Appendix 2 CCTV Camera

In Summary

The issues:

- 1 The Faulty Camera
 - a. A fault has occurred with one of the cameras, (which had previously been replaced under warranty) this fault may have occurred due to a power surge and it not being adequately protected with a UPS.
 - b. CCTV equipment found not to be covered by current insurance policy and not covered by the warranty provided by the installer or manufacturer.
- 2 The Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS)
 - a. Upgraded UPS is deemed necessary to protect camera from future power surges/outages. Original one bought was found to be not fit for purpose and was being returned by Cllr Worth for a refund. (Nov meeting)
 - b. Currently we are 'piggy backing' the UPS at the Visitor Centre which is not an ideal, long-term solution.
 - c. November meeting agreed to obtain an upgraded UPS, quotes sought from original installer. Cllr Worth given approval to proceed.

Actions taken so far:

Since the discussion at the December meeting Cllr Manning has sought to clarify the situation with regard to where the fault, if any, with the Camera lies (i.e., with the camera, the instillation, UPS, or lack of)

The current situation:

- 1 A new camera is required, at cost to the Council.
- 2 Upgraded UPS is required to protect the camera going forward.
- 3 Cllr. Tigwell has confirmed that the Council has sufficient funds in the 21/22 budget to purchase the necessary equipment should it decide to do so. (Email 09 Jan 22)
- 4 Cllr. Manning sought confirmation from Cllrs Geen, Tigwell and Worth to proceed with the purchase of the upgraded UPS and the new camera. (Email 20 Jan 22)

2022
£150
£150
£150
£ 80
£150
no charge

Costs outlined below from Bob Castle in email dated 10 January 2022

week of my time as constant connection losseseven was up in the middle of the night reconnecting note inc. in service element	
New ANPR Camera c/w 12 months Parts/Labour Warranty	£485
(You will be supplied with serial no.)	
The above totals	£1,165 plus vat
I have written off / absorbed as goodwill	£380 plus vat
Balance Payable	£785 plus vat

Further actions to be taken:

- 1 Clerk to undertake to add the UPS and CCTC equipment to the schedule of insurance when renewed in March/April.
- 2 One point of contact to be agreed between Council and Installer, to avoid any confusion going forwards. Suggested that this is either Cllr. Worth or Cllr. Manning.

See below for more detail regarding the issue and related correspondence.

Correspondence and Further Information on the matter

From Cllr. Manning To Cllr Geen, Cllr Worth cc Cllr Tigwell Date 12 Dec 2022 at 1718

At the last meeting we agreed on the spend for the UPS but that was all. I believe I mentioned one of the cameras was down and Dave added that HANWA were querying whether or not the fault lay with the camera or I believe the installation as it was the second time this camera had failed. Being charged to replace it plus the other costs involved were new to me, hence my email to David the other day. At this stage I am not sure I accept that any of the blame, therefore the costs lie with us. Bob is our contractor, he is our advisor and he was the installer therefore I would need to see some evidence to suggest any failing can be down to us.

Even if the camera is out of its warranty, which I have queried with Dave, there is a question about fit for purpose. A camera like this is not expected to just outlast its warranty. I thought we were buying something of quality so would need to have this explained to me. We clearly need to know where the failing is occurring. If it is a faulty camera then the manufacturers are liable, if it has something to do with the installation then it would be down to Bob. I thought we had made it clear to him that apart from the obvious servicing we do not have spare cash floating around. This does need more questions to be asked.

Notes from minutes of Meeting 14th Dec 2022

CCTV system repair and UPS update. Cllr Worth reported that a complicated situation was developing. One of the cameras of the Council's system installed by Bob Castle in the Information Centre has failed and that the camera manufacturers are unwilling to replace it as this would be the second unit that has failed within a matter of months suggesting that there is a fault with the installation. Obviously, this represents an entirely unacceptable situation where the Council would be facing an endless series of replacement camera purchases at £475 (plus VAT) per unit. Power supply regulation via a UPS may be a factor that would help to ameliorate the situation. The UPS that was previously purchased by the Council may not be of the correct type and may need to back to the vendor. It was suggested that other users of the same system (Callington Town Castle) were contacted to see if they were encountering similar issues.

Action. Cllr Geen to check on the terms of the original contract. A check to be carried out to see if a UPS was specified.

Action Taken: Cllr. Geen contacted the previous Clerk to ascertain if a written contract existed between the Council and the Installer. Reply was that they were only aware of a verbal contract and quotation for the provision of services which included maintenance of the system.

