

ESV Validation Report

AusNet Services 2018-2019
Fire Start Report

Draft Report

Executive summary

The Victorian Governor in Council made the Order In Council for the F-Factor Scheme Order 2016 under section 16C of the *National Electricity (Victoria) Act 2005*. This was gazetted on 22 December 2016.

AusNet Services provided its fire start report to the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) on 30 September 2019. This report covered the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019.

The AER forwarded the fire start report to Energy Safe Victoria (ESV) on 30 September 2019 for validation by 30 November 2019. ESV undertook the validation process in a staged manner as follows:

- A **preliminary review** to ensure the information provided was complete and in a satisfactory form
- A **completeness assessment** to determine whether all fires previously reported to ESV had been included in the fire start report and to ensure all incidents in the fire start report had been previously reported as fires to ESV
- A **comparative analysis of IRU-specific factors** to identify any material differences between the information reported by AusNet Services in its fire start report and previously to ESV in relation to those aspects of the fire start report pertinent to the calculation of the total Ignition Risk Units (IRU) amount
- A **comparative analysis of non-IRU factors** to identify any differences between the information reported by AusNet Services in its fire start report and previously to ESV in relation to those aspects of the fire start report not pertinent to the IRU calculation.

Except for the analysis of non-IRU factors, ESV consulted with AusNet Services regarding any discrepancies identified to clarify the reasons for the discrepancies and to provide an opportunity to amend the fire start report.

Further detail on the methodology used for the validation analysis is provided herein.

On completion of the validation analysis, ESV issued the draft “ESV Validation Report: AusNet Services 2018-2019 Fire Start Report” to the AER on 29 November 2019. The AER will provide a copy of this report to AusNet Services and invite AusNet Services to respond with any comments. Any comments received from AusNet Services will be reviewed and a final report issued by 15 February 2020.

Based on the analysis presented in this report and the data reported in the amended fire start report (*FY19 Ffactor RIN AusNet Services (Final) 20191101Resubmission.xlsx*), ESV can confirm that the **total IRU amount of 220.76 is correct.**

Contents

- Executive summary3**
- Introduction7**
 - Background7
 - Request from the AER7
- Validation process8**
 - Scope8
 - Methodology applied8
 - Caveats10
- Accuracy of information provided11**
 - Preliminary review11
 - Completeness assessment11
 - Comparative analysis — IRU-specific factors13
 - Comparative analysis — non-IRU factors15
- Verification of the IRU amount18**
 - Note on EM-COP Fire Danger Ratings data18
- Conclusion19**

Introduction

Background

The Victorian Governor in Council made the Order In Council for the F-Factor Scheme Order 2016 under section 16C of the *National Electricity (Victoria) Act 2005*. This was gazetted on 22 December 2016.

The F-factor scheme is managed by the Australian Energy Regulator (AER). Section 7 of the Order In Council identifies that the AER may request Energy Safe Victoria (ESV) to validate the fire start reports submitted to the AER by the Distribution Network Service Providers. Each fire start report will have an individual validation report.

The Order In Council stipulates that each Distribution Network Service Provider (DNSP) will provide a fire start report to the AER by 30 September each year. The Order In Council also stipulates that, if requested by the AER, ESV will provide a validation report to the AER by 30 November each year.

The Order In Council also identifies that the AER may refer any submissions regarding the validation reports to ESV in order to provide a revised validation that responds to the submissions by 15 February in the following year.

Request from the AER

On 30 September 2019, the AER provided ESV with the AusNet Services 2018-2019 fire start report for validation. This comprised the following documents:

- Attachment 1 - FY19 Ffactor RIN AusNet Services (Final) Excel spreadsheet
- Attachment 2 - WSP Audit Report PDF document
- Attachment 3 - F Factor Statutory Declaration - 2019 - Signed PDF document

These documents consider the AusNet Services distribution system separately from other systems managed by the service provider.

On 10 October 2019, ESV confirmed receipt of the above documents and advised the AER that, where ESV deemed it necessary for the purposes of validation, ESV would seek additional information directly from the DNSPs. This is in line with clause 7(4) of the Order In Council. Where additional information was sought, ESV ensured that the AER was copied into any correspondence.

