

South Wairarapa District Council DUML 2020

Deriving submission information		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 2.1 With: Clause 11(1) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 01-Feb-20 To: 29-Feb-20</p>	<p>The database is not confirmed as accurate with a 95% level of confidence as recorded in section 3.1.</p> <p>15 lamps had incorrect total wattages, resulting in potential over submission of 171W or 730 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours. Corrections were processed in the database extract for February 2020, and revised submission information was provided for February 2020 revision 1.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Changes are not always recorded in the database extract from the date which they became effective.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium Actual impact: Unknown Audit history: Once Controls: Moderate Breach risk rating: 4</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Medium	<p>The controls are rated as moderate. SWDC is aware of the issues preventing all lights from being recorded in RAMM, and ensures that the extracts are validated and corrected as necessary before being provided to Mercury.</p> <p>When discrepancies were identified during the audit they were promptly investigated and updated information was provided to Mercury, which was used to produce revision submissions.</p> <p>The potential impact could be medium because the database could not be confirmed to be accurate with 95% confidence.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
We will continue to work with SWDC when discrepancies are identified to ensure timely correction. We will also work with SWDC to have the database reflect changes on a daily basis to ensure accurate consumption reporting.	Sep 20	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
We will continue to work with SWDC when discrepancies are identified to ensure timely correction. We will also work with SWDC to have the database reflect changes on a daily basis to ensure accurate consumption reporting.	Sep 20	

Location of each item of load			
Non-compliance	Description		
<p>Audit Ref: 2.3</p> <p>With: Clause 11(2)(b) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: unknown</p> <p>To: 05-Feb-20</p>	<p>20 items of load do not have sufficient location information recorded to enable them to be readily located.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 2</p>		
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
Low	<p>Controls are rated as moderate. The correct location addresses including GPS coordinated will be updated once the lights are vested in council.</p> <p>The impact is assessed to be low. The 20 lights are affected are all situated in recently connected new subdivisions. The street addresses are recorded, and all lights within each street have the same lamp type.</p>		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
The database will be updated as explained above.			Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date	
The database will be updated as explained above.			

Database accuracy			
Non-compliance	Description		
<p>Audit Ref: 3.1</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(b)</p> <p>From: 27-Feb-20</p> <p>To: 27-Feb-20</p>	<p>The database is not confirmed as accurate with a 95% level of confidence.</p> <p>15 lamps had incorrect total wattages, resulting in potential over submission of 171W or 730 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours. Corrections were processed in the database extract for February 2020, and revised submission information was provided for February 2020 revision 1.</p> <p>20 items of load do not have sufficient location information recorded to enable them to be readily located.</p> <p>Two items of load had correct GPS coordinates, but incorrectly recorded street addresses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A light situated at the end of Westwood Lane, Greytown was recorded against Kuratawhiti St, Greytown. • A light outside 17 Homestead Lane, Greytown was recorded against Udy Street, Greytown. <p>95 items of load had transposed GPS coordinates, with the northing value recorded in the easting field and vice versa. Dave Patten confirmed he will arrange for the GPS coordinates to be updated.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: Once</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 4</p>		
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
Medium	<p>The controls are rated as moderate. SWDC is aware of the issues preventing all lights from being recorded in RAMM, and ensures that the extracts are validated and corrected as necessary before being provided to Mercury.</p> <p>When discrepancies were identified during the audit they were promptly investigated and updated information was provided to Mercury, which was used to produce revision submissions.</p> <p>The potential impact could be medium because the database could not be confirmed to be accurate with 95% confidence.</p>		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
The 20 items of load will be updated in the database once vested in council. We will follow up with SWDC to ensure the address and GPS details are corrected.		Sep 20	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date	
The 20 items of load will be updated in the database once vested in council. We will follow up with SWDC to ensure the address and GPS details are corrected.		Sep 20	

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-Feb-20</p> <p>To: 29-Feb-20</p>	<p>The database is not confirmed as accurate with a 95% level of confidence as recorded in section 3.1.</p> <p>15 lamps had incorrect total wattages, resulting in potential over submission of 171W or 730 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours. Corrections were processed in the database extract for February 2020, and revised submission information was provided for February 2020 revision 1.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Changes are not always recorded in the database extract from the date which they became effective.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Unknown</p> <p>Audit history: None</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 4</p>		
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
Medium	<p>The controls are rated as moderate. SWDC is aware of the issues preventing all lights from being recorded in RAMM, and ensures that the extracts are validated and corrected as necessary before being provided to Mercury.</p> <p>When discrepancies were identified during the audit they were promptly investigated and updated information was provided to Mercury, which was used to produce revision submissions.</p> <p>The potential impact could be medium because the database could not be confirmed to be accurate with 95% confidence.</p>		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
We will work with SWDC to have the database reflect changes on a daily basis to ensure accurate consumption reporting.		Sep 20	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date	
We will work with SWDC to have the database reflect changes on a daily basis to ensure accurate consumption reporting.		Sep 20	