

Waitomo District Council DUML January 2020

Deriving submission information	
Non-compliance	Description
<p>Audit Ref: 2.1</p> <p>With: Clause 11(1) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 01-Apr-19</p> <p>To: 30-Nov-19</p>	<p>The database is not confirmed as accurate with a 95% level of confidence as recorded in section 3.1.</p> <p>Potential under submission of 0 to 129,024.8 kWh per annum (including festive lights) for NZTA urban lights depending on whether WDC and Meridian are responsible for this load.</p> <p>Under submission of 1,553 kWh p.a. for private lights.</p> <p>Over submission of 2,398W (estimated 6,827 kWh) for festive lights during the eight months Meridian has supplied 0008807413WMA59 and the lights were disconnected.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Livening dates are not recorded for new connections, and lamp installation dates are replaced where lights change.</p> <p>Potential impact: High</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 6</p>
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating
<p>Medium</p>	<p>The risk rating and impact depends on the correct ICP number for the NZTA urban lights, and who is responsible for the load. If WDC and Meridian are not responsible, there is no impact.</p> <p>I have recorded the controls as weak, based on the exceptions identified during the field audit, lights with missing ICP numbers, and incorrect treatment of festive lights.</p> <p>The maximum potential impact is high, based on the NZTA urban light wattage and if WDC and Meridian are responsible for the load.</p> <p>The minimum potential impact is low based on the wattage differences excluding the NZTA urban lights. Because the responsible party is not known, and Trustpower is responsible for other NZTA lights within the region I have assessed the impact to be medium.</p>

Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>We are confirming with WDC whether the NZTA Urban lights are their responsibility and will have the ICP included against these items of load if this is the case.</p> <p>Historic submissions will be revised to include NZTA urban lights if required and exclude festive lights where these were not connected.</p> <p>We will confirm with WDC which of the private lights they will take responsibility for and whether these will be included with the DUML or have individual ICPs created.</p>	<p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>31 March 2020</p>	<p>Identified</p>
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
<p>We will revise our process to exclude the festive lights where these are not connected.</p>	<p>28 Feb 2020</p>	

ICP identifier and items of load	
Non-compliance	Description
<p>Audit Ref: 2.2</p> <p>With: Clause 11(2)(a) and (aa) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 01-Apr-19</p> <p>To: 30-Nov-19</p>	<p>ICP numbers are not recorded in the database for 201 NZTA urban lights and ten private lights.</p> <p>Potential impact: High</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: Once</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 6</p>
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating
<p>Medium</p>	<p>The risk rating and impact depends on the correct ICP number for the NZTA urban lights, and who is responsible for the load. If WDC and Meridian are not responsible, there is no impact.</p> <p>I have recorded the controls as weak, because no ICP number is recorded in the database for the NZTA urban lights or private lights.</p> <p>The maximum potential impact is high, based on the NZTA urban light wattage and if WDC and Meridian are responsible for the load.</p> <p>The minimum potential impact is low, with the NZTA urban lights having no impact if Meridian and Waitomo DC are not responsible. The private lights have a low impact based on the wattage and that WDC and TLC working to resolve this issue.</p> <p>Because the responsible party is not known, and Trustpower is responsible for other NZTA lights within the region I have assessed the impact to be medium.</p>

Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>We are confirming with WDC whether the NZTA Urban lights are their responsibility and will have the ICP included against these items of load if this is the case.</p> <p>Historic submissions will be revised to include NZTA urban lights if required and exclude festive lights where these were not connected.</p> <p>We will confirm with WDC which of the private lights they will take responsibility for and whether these will be included with the DUML or have individual ICPs created.</p>	<p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>31 March 2020</p>	<p>Identified</p>
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	

