

Compliance plan for New Plymouth DC DUML - 2022

Deriving submission information		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 2.1 With: Clause 11(1) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 01-Feb-22 To: 31-Aug-22</p>	<p>The field audit found that the best available estimate is not precise enough to conclude that the database is accurate within $\pm 5\%$.</p> <p>One item of load had a blank gear wattage, when zero was expected.</p> <p>Five lights were assigned to incorrect NSPs and corrected during the audit.</p> <p>Submission was overstated for ICPs 1000542569PC16D and 1000542572PC514 due to a calculation error in the wattage reports provided by Power Solutions for February 2022 to August 2022. Festive lights were included after they were disconnected totalling 2200 W (estimated over submission of 4,698.1 kWh over six months based on 4,271 hours per annum) and revised submission information will be washed up.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: Multiple times</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 4</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
<p>Medium</p>	<p>Controls are rated as moderate, as they are sufficient to mitigate the risk most of the time but there is room for improvement. The cell reference in the monthly report has been corrected.</p> <p>Due to the low precision for the field audit sample I have estimated the impact of the non-compliance to be medium:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in absolute terms, total annual consumption is estimated to be 1,400 kWh higher than the DUML database indicates, and • there is a 95% level of confidence that the annual consumption is between 77,300 kWh lower and 34,800 kWh p.a. higher than the database indicates. 	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>NPDC database corrected for 5 lights</p> <p>Revised data for festive lights has been sent</p> <p>Please note NPDC are reviewing how they can adjust their reporting methodology that will allow a daily capacity value to be reported/reconciled</p> <p>NPDC are reviewing spec sheets from suppliers & will communicate directly with Veritek or update their database</p>	<p>11.11.2022</p> <p>23.11.2022</p> <p>30.11.2023</p> <p>18.11.2022</p>	<p>Identified</p>

Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date

Description and capacity of load		
Non-compliance	Description	
Audit Ref: 2.4 With: Clause 11(2)(c) and (d) of Schedule 15.3 From: 20-Sep-22 To: 20-Sep-22	One item of load had a blank gear wattage, when zero was expected. The gear wattage was updated to zero during the audit. Potential impact: None Actual impact: None Audit history: None Controls: Strong Breach risk rating: 1	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Low	The controls are rated as strong and the impact as low because most lamp models had a gear wattage populated. There was no impact on total wattage or submission as the missing values were expected to be zero.	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
NPDC database updated to zero wattage	18.11.2022	Cleared
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
NPDC to ensure gear wattage is correct		

All load recorded in database	
Non-compliance	Description
Audit Ref: 2.5 With: Clause 11(2A) of Schedule 15.3 From: 20-Sep-22 To: 14-Oct-22	Three 21W LEDs in Tauranga Place connected to pole numbers H224, H225 and H226 were not recorded in the database. Potential impact: Low Actual impact: Low Audit history: Three times Controls: Moderate Breach risk rating: 2

Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
Low	<p>Controls are rated as moderate, the process in place has sufficient controls to ensure that all items of load are recorded in the database most of the time, but improvements are required to the new connection processes.</p> <p>The audit risk rating is assessed to be low because the impact on submission is 63W or 269 kWh per annum.</p>		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
Lights have been added to the database		18.11.2022	Identified
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: 20-Sep-22</p> <p>To: 14-Oct-22</p>	<p>The field audit found that the best available estimate is not precise enough to conclude that the database is accurate within $\pm 5\%$.</p> <p>One blank gear wattage which should have been populated with zero.</p> <p>Five lights were assigned to incorrect NSPs and corrected during the audit.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: Multiple times</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 4</p>		
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
Medium	<p>Controls are rated as moderate, as they are sufficient to mitigate the risk most of the time but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>Due to the low precision for the field audit sample I have estimated the impact of the non-compliance to be medium:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in absolute terms, total annual consumption is estimated to be 1,400 kWh higher than the DUML database indicates, and there is a 95% level of confidence that the annual consumption is between 77,300 kWh lower and 34,800 kWh p.a. higher than the database indicates. 		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
Revised data for festive lights has been sent		23.11.2022	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date	

		Comments on the other parts of the non-compliance are recorded in section 2.1.
--	--	--

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-22</p> <p>To: 31-Aug-22</p>	<p>The field audit found that the best available estimate is not precise enough to conclude that the database is accurate within $\pm 5\%$.</p> <p>One item of load had a blank gear wattage, when zero was expected.</p> <p>Five lights were assigned to incorrect NSPs and corrected during the audit.</p> <p>Submission was overstated for ICPs 1000542569PC16D and 1000542572PC514 due to a calculation error in the wattage reports provided by Power Solutions for February 2022 to August 2022. Festive lights were included after they were disconnected totalling 2200 W (estimated over submission of 4,698.1 kWh over six months based on 4,271 hours per annum) and revised submission information will be washed up.</p> <p>The monthly database extract provided does not track changes at a daily basis and is provided as a snapshot.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Medium</p> <p>Audit history: Multiple times</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 4</p>		
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating		
Medium	<p>Controls are rated as moderate, as they are sufficient to mitigate the risk most of the time but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>Due to the low precision for the field audit sample I have estimated the impact of the non-compliance to be medium:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in absolute terms, total annual consumption is estimated to be 1,400 kWh higher than the DUML database indicates, and there is a 95% level of confidence that the annual consumption is between 77,300 kWh lower and 34,800 kWh p.a. higher than the database indicates. 		
Actions taken to resolve the issue		Completion date	Remedial action status
Revised data for festive lights has been sent		23.11.2022	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur		Completion date	Comments on the other parts of the non-compliance are recorded in section 2.1.