Validation process

While the scope of the fire start report and the validation process are detailed in the Order In Council (as outlined below), the approach to be undertaken in assessing the accuracy of information provided is not specified. This section describes the process that ESV applied to the validation assessment; the results are provided later in this report.

Scope

In reviewing the information provided in a DNSP's fire start report, clause 7(3) of the Order In Council stipulates that ESV's validation report:

- (b) must include an assessment of the accuracy of the information provided in the fire start report pursuant to clauses 6(3)(d)-(f) and (h), specifically;
- (c) must verify the estimate of the ignition risk unit (IRU) amount for the financial year provided under clause 6(3)(g).

These specific items are detailed in clause 6(3) of the Order In Council, which states that a DNSP's fire start report must, among other things:

- (d) if the Distribution Network Service Provider is the service provider in relation to more than one distribution system, distinguish between distribution systems;
- (e) list all fire starts for a financial year, stating in each case and where known;
 - (i) what kind of fire start it was;
 - (ii) the date, time and latitude and longitude for each fire;
 - (iii) the unique identification number of the pole and polyphase electric line nearest to the fire start;
 - (iv) the voltage of the electric line in which the ignition occurred;
 - (v) the estimated value of the fire start expressed in IRUs, calculated in accordance with this Order;
- (f) state whether the fire was reported to a relevant entity;
- (g) calculate the total IRU amount for the financial year on the basis of the information contained in the fire start report, in accordance with this Order;
- (h) include such other information as the AER may from time to time specify;

Clause 6(3) of the Order In Council also requires that the DNSP's fire start report:

- (i) include an independent audit of the fire start report undertaken by an external auditor;
 - (i) stating, in the auditor's opinion, whether the information contained in the fire start report is accurate and reliable; and
 - (ii) which is acceptable to the AER.

Methodology applied

For its validation assessment, ESV broke these items into the two categories:

- IRU-specific factors

These comprise those factors within the fire start report that are directly relevant to the calculation of the IRUs for the incident. Specifically these are the date, time and latitude and longitude for the fire and the distribution business' estimate of the IRUs for the fire [items (e)(ii) and (e)(v) in the Order In Council].

- Non-IRU factors

These comprise all other information reported in the fire start report [items (e)(i), (e)(iii) and (e)(iv)].

A more detailed analysis was undertaken of the IRU-specific factors than of the non-IRU factors.

ESV validated the DNSP fire start reports as follows:

- *Preliminary review*

The purpose of the preliminary review was to determine that the information provided to ESV was complete and in a satisfactory form for ESV to undertake its validation analysis.

ESV started by reviewing the documentation provided by the AER to ensure that all relevant information was provided and readable.

The DNSP's fire start spreadsheet was then subject to a preliminary, high-level review to ascertain whether there were any obvious issues with the information contained therein. If the preliminary review identified any issues, ESV would contact the DNSP so that the DNSP could provide an updated spreadsheet.

- *Completeness assessment*

The purpose of the completeness assessment was to determine whether:

- all fires in the DNSP's fire start report are listed as fires in OSIRIS¹
- all network-related fires listed in OSIRIS are included in the DNSP's fire start report.

Where there were differences identified, ESV contacted the DNSP to confirm the reasons for the difference.

The DNSP then provided a rationale for the differences and, where there was a change to the information in the fire start spreadsheet, the DNSP provided an updated spreadsheet reflecting any changes and, in some instances, additional supporting information.

We reviewed the rationale and information subsequently provided by the DNSP to confirm we were satisfied with the reasons for the inclusion or exclusion of specific incidents.

- *Comparative analysis — IRU-specific factors*

The purpose of the comparative analysis of IRU-specific factors was to identify any material differences between the information reported by the DNSP in its fire start report and through OSIRIS. In determining materiality, ESV considered whether:

- any differences in the location were sufficient to result in a change to the location multiplier being applied to the fire start
- any differences in the location were sufficient to result in an incorrect CFA region being used for determining the applicable Fire Danger Rating for the fire start
- any differences in the date and time were sufficient to result in an incorrect Fire Danger Rating being applied to the fire start.

