may be other service elements but my submission is limited to the Ground Defence Section and it's role in Base Security and the direct GRDEF/RCB interface.

I have an opinion of the Malaysian Pingat Jasa offer to the Commonwealth, if in any way relevant, but I am certain that the Tribunal is well placed to ascertain the relevance of that to the RCB contention.

Yours

Joe Piers

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows