

Dear Kate,

Many who sent submissions were upset to see that no mention was made of their input, as was done in the NZ "To Be Who I Am" HRC report.

I was also very upset, that after Graham Innes asked via Sarah Winter, if I would pass on my contacts in Canberra, in order to save the limited time available. This was to ascertain that what I had received from DIAC and DFAT was correct. I know that this happened, as both departments told me it had. Although verified as true, those details were never used in the "Sex Files report". They answered the questions concerning how to amend documentation within both of these departments. Also that DFAT, Passport Office, was to set up a designated page on their web site to help Trans people needing to amend their passport. I was also denied being able to place these details on the blog site.

The details from both DIAC and DFAT can be accessed via my web site, [www.changingaspects.com](http://www.changingaspects.com) on the Advocacy page and then "How you can amend your documentation via DIAC and DFAT. We have also added the next part about the need to use form B11 from passport offices.

As to the letters from the Federal Attorney-General concerning staying married after surgery, the most important one was sent to me on the day of the launch of "Sex Files" in Canberra, which I attended. That letter and the previous one concerning "Deeming" are in the attachment along with a letter from Centrelink, also concerning staying married after surgery. I also understood that defined superannuation benefits were to be backdated to 01-01-2009.

To have worked hard over two years with a very dear friend and her partner ("They have stayed married") on this problem only to be questioned about the very existence of these letters, was mortifying

- (a) Why were the DIAC and DFAT results not published in the "Sex Files report"?
- (b) Why were my letters from the Federal Attorney-General never made public?
- (c) Why was I not believed at the National LGBT conference?
- (d) Why did only three of the people who questioned my veracity come to the special meeting arranged to show them parts of those letters.
- (e) Very importantly, why were the responses from DIAC and DFAT buried?
- (f) Why were all copies of what I sent concerning the above never made public by the AHRC?

I feel very strongly about this, and wonder if it has some thing to do with waiting for answers from the Federal Attorney-General's Office and the announcement we were told about at your meeting.

If what I had sent the AHRC had been made common knowledge, then many would not be still awaiting answers as to amending documentation, and staying married

Yours Sincerely  
Kathy Anne Noble  
Changing Aspects