Where potentially material differences were identified, ESV contacted the DNSP to confirm the reasons for the differences.

The DNSP then provided a rationale for the differences and, where there was a change to the information in the fire start spreadsheet, the DNSP provided an updated spreadsheet reflecting any changes and, in some instances, additional supporting information.

We reviewed the rationale and information subsequently provided by the DNSP to confirm we were satisfied with the rationale and information provided.

¹ OSIRIS is ESV's incident reporting portal for the major electricity companies to report details of any serious electrical incidents to ESV. These incidents include a range of events that include fires involving network assets.

- *Comparative analysis — non-IRU factors*

The purpose of the comparative analysis of non-IRU factors was to identify any differences between the information reported by the DNSP in its fire start report and through OSIRIS.

Where differences were identified, ESV identified these in this validation report. The DNSP was able to comment on these differences in its response to the draft validation report.

Following the validation process, ESV then used the final data to calculate an IRU amount for each fire start. We then compared these against the IRU amounts provided by the DNSP, and a total IRU amount was calculated.

Caveats

The following caveats apply to the validation process and the contents and findings of this report:

- *Accuracy of the fire start data*

The validation process involves the comparison of two data sets — the DNSP's fire start report and incident data reported by the DNSP via ESV's OSIRIS. Where there are differences between the data reported in these two data sets, ESV has not sought to ascertain which data set provide the true and accurate record of each fire start for the purposes of this report beyond a desktop assessment.

ESV can only attest that the data provided in the fire start report is appropriate for the purposes of calculating the total IRU amount. The information provided in the DNSP's fire start report should not be used for other purposes without further analysis of the data to verify it is fit for such purposes.

- *Validation against third-party sources*

ESV has not sought to validate or verify the data in the DNSP's fire start report in its entirety against third-party sources such as the Country Fire Authority (CFA) and Melbourne Metropolitan Fire Brigade (MFB).

This is not deemed to be a significant limitation on the validation process as any fires involving network assets should be reported by the CFA/MFB to the DNSP and these are, in turn, reportable to ESV.

Individual records may have been subject to confirmation with the CFA and/or MFB on a case-by-case basis. If this has occurred, it is noted within the report.

- *Independent verification of fire starts*

ESV does not have the resources available to routinely undertake independent assessments of the DNSP's electricity network in order to ascertain whether the DNSP identifies all incidents, including fires. As such, the fire starts may be under-reported; however, we are confident that the number of such incidents is small and that no significant fires could have gone unreported.

Similarly ESV has not undertaken an independent audit of the DNSP's records to ensure their accuracy. In this regard, we have relied on this being undertaken as part of the independent audit commissioned by the DNSP, the details of which were submitted as part of the fire start report.

Accuracy of information provided

ESV undertook an assessment of the accuracy of the information provided in the AusNet Services fire start report in accordance with clause 7(3)(b) of the Order In Council. The following sections outline the findings of the assessment.

Further details regarding the specific incidents reported in the fire start report are available upon request.

Preliminary review

Upon receipt of AusNet Services' documentation, we undertook a preliminary review to ensure that all the required documents had been provided to ESV and that the fire reporting spreadsheet had no obvious issues with regard to incomplete or incorrect data.

No high-level issues were identified with the documentation provided by AusNet Services.

Completeness assessment

We compared the records provided in the AusNet Services fire start spreadsheet with those available from ESV's OSIRIS incident reporting portal. This comparison was undertaken to assess the completeness of the fire start report, with specific attention paid to identifying any records missing from either data set or classified differently between the data sets.

The analysis identified 15 incidents where there were differences between the AusNet Services fire start report and ESV's OSIRIS records. Details are provided in Table 1.

ESV wrote to AusNet Services on 17 October seeking clarification regarding these differences.

