Compliance plan for MERC managed Auckland DUML Audit 2018

| Deriving submission information | | | |
|--|---|------------------|------------------------|
| Non-compliance | Description | | |
| Audit Ref: 2.1 With: 11(1) of Schedule 15.3 | The field audit found variances and two ICPs that appear to have load but are decommissioned in the registry resulting in an estimated under submission of 54,206.16 kWh per annum. | | |
| | One example of volume being trunca | nted rather than | rounded. |
| From: 01-Jun-17 | Potential impact: High | | |
| To: 31-May-18 | Actual impact: High | | |
| , | Audit history: Once | | |
| | Controls: Weak | | |
| | Breach risk rating: 9 | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | |
| High | The controls are rated as weak as the field audit found variances between the spreadsheets for all but one customer. | | |
| | The impact is assessed to be high, based on the kWh differences described above. | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status |
| For the ICP's decommissioned Mercury believes the database reflects this accurately. | | June 2018 | Disputed |
| Excluding the decommissioned sites Mercury will look to update the data bases based upon this field audit. | | | |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | |
| Mercury will look to develop a DUML process to ensure consistent treatment of DUML databases | | May 2019 | |

| Location of each item of load | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| Non-compliance | Description | | |
| Audit Ref: 2.3 | 19 items of load for Acacia Cove with no location details recorded. | | |
| With: 11(2)(b) | Potential impact: None | | |
| | Actual impact: None | | |
| From: 01-Jun-17 | Audit history: None | | |
| To: 31-May-18 | Controls: Moderate | | |
| | Breach risk rating: 2 | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | |
| Low | The controls in place mitigate risk most of the time. The items of load associated with these ICPs have a low rate of change. | | |
| | The number of items of load is small therefore the audit risk rating is low. | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status |
| Mercury is working with the building manager to obtain location details. | | October 2018 | Investigating |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | |
| Implementation of consistent DUML procedures via improved documentation | | June 2019 | |

| Description and capacity of load | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| Non-compliance | Description | | |
| Audit Ref: 2.4 | Nulite spreadsheet has no lamp descriptions recorded. 7 items of load in Acacia Cove have no lamp wattages recorded. | | |
| With: 11(2)(c) of Schedule 15.3 | Potential impact: Low | | |
| | Actual impact: Unknown | | |
| From: 01-Jun-17 | Audit history: Once | | |
| To: 31-May-18 | Controls: Moderate | | |
| · | Breach risk rating: 2 | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | |
| Low | The controls are rated as moderate as the missing details relate only to Nulite and these are historic and affect a small volume of load, and the 7 items of load for Acacia Cove are under investigation. | | |
| | The risk rating is assessed as low as the volume of items of load is small. | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status |
| Working with the customers to confirm database accuracy. | | October 2018 | Investigating |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | |
| Implementation of a DUML procedure | | June 2019 | |

| All load recorded in database | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| Non-compliance | Description | | |
| Audit Ref: 2.5 With: 11(2A) of Schedule 15.3 | 48 additional items of load found in the field than recorded in the spreadsheets. Potential impact: Low Actual impact: Low | | |
| From: 01-Jun-17 | Audit history: Once | | |
| To: 31-May-18 | Controls: Weak | | |
| | Breach risk rating: 9 | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | |
| High | The controls are weak as the inaccuracies found indicate that the database load has not been captured correctly in all instances. | | |
| | The impact is assessed to be high, based on the kWh differences associated with these variances. | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status |
| With the exception of the decommissioned sites and the incorrect information provided by Veritek last year and has been referred back, Mercury will update the databases based upon the information contained in the audit. | | June 2018 | Disputed |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | |
| As previously indicated, DUML procedures to be documented. | | June 2019 | |

| Tracking of load changes | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| Non-compliance | Description | | |
| Audit Ref: 2.6 | Tracking of load change not captured correctly for Acacia Cove. | | |
| With: 11(3) of | Potential impact: Low | | |
| Schedule 15.3 | Actual impact: Low | | |
| | Audit history: Once | | |
| From: 01-Jun-17 | Controls: Moderate | | |
| To: 31-May-18 | Breach risk rating: 2 | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | |
| Low | The controls are moderate as the controls to manage load changes will mitigate risk most of the time. | | |
| | The audit risk rating is low due to the small volume of load associated. | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status |
| Same as 2.4. Working with the customer to confirm accuracy and will raise an IT ticket to ensure flow through to submissions. | | October 2018 | Investigating |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | |
| DUML procedure to be | developed | Not provided | |

| Database accuracy | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|------------------------|--|
| Non-compliance | Description | | | |
| Audit Ref: 3.1 With: 15.2 and 15.37B(b) | The field audit found variances and two ICPs that appear to have load but are decommissioned in the registry resulting in an estimated under submission of 49,723.38 kWh per annum. | | | |
| | Potential impact: High | | | |
| From: 01-Jun-17 | Actual impact: High | al impact: High | | |
| To: 31-May-18 | Audit history: Once | | | |
| · | Controls: Weak | | | |
| | Breach risk rating: | | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | | |
| High | The controls are rated as weak as the field audit found variances between the spreadsheets for all but one customer. | | | |
| | The impact is assessed to be high, based on the kWh differences described above. | | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status | |
| Mercury disputes the 2 decommissioned ICP's | | October | Disputed | |
| Mercury will update the database and systems based on this audit and work with the site managers to clarify discrepancies. | | 2018 | | |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | | |
| DUML procedures to be documented. | | June 2019 | | |

| Volume information accuracy | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| Non-compliance | Description | | |
| Audit Ref: 3.2 With: 15.2 and 15.37B(c) | The field audit found variances and two ICPs that appear to have load but are decommissioned in the registry. Two ICPs have the incorrect daily kWh figure resulting in under submission. This is resulting in an estimated under submission of 54,206.16 kWh per annum. | | |
| From: 01-Jun-17 To: 31-May-18 | One example of volume being truncated rather than rounded. Potential impact: High Actual impact: High Audit history: Once Controls: Weak | | |
| | Breach risk rating: | | |
| Audit risk rating | Rationale for audit risk rating | | |
| High | The controls are rated as weak as the field audit found variances and the incorrect daily kWh figure used for two ICPs in SAP. | | |
| | The impact is assessed to be high, based on the kWh differences described above. | | |
| Actions taken to resolve the issue | | Completion date | Remedial action status |
| Mercury disputes that the 2 ICP's are not decommissioned. | | June 2018 | Disputed |
| Variances will be corrected based on this audit and will flow through to submissions. | | | |
| Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur | | Completion date | |
| DUML procedures to be documented. | | June 2019 | |