

South Wairarapa DC DUML Compliance Plan 2021

Deriving submission information		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 2.1 With: Clause 11(1) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 15-May-20 To: 17-May-21</p>	<p>Variance in light volumes reported to Mercury vs what is recorded in the database is likely to be resulting in an estimated 48,756 kWh per annum of under submission.</p> <p>The database accuracy is assessed to be 95.4% of the database for the sample checked indicating a potential under submission of approximately 14,400 kWh per annum.</p> <p>14 items of load have incorrect lamp wattage resulting in an estimated minor over submission of 222 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours.</p> <p>12 items of load have incorrect gear wattage resulting in an estimated minor under submission of 406 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours.</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: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: Twice Controls: Moderate Breach risk rating: 4</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Medium	<p>The controls are rated as moderate as controls will mitigate risk most of the time, but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>The audit risk rating is assessed to be medium based on the potential submission inaccuracies.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status

<p>Variance in raw database and monthly extract used for submission</p> <p>We will be liaising with SWDC to determine the reason for the raw RAMM database and monthly database extract variances however, we note that our database extract is consistent with the auditor findings below and therefore we deem our database extract and submission to be correct.</p> <p>Database accuracy</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the audit was conducted based on the raw RAMM database and not the extract that SWDC provide to Mercury for submission.</p> <p>14 items with incorrect lamp wattage</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the monthly database extract that SWDC sends to Mercury for submission has the correct lamp wattage values of 58 for the ITALO 1 STU-S 4.7-3M model and 51 for the Itron Zero OC6 STA model. Our submission is based on the correct lamp wattage and therefore there is no over submission due to lamp wattage.</p> <p>12 items with incorrect gear wattage</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the monthly database extract that SWDC sends to Mercury for submission has the correct gear wattage values of 14 for the 100W SON model, 18 for the 150W SON model and 9 for the 50W HPL model. Our submission is based on the correct gear wattage and therefore there is no under submission due to gear wattage.</p> <p>Blank or incorrect ICP</p> <p>The monthly database extract that Mercury receives from SWDC does not have any blank or incorrect ICPs. Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury.</p> <p>We accept that the raw RAMM database varies from the database extract that Mercury receives monthly and uses for submission. We will be liaising with SWDC to determine the reason for this and will correct as necessary.</p>	Oct21	Disputed
<p>Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur</p>	<p>Completion date</p>	
<p>Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury. We will work with SWDC to ensure the change management process is working as expected and that any database variances are corrected.</p>	Oct21	

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: 15-May-20 To: 17-May-21	Blank or incorrect ICP number recorded in the database for 861 items of load. 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 recorded as moderate because they mitigate risk most of the time but there is room for improvement. There is no impact on settlement as the load is being reconciled to the correct ICP. There is no option to record none so I recorded this as low.	
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date
The monthly database that Mercury receives from SWDC does not have any blank or incorrect ICPs. Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury.		Oct21
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date
Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury. We will work with SWDC to ensure the change management process is working as expected and that any database variances are corrected.		Oct21
		Disputed

Database accuracy		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 3.1</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(b)</p> <p>From: 15-May-20</p> <p>To: 17-May-21</p>	<p>The database accuracy is assessed to be 95.4% of the database for the sample checked indicating a potential under submission of approximately 14,400 kWh per annum.</p> <p>14 items of load have incorrect lamp wattage resulting in an estimated minor over submission of 222 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours.</p> <p>12 items of load have incorrect gear wattage resulting in an estimated minor under submission of 406 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours.</p> <p>Blank or incorrect ICP number recorded in the database for 861 items of load.</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: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: Twice</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 as controls will mitigate risk most of the time, but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>The audit risk rating is assessed to be medium based on the potential submission inaccuracies.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status