On 30 and 31 October, AusNet Services provided further information on each of the incidents. In summary, six incidents listed in the fire start report were re-opened in OSIRIS for updating, three incidents were removed from the fire start report, four fires listed in OSIRIS were added to the fire start report, and two incidents listed in OSIRIS were updated to remove fire details.

In addressing the items in Table 1, AusNet Services identified two further incidents (20181113SPN_01 and 20181116SPN_01) that had been reported in OSIRIS as not resulting in fires when both incidents had involved candled or burnt fuses. AusNet Services requested that these incident reports be re-opened in OSIRIS so they could be updated to "pole-top fire". Both were already listed in the AusNet Services fire start report.

An updated fire start spreadsheet reflecting the above changes was submitted to the AER and ESV on 1 November 2019 — FY19 Ffactor RIN AusNet Services (Final) 20191101Resubmission.xlsm.

Table 1: Variations between the fire start report and OSIRIS

OSIRIS report	Included in report	Listed as fire in OSIRIS	Comment
20181115SPN_01 20181214SPN_01 20181214SPN_03 20181219SPN_01 20181221SPN_01 20190213SPN_06	Yes	No	These incidents were listed in the fire start report but were not recorded as fires in OSIRIS. Further review by AusNet Services identified that these were f-factor reportable events. The OSIRIS reports were re-opened for AusNet Services to update the fire details.
20180911SPN_02 20181127SPN_01 20181221SPN_02	Yes	No	These incidents were listed in the fire start report but were not recorded as fires in OSIRIS. Further review by AusNet Services identified that these were not f-factor reportable events. The AusNet Services fire start report was updated accordingly and resubmitted to the AER and ESV.
20180827SPN_01 20181107SPN_01 20190211SPN_02 20190322SPN_02	No	Yes	These incidents were listed as fires in OSIRIS but were not included in the fire start report. Further review by AusNet Services identified that these were f-factor reportable events. The AusNet Services fire start report was updated accordingly and resubmitted to the AER and ESV.
20190111SPN_08 20190115SPN_04	No	Yes	These incidents were listed as fires in OSIRIS but were not included in the fire start report. Further review by AusNet Services identified that these were not fire events. The OSIRIS reports were re-opened for AusNet Services to remove the fire details.

Comparative analysis — IRU-specific factors

We compared the location (latitude and longitude) and timing (date and time) of each record in the fire start report with the record of the same incident in OSIRIS.

As we recognised that errors may be introduced into the location data due to rounding errors and other system-induced errors, we rounded all latitudes and longitudes to five decimal places to reduce the impact of such errors on the analysis.

We then checked the location area (used to determine the location multiplier) and the CFA fire district (used to determine the danger multiplier) using the DNSP and OSIRIS location data to ascertain whether these differed from the fire start report. As such, we only consider those differences in location that were material to the calculation of the IRU amount.

In undertaking its analysis, ESV focused on those records where the differences could materially affect the IRU calculated for the fire start.

ESV applied the following tests to determine if the differences between the data sets could be material:

- **Test 1** : Is the difference in coordinates sufficient that a change in location may result in a change to the location multiplier?

The location area for each fire start was determined based on the coordinates in the fire start report and OSIRIS. This was done by identifying the location areas in which the coordinates were sited. If these differed from the location areas listed in the fire start report, the incident was investigated in more detail to identify the cause of the difference. Where necessary, the incident was referred back to the DNSP for further clarification.

- **Test 2** : Does the Fire Danger Rating applicable at the location and time for a record differ when based on the information specified in the fire start report and in OSIRIS?

The Fire Danger Rating is dependent on the location of the fire (which CFA region the fire occurred in) and the time of the fire (what was the applicable Bureau of Meteorology Fire Danger Rating at the time of the fire).

The CFA region for each fire start was determined based on the coordinates in the fire start report and OSIRIS. This was used to look up the Fire Danger Rating for that region in the spreadsheet of ratings available from the EM-COP website at the listed date and time of the fire.

The Fire Danger Rating was determined based on the coordinates and times in the fire start report and OSIRIS. If these differed from the ratings listed in the fire start report, the incident was investigated in more detail to identify the cause of the difference. Where necessary, the incident was referred back to the DNSP for further clarification.