Database accuracy	
Non-compliance	Description
<p>Audit Ref: 3.1</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(b)</p> <p>From: 01-Apr-19</p> <p>To: 13-Jan-20</p>	<p>The database is not confirmed as accurate with a 95% level of confidence as recorded in section 3.1.</p> <p>Potential under submission of 0 to 129,024.8 kWh per annum (including festive lights) for NZTA urban lights depending on whether WDC and Meridian are responsible for this load. Broadspectrum have recently taken responsibility for maintaining the NZTA urban lights, and changes are not communicated to Alf Downs so they can be updated in the database.</p> <p>Under submission of 1,553 kWh p.a. for private lights.</p> <p>Over submission of 2,398W (estimated 6,827 kWh) for festive lights during the eight months Meridian has supplied 0008807413WMA59 and the lights were disconnected.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Livening dates are not recorded for new connections, and lamp installation dates are replaced where lights change.</p> <p>Potential impact: High</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: Once</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 6</p>

Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
<p>Medium</p>	<p>The risk rating and impact depends on the correct ICP number for the NZTA urban lights, and who is responsible for the load. If WDC and Meridian are not responsible, there is no impact.</p> <p>I have recorded the controls as weak, based on the exceptions identified during the field audit, lights with missing ICP numbers, and incorrect treatment of festive lights.</p> <p>The maximum potential impact is high, based on the NZTA urban light wattage and if WDC and Meridian are responsible for the load.</p> <p>The minimum potential impact is low based on the wattage differences excluding the NZTA urban lights. Because the responsible party is not known, and Trustpower is responsible for other NZTA lights within the region I have assessed the impact to be medium.</p>		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>We are confirming with WDC whether the NZTA Urban lights are their responsibility and will have the ICP included against these items of load if this is the case.</p> <p>Historic submissions will be revised to include NZTA urban lights if required and exclude festive lights where these were not connected.</p> <p>We will confirm with WDC which of the private lights they will take responsibility for and whether these will be included with the DUMML or have individual ICPs created.</p>		<p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>31 March 2020</p>	<p>Identified</p>
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date	
<p>We will revise our process to exclude the festive lights where these are not connected.</p>		<p>28 Feb 2020</p>	

Volume information accuracy	
Non-compliance	Description
<p>Audit Ref: 3.2</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(c)</p> <p>From: 01-Apr-19</p> <p>To: 30-Nov-19</p>	<p>The database is not confirmed as accurate with a 95% level of confidence as recorded in section 3.1.</p> <p>Potential under submission of 0 to 129,024.8 kWh per annum (including festive lights) for NZTA urban lights depending on whether WDC and Meridian are responsible for this load.</p> <p>Under submission of 1,553 kWh p.a. for private lights.</p> <p>Over submission of 2,398W (estimated 6,827 kWh) for festive lights during the eight months Meridian has supplied 0008807413WMA59 and the lights were disconnected.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Livening dates are not recorded for new connections, and lamp installation dates are replaced where lights change.</p> <p>Potential impact: High</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Weak</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 6</p>
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating
<p>Medium</p>	<p>The risk rating and impact depends on the correct ICP number for the NZTA urban lights, and who is responsible for the load. If WDC and Meridian are not responsible, there is no impact.</p> <p>I have recorded the controls as weak, based on the exceptions identified during the field audit, lights with missing ICP numbers, and incorrect treatment of festive lights.</p> <p>The maximum potential impact is high, based on the NZTA urban light wattage and if WDC and Meridian are responsible for the load.</p> <p>The minimum potential impact is low based on the wattage differences excluding the NZTA urban lights. Because the responsible party is not known, and Trustpower is responsible for other NZTA lights within the region I have assessed the impact to be medium.</p>

Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>We are confirming with WDC whether the NZTA Urban lights are their responsibility and will have the ICP included against these items of load if this is the case.</p> <p>Historic submissions will be revised to include NZTA urban lights if required and exclude festive lights where these were not connected.</p> <p>We will confirm with WDC which of the private lights they will take responsibility for and whether these will be included with the DUML or have individual ICPs created.</p>	<p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>15 Feb 2020</p> <p>31 March 2020</p>	<p>Identified</p>
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
<p>We will revise our process to exclude the festive lights where these are not connected.</p>	<p>28 Feb 2020</p>	