

Compliance plan for Rotorua Lakes Council Mercury DUML 2024

Deriving submission information		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 2.1</p> <p>With: Clause 11(1) of Schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 22-Dec-22</p> <p>To: 30-Jun-24</p>	<p>HHR profile used without an exemption.</p> <p>40 items of load reconciled against a different ICP from that recorded in the database.</p> <p>The monthly wattage report is used as a snapshot and does not take into account changes made during the month.</p> <p>Potential impact: Low</p> <p>Actual impact: Low</p> <p>Audit history: Multiple times</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 2</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Low	<p>The controls are recorded as moderate because they mitigate risk most of the time but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>The audit risk rating is assessed as low as the issues raised have only a minor effect on reconciliation.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>We are in the process of drafting applications for DUML profiles that allow us to submit as HHR, we will submit to the EA as soon as possible.</p> <p>Power Solutions, who manage the database for RLDC, notes that “The 40 lights are recorded against the correct ICP in the wattage report. These lights are ones where we have 2 lights on a single pole, each with a different owner, in this case parks and council road lighting. As ever with RAMM, we can’t record 2 different ICP numbers on the pole record, so we must manually separate these and allocate the wattage to the correct ICP based on the light owner.”</p> <p>We are focusing on resolving the ‘snapshot’ issue in general and are having internal discussions before liaising with customers to provide any direction.</p>	August/September 2024	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
We are focused on resolving DUML non-compliances.	Ongoing	

Location of each item of load		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 2.3</p> <p>With: 11(2)(b) of schedule 15.3</p> <p>From: 22-Dec-22</p> <p>To: 30-Jun-24</p>	<p>Two items of load with insufficient location details recorded.</p> <p>Potential impact: Low</p> <p>Actual impact: None</p> <p>Audit history: Three times previously</p> <p>Controls: Strong</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 1</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Low	<p>The controls are rated as strong as processes in place mitigate this risk to an acceptable level.</p> <p>The audit risk rating is low this affected only two items of load and has no direct impact on reconciliation.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
RLDC and Power Solutions are aware and will be making the necessary corrections.	August/September 2024	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
We will continue to liaise with RLDC and Power Solutions to ensure database accuracy.	Ongoing	

Database accuracy		
Non-compliance	Description	
Audit Ref: 3.1 With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(b) From: 22-Dec-22 To: 30-Jun-24	Discrepancies from the previous audit not corrected. Potential impact: Low Actual impact: Low Audit history: Once 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. The impact on settlement is minor; therefore, the audit risk rating is low.	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
RLDC and Power Solutions are aware and will be making the necessary corrections.	August/September 2024	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
We will continue to liaise with RLDC and Power Solutions to ensure database accuracy.	Ongoing	

Volume information accuracy		
Non-compliance	Description	
<p>Audit Ref: 3.2</p> <p>With: Clause 15.2 and 15.37B(c)</p> <p>From: 22-Dec-22</p> <p>To: 30-Jun-24</p>	<p>HHR profile used without an exemption.</p> <p>40 items of load reconciled against a different ICP from that recorded in the database.</p> <p>The monthly wattage report is used as a snapshot and does not take into account changes made during the month.</p> <p>Potential impact: Medium</p> <p>Actual impact: Low</p> <p>Audit history: Multiple times</p> <p>Controls: Moderate</p> <p>Breach risk rating: 2</p>	
Audit risk rating	Rationale for audit risk rating	
Low	<p>The controls are recorded as moderate because they mitigate risk most of the time but there is room for improvement.</p> <p>The audit risk rating is assessed as low as the issues raised have only a minor effect on reconciliation.</p>	
Actions taken to resolve the issue	Completion date	Remedial action status
<p>We are in the process of drafting applications for DUML profiles that allow us to submit as HHR, we will submit to the EA as soon as possible.</p> <p>Power Solutions, who manage the database for RLDC, notes that “The 40 lights are recorded against the correct ICP in the wattage report. These lights are ones where we have 2 lights on a single pole, each with a different owner, in this case parks and council road lighting. As ever with RAMM, we can’t record 2 different ICP numbers on the pole record, so we must manually separate these and allocate the wattage to the correct ICP based on the light owner.”</p> <p>We are focusing on resolving the ‘snapshot’ issue in general and are having internal discussions before liaising with customers to provide any direction.</p>	August/September 2024	Identified
Preventative actions taken to ensure no further issues will occur	Completion date	
We are focused on resolving DUML non-compliances.	Ongoing	