Using these two tests, we identified five incidents where the differences in information have the potential to materially affect the IRU for the incident. All were associated with the location data; none was associated with the date and time data. ESV then reviewed each of these five incidents in detail (Table 2). In all five instances, ESV concluded that the location data provided in the AusNet Services fire start report was likely to be correct and the OSIRIS coordinates related to property addresses that did not match the actual fire locations.

ESV wrote to AusNet Services on 21 November noting the location discrepancies and the need to update OSIRIS accordingly. No changes to the AusNet Services fire start report were necessary.

AusNet Services reviewed all five incidents and confirmed that the location data provided in the fire start report was correct. AusNet Services should be commended for confirming the location data despite this adversely affected the IRUs in all five cases.

Table 2: Material differences the fire start report

OSIRIS report	Amend OSIRIS	Amend fire start report	ESV and AusNet Services commentary
20181219SPN_01	Yes	No	<p>The two locations are approx. 50 m apart.</p> <p>ESV's assessment of aerial photography concluded that the fire start report was likely to be correct.</p> <p>AusNet Services confirmed that the coordinates in the fire start report were correct and that OSIRIS would be updated accordingly.</p>
20190211SPN_02	Yes	No	<p>The two locations are approx. 435 m apart.</p> <p>ESV's assessment of aerial photography concluded that the fire start report was likely to be correct.</p> <p>AusNet Services confirmed that the coordinates in the fire start report were correct and that OSIRIS would be updated accordingly.</p>
20190227SPN_02	Yes	No	<p>The two locations are approx. 60 m apart.</p> <p>ESV's assessment of aerial photography concluded that the fire start report was likely to be correct.</p> <p>AusNet Services confirmed that the coordinates in the fire start report were correct and that OSIRIS would be updated accordingly.</p>
20190304SPN_08	Yes	No	<p>The two locations are approx. 17 m apart.</p> <p>ESV's assessment of aerial photography concluded that the fire start report was likely to be correct.</p> <p>AusNet Services confirmed that the coordinates in the fire start report were correct and that OSIRIS would be updated accordingly.</p>
20190619SPN_01	Yes	No	<p>The two locations are approx. 14 m apart.</p> <p>ESV's assessment of aerial photography concluded that the fire start report was likely to be correct.</p> <p>AusNet Services confirmed that the coordinates in the fire start report were correct and that OSIRIS would be updated accordingly.</p>

Comparative analysis — non-IRU factors

ESV undertook a comparison of the data in the AusNet Services fire start report and OSIRIS related to:

- the pole and polyphase electric line identification numbers
- the voltage of the electric line
- the kind of fire start.

A direct comparison was made of the details of the pole and line identification numbers and line voltage in the fire start report and OSIRIS. This did not require any subjective assessment. The comparison identified 22 incidents with differences between the fire start report and OSIRIS. Of these, nine related to typographic errors in either data set, three were due to pole or line numbers not being provided in OSIRIS and 11 were where the data was different between the data sets. None of the differences related to the reported voltages. Table 3 provides a breakdown of these findings.

Details from OSIRIS were used to determine whether the kind of fire start had been correctly identified. This involved a subjective assessment of the information.

The assessment of the kind of fire identified 123 fire starts where ESV would have classified the fire differently to AusNet Services. This included 108 incidents where AusNet Services classified the incidents as “otherwise started by a distribution system” and ESV classified these as “started in or originated from a distribution system”. The classifications are essentially interchangeable and ESV’s accepts the classifications applied by AusNet Services.

These remaining 15 incidents were:

- Incident 20181116SPN_01

AusNet Services classified this incident as “started by lightning striking a distribution system or a part of a distribution system”, but ESV’s review identified that this incident was “started by any person, bird, reptile or other animal coming into contact with a distribution system”. While lightning caused the fuse to trip, the cause of the fire was due to mal-operation of the fuse resulting from mud build-up in the fuse tube from nesting wasps.