<p>Database accuracy</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the audit was conducted based on the raw RAMM database and not the extract that SWDC provide to Mercury for submission. We will be liaising with SWDC to determine the reason for the raw RAMM database and monthly database extract variances however, we note that our database extract is consistent with the auditor findings below and therefore we deem our database extract and submission to be correct.</p> <p>14 items with incorrect lamp wattage</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the monthly database extract that SWDC sends to Mercury for submission has the correct lamp wattage values of 58 for the ITALO 1 STU-S 4.7-3M model and 51 for the Itron Zero OC6 STA model. Our submission is based on the correct lamp wattage and therefore there is no over submission due to lamp wattage.</p> <p>12 items with incorrect gear wattage</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the monthly database extract that SWDC sends to Mercury for submission has the correct gear wattage values of 14 for the 100W SON model, 18 for the 150W SON model and 9 for the 50W HPL model. Our submission is based on the correct gear wattage and therefore there is no under submission due to gear wattage.</p> <p>Blank or incorrect ICP</p> <p>The monthly database that Mercury receives from SWDC does not have any blank or incorrect ICPs. Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury.</p> <p>GPS coordinates</p> <p>The monthly extract contains 94 items with transposed GPS coordinates. We will be liaising with SWDC to have these corrected.</p> <p>We accept that the raw RAMM database varies from the database extract that Mercury receives monthly and uses for submission. We will be liaising with SWDC to determine the reason for this and will correct as necessary.</p>	Oct21	Disputed
<p>Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur</p>	<p>Completion date</p>	
<p>Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury. We will work with SWDC to ensure the change management process is working as expected and that any database variances are corrected.</p>	Oct21	

Volume information accuracy		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 3.2</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(c)</p> <p>From: 15-May-20</p> <p>To: 17-May-21</p>	<p>Variance in light volumes reported to Mercury vs what is recorded in the database is likely to be resulting in an estimated 48,756 kWh per annum of under submission.</p> <p>The database accuracy is assessed to be 95.4% of the database for the sample checked indicating a potential under submission of approximately 14,400 kWh per annum.</p> <p>14 items of load have incorrect lamp wattage resulting in an estimated minor over submission of 222 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours.</p> <p>12 items of load have incorrect gear wattage resulting in an estimated minor under submission of 406 kWh p.a. based on 4,271 burn hours.</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: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: Twice</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 4</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
<p>Medium</p>	<p>The controls are rated as moderate as controls will mitigate risk most of the time, but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>The potential impact could be low as the issue will have a minor impact on settlement.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status

<p>Variance in raw database and monthly extract used for submission</p> <p>We will be liaising with SWDC to determine the reason for the raw database and monthly database extract variances; however, we note that our database extract is consistent with the auditor findings below and therefore we deem our database extract and submission to be correct.</p> <p>Database accuracy</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the audit was conducted based on the raw RAMM database and not the extract that SWDC provide to Mercury for submission.</p> <p>14 items with incorrect lamp wattage</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the monthly database extract that SWDC sends to Mercury for submission has the correct lamp wattage values of 58 for the ITALO 1 STU-S 4.7-3M model and 51 for the Itron Zero OC6 STA model. Our submission is based on the correct lamp wattage and therefore there is no over submission due to lamp wattage.</p> <p>12 items with incorrect gear wattage</p> <p>We dispute the findings as the monthly database extract that SWDC sends to Mercury for submission has the correct gear wattage values of 14 for the 100W SON model, 18 for the 150W SON model and 9 for the 50W HPL model. Our submission is based on the correct gear wattage and therefore there is no under submission due to gear wattage.</p> <p>We accept that the raw RAMM database varies from the database extract that Mercury receives monthly and uses for submission. We will be liaising with SWDC to determine the reason for this and will correct as necessary.</p>	Oct21	Disputed
<p>Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur</p>	<p>Completion date</p>	
<p>Mercury will be liaising with SWDC to determine why the raw RAMM database is different to the monthly extract provided to Mercury. We will work with SWDC to ensure the change management process is working as expected and that any database variances are corrected.</p>	Oct21	