

Compliance plan for NZTA Waipa DUML Audit 2018

Deriving submission information		
Non-compliance	Description	
Audit Ref: 2.1 With: Clause 11(1) of Schedule 15.3 From: unknown To: 30-Apr-18	Database extract used for submission is not up to date resulting in an estimated under submission of 90,422.65 kWh per annum. The database used to prepare submissions contains some inaccurate information. The database accuracy is assessed to be 95.5% indicating an estimated over submission of 13,000 kWh per annum. The database is not complete as ballasts are not recorded in the RAMM database. Potential impact: High Actual impact: High Audit history: None Controls: Weak Breach risk rating: 9	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
High	The controls are rated as weak as they are unlikely to mitigate risk and remove errors. The impact is assessed to be high, based on the kWh differences.	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will meet with the customer to explain the compliance obligations and to request that a full inventory count is undertaken for each ICP. TRUS will work with the customer to ensure the database is updated and monthly reporting to TRUS is established.	30/06/18 TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit.	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Field audit to be completed, new reporting put in place	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	

ICP identifier and items of load		
Non-compliance	Description	
Audit Ref: 2.2 With: Clause 11(2)(a) and (aa) of Schedule 15.3 From: unknown To: 30-Apr-18	ICP number not recorded correctly in RAMM. ICP not recorded against each item of load in the database. Potential impact: Medium Actual impact: Unknown Audit history: Twice previously Controls: Weak Breach risk rating: 4	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Medium	The controls are rated as weak as this has been noted in the last two audit reports. The impact is assessed to be medium, as the volume of lights with no ICP is high and I am unable to determine how many of these relate to the ICPs in this audit report.	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will work with the customer to ensure all items of load related to TRUS ICPs has an ICP recorded	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Field audit to be completed, new reporting put in place	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	

Description and capacity of load		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 2.4</p> <p>With: Clause 11(2)(c) and (d) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: unknown</p> <p>To: 30-Apr-18</p>	<p>41 items of load had no lamp, make, model or wattage recorded.</p> <p>Ballast wattage is not recorded in the database.</p> <p>Potential impact: Low</p> <p>Actual impact: Low</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 3</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Low	<p>The controls are rated as weak as the database is incomplete.</p> <p>The impact is assessed to be low, as the correct ballasts are being applied and therefore reconciliation is accurate.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will work with the customer to update database anomalies and ballast as part of the complete field audit.	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Field audit to be completed, new reporting put in place	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	

All load recorded in database		
Non-compliance	Description	
Audit Ref: 2.5 With: Clause 11(2A) of Schedule 15.3 From: unknown To: 30-Apr-18	All load is not recorded in the database. Potential impact: High Actual impact: Medium Audit history: None Controls: Weak Breach risk rating: 6	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Medium	The controls are rated as weak as the updates are not flowing through to submission. The impact is assessed to be medium, based on the kWh differences described in section 3.1 .	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will meet with the customer to explain the compliance obligations and to request that a full inventory count is undertaken for each ICP. TRUS will work with the customer to ensure the database is updated and monthly reporting to TRUS is established.	30/06/18 TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Field audit to be completed, new reporting put in place	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	

Tracking of load changes		
Non-compliance	Description	
Audit Ref: 2.6 With: Clause 11(3) of Schedule 15.3 From: unknown To: 30-Apr-18	The tracking of load change for the Waipa North area is updated one month after the change has occurred. Potential impact: Low Actual impact: Low Audit history: None Controls: Moderate Breach risk rating: 2	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Low	The controls are rated as moderate, as the changes are tracked and confirmed before they are uploaded to the NZTA database. The impact is assessed to be low, as the volume of changes made are small and therefore this will have a minor effect on submission.	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will work with customer to improve their maintenance processes and reporting	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Once the update to RAMM database process has changed to a more regular occurrence, there should not be any further instances	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	

Database accuracy		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 3.1 With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(b)</p> <p>From: entire audit period</p>	<p>The database used to prepare submissions contains some inaccurate information. The database accuracy is assessed to be 95.5% indicating an estimated over submission of 13,000 kWh per annum.</p> <p>The database is not complete as ballasts are not recorded in the RAMM database.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 6</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Medium	<p>The controls are rated as weak as they are unlikely to mitigate risk and remove errors.</p> <p>The impact is assessed to be medium, based on the kWh differences described above.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will work with the customer to update database anomalies and ballast as part of the complete field audit.	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Field audit to be completed, new reporting put in place	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	

Volume information accuracy		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 3.2</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(c)</p> <p>From: entire audit period</p>	<p>Database extract used for submission is not up to date resulting in an estimated under submission of 90,422.65 kWh per annum.</p> <p>The database used to prepare submissions contains some inaccurate information. The database accuracy is assessed to be 95.5% indicating an estimated over submission of 13,000 kWh per annum.</p> <p>The database is not complete as ballasts are not recorded in the RAMM database.</p> <p>Potential impact: High</p> <p>Actual impact: High</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 9</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
High	<p>The controls are rated as weak as they are unlikely to mitigate risk and remove errors.</p> <p>The impact is assessed to be high, based on the kWh differences.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
TRUS will work with the customer to update database anomalies and ballast as part of the complete field audit.	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
Field audit to be completed, new reporting put in place	TRUS expects that the majority of the field count should be complete before the next audit	