- Incidents 20180808SPN_03 and 20190204SPN_01

AusNet Services classified these incidents as “started by any person, bird, reptile or other animal coming into contact with a distribution system”, but ESV’s review identified that these incidents were “started in or originated from a distribution system”. In reporting these incidents in OSIRIS, AusNet Services noted the cause as defective equipment; neither incident was attributed to any sort of contact event.

- Incidents 20181005SPN_01, 20190410SPN_01 and 20190828SPN_01

AusNet Services classified these incidents as “started by any other thing forming part of or coming into contact with a distribution system”, but ESV’s review identified that these incidents were “started in or originated from a distribution system”. In reporting the first two incidents in OSIRIS, AusNet Services noted the cause as defective equipment; the cause of the third was inconclusive but probably due to an asset failure. In all three instances, the incidents were not attributed to any sort of contact event.

- Incidents 20181113SPN_02 and 20190308SPN_05

AusNet Services classified these incidents as “otherwise started by a distribution system”, but ESV’s review identified that these incidents were “started by any other thing forming part of or coming into contact with a distribution system”. In reporting these incidents in OSIRIS, AusNet Services noted that both had been caused by excavators coming into contact with overhead lines.

- Incidents 20181218SPN_01, 20190111SPN_06, 20190211SPN_04, 20190403SPN_03 and 20190416SPN_04

AusNet Services classified these incidents as “otherwise started by a distribution system”, but ESV’s review identified that these incidents were “started by any person, bird, reptile or other animal coming into contact with a distribution system”. In reporting these incidents in OSIRIS, AusNet Services attributed the cause of the first incident to possum contact, the next three to bird contact, and the final incident as inconclusive but exhibiting a burn pattern consistent with other bird contact fires.

- Incidents 20181214SPN_03 and 20190117SPN_01

AusNet Services classified these incidents as “otherwise started by a distribution system”, but ESV’s review identified that these incidents were “started by lightning striking a distribution system or a part of a distribution system”. In reporting these incidents in OSIRIS, AusNet Services attributed the cause of these incidents to lightning strike.

None of the differences in pole and line identification numbers or classification of kind of fire start had a material impact on the total IRU calculation.

No consultation was held with AusNet Services regarding these differences.

Table 3: Variations in pole id, line id and voltage

OSIRIS report	Cause of the variation		
	typographic error	different data	data not in OSIRIS
20180808SPN_01	line id		
20180808SPN_03		line id	
20180827SPN_01			pole id
20180926SPN_01	line id		
20181005SPN_01		line id	
20181112SPN_04			line id
20181115SPN_01		line id	
20181116SPN_03		pole id	
20190111SPN_02	line id		
20190111SPN_03	line id		
20190111SPN_07	line id		
20190131SPN_01		line id	
20190131SPN_03		pole id	
20190204SPN_02	line id		
20190211SPN_03	line id		
20190212SPN_04	pole id		
20190218SPN_03	line id		
20190220SPN_01		pole id	
20190403SPN_01		line id	
20190410SPN_01		line id	pole id
20190422SPN_01		line id	
20190827SPN_04		pole id	

Verification of the IRU amount

Following the validation of individual records, ESV compiled any changes to the fire start records and assigned the corresponding location and danger multipliers. The individual and total IRU amounts were then calculated.

We then compared our location and danger multipliers with those of AusNet Services to determine whether AusNet Services had correctly assigned the multipliers for each fire start. There were no differences in the multipliers or IRU amounts.

As part of the validation process, ESV identified differences in the fire start report that had a material impact on the total IRU amount; these differences did not require AusNet Services to issue an amended fire start report nor did it need to amend the total IRU amount.

While some differences have been identified, ESV recognises that there will always be errors in any reporting involving the manual entry of data and manual transfer of data between systems. AusNet Services should be commended for the accuracy of its fire start report and its OSIRIS reporting. In the first fire start report that ESV validated for 2016-2017 financial year, there were extremely high levels of difference between the two data sources. AusNet Services, and its regulatory reporting staff, have clearly put in significant effort to ensure that the alignment of reporting to the AER and ESV.

ESV can confirm that the total IRU amount of 220.76 as reported in the amended fire start report (*FY19 Ffactor RIN AusNet Services (Final) 20191101Resubmission.xlsx*) is correct.

Note on EM-COP Fire Danger Ratings data

The EM-COP website provides a function whereby users can download a spreadsheet of the historic Fire Danger Ratings for use in the F-factor reporting process. The DNSPs use this data to determine the appropriate Fire Danger Ratings to attach to their fire start reports.

In undertaking the validation process, ESV identified that the spreadsheet included several types of suspect data:

- repeated rows the time stamp is the same as the previous row and the FDR data is duplicated
- new data the time stamp is the same as the previous row but the FDR data has been altered, generally to include a row of zeroes that is interpreted as “no forecast”
- backward step the time stamp for the row pre-dates the previous row, generally without changing the data

Repeated rows and backward steps generally do not affect the fire start reporting exercise. The insertion of new rows with “no forecast” data potentially can have a significant impact on the fire start reports.

In a review of records from 1 July 2014 to 20 November 2019, ESV identified 203 suspect entries in the data broken down as follows:

- two instances that occur before the 2018-2019 financial year; both of these are repeated rows
- 41 instances in 2018-2019, including six repeated rows, 24 rows with new data, nine backward steps with new data and two backward steps with repeated data
- 160 suspect rows in 2019-2020, including 40 repeated rows, 54 rows with new data, 34 backward steps with new data and 32 backward steps with repeated data.

The frequency of errors occurring seems to be escalating and potentially poses a significant risk to the accuracy of next year’s fire start reports.

This issue has been brought to the attention of the AER. It has also been raised with DELWP Powerline Bushfire Safety Program as the client for the EM-COP reporting.

Conclusion

As noted earlier, the Order In Council stipulates that this validation report:

- (b) must include an assessment of the accuracy of the information provided in the fire start report pursuant to clauses 6(3)(d)-(f) and (h), specifically:
- (c) must verify the estimate of the ignition risk unit (IRU) amount for the financial year provided under clause 6(3)(g).

Table 4 identifies where these items have been assessed within this report and summarises the key findings of the validation assessment.

With the recent updates to OSIRIS that allow the DNSPs to report locations by latitude and longitude rather than address (with coordinates inferred from the address), ESV will be looking to extend the validation reporting for future years to a broader check of the location data in the fire start reports. We will still identify locations where there are material differences, as well as report on broader alignment of data between the AER and ESV data.

Table 4: Summary of findings

Statistic	Relevant report section	Key findings
Clause 6(3)(d)	Request from AER	The fire start report addressed the AusNet Services distribution system separately from other systems managed by the service provider.
Clause 6(3)(e)(i)	Comparative analysis — non-IRU factors	There were 123 differences between the assessment of the fire type made by AusNet Services and that made by ESV. Of these, 108 related to the application of interchangeable classifications, with either classification being appropriate. A further 15 were due to differences in the classification of events. These differences were not material to the calculation of the total IRU amount.
Clause 6(3)(e)(ii)	Comparative analysis — IRU-specific factors	There were no material differences in the date and time of incidents in the AusNet Services fire report. There were five differences that were potentially material to the calculation of the total IRU amount. None of these required amendment of the fire start report; all required an update of the incident reports in OSIRIS.
Clause 6(3)(e)(iii)	Comparative analysis — non-IRU factors	There was seven differences between the fire start report and OSIRIS in relation to pole identification numbers. There were 16 differences between the fire start report and OSIRIS in relation to polyphase electric line identification numbers. These differences were not material to the calculation of the total IRU amount.
Clause 6(3)(e)(iv)	Comparative analysis — non-IRU factors	There were no differences between the fire start report and OSIRIS in relation to voltage of the line involved in the fire.
Clause 6(3)(e)(v)	Verification of IRU amount	The total IRU amount of 220.76 provided in the fire start report (<i>FY19 Ffactor RIN AusNet Services (Final) 20191101 Resubmission.xlsm</i>) is correct.
Clause 6(3)(f)	Completeness assessment	AusNet Services had reported all fires to ESV as the relevant entity.