From: Cllr. Manning To: Robert Castle **Date: Fri, Jan 7, 2022 at 1020** Subject: Defective Camera

I have been asked to pick this issue up and resolve it. In order to do this, I need to better understand the issues.

Backgound:

The initial installation of the CCTV system began on the 20th January 2021, at that time you recommended we also install a UPS but it was pointed out the funds were spent but we would put one in as soon as we could. You advised that this meant the system would go down if the village suffered a power cut and the system would then need to be restarted, we accepted this.

On or around March 20th the camera on Plymouth Hill stopped working, it was collected by you and returned to your supplier and found to be defective. A new camera was installed and the system then continued to work until sometime in November 2021 when again the camera on Plymouth Hill failed. This time your supplier refused to replace it. You then submitted a quote for a new camera plus the installation. So my questions for you are:

1 What is wrong with the camera that was installed in March. It is not enough for them to say it not working, we know that we need to know why.

2 Why is your supplier refusing to honour the 12 month warranty that came with that camera and runs until March 2022.

As you can appreciate Bob our contract although verbal, is with you and not your supplier. As we do not, and never have touched the cameras or any part of the installation it is hard for us to understand how any of this can be seen to be our fault. The problem has to be either within the installation or the equipment. Now I have faith in the fact that it is not within the installation which leaves the camera itself.

I would be grateful if you could treat this matter with a sense of urgency as snow is on the Horizon. If you could begin by answering the two questions I pose I would be very grateful. From Bob Castle To Cllr. Manning Date Friday 7th 2022 at 1307

Here's the answers you requested regarding the damaged camera (defective would not be the correct term)

 On both occasions the power circuit failed on the camera due to spiking or possible external electrical interference like a lightning strike in the area Technically fail one could be chargable according to our t's and c's but wasn't.
As per our standard trading terms below warranty is 12 months parts and labour were sent along with an initial quotation to Steve on Thurs Nov 26th 2020

The client is responsible for insuring the equipment during and on completion of installation.

2.0. WARRANTY AND WARRANTY EXCLUSIONS

All equipment supplied by Castle CCTV Ltd will be provided with a 12 months parts warranty in line with the manufacturer's terms and conditions and 12 months labour warranty. Failure of equipment or cabling not supplied by Castle CCTV Ltd will be charged at published trade rates.

Acts of God, User Errors, Third Party Interference, Radio Transmission Interference, Flood, Fire, Electrical Supply Interruptions, Electrical Surge, ADSL or Phone line failures, Lightning, Deliberate or Accidental Damage, will not be warranted. Call outs relating to any of the above will be charged at the current rate.

I have sent you an invoice already which was absorbing a huge amount of labour cost myself as a gesture of good will also inc a staggered payment option

Quote from email omitted as updated/replicated in table below as revised costs Therefore in summary I am happy to charge you labour only and a free camera as above - but somewhere along the line I need to be fair to myself after doing so much for you

Currently I think Ali has the system on his UPS....to which I spent hours trying to find a suitable "onlineUPS" which is an SEP700 at around £300 odd from memory - only one that is full spec and not near a £1000 as all others were.

Hopefully if Ali Bright is agreeable your system could stay on his permanently to save you some cost

From Bob Castle

To Gregg Manning

Date: 10 January 2022 at 1249

Here's a summary with your costs advised – even if you give me a verbal nod to proceed I will crack on as finding gaps in weather etc few and far between this time of year.

Annual Service	£150
	£150
Visit to check and collect camera	
Reinstall of new ANPR	£150
USB stick data return to site for police and	£ 80
delivery of free UPS formerly from Exmouth TC	
system (after Ali checking/charging it	
dídn't work)	
Online test reconfig and programming post fitting and	£150
pre config here	
Downloading of 120Gb of data ref recent Police	no charge
request took me the best part of a week of my time	
as constant connection losseseven was up in the	
middle of the night reconnecting	
note inc in service element	
New ANPR Camera c/w 12 months Parts/Labour	£485
Warranty	
(You will be supplied with serial no.)	
The above totals	£1,165 plus vat
I have written off / absorbed as goodwill	£380 plus vat
Balance Payable	£785 plus vat

The below is an "onlineUPS" at the lowest cost I have seen, mostly £900 plus for all others I had found for an online UPS (a UPS that sees no break in power at all – only if power off long enough to drain battery would it see "no power")

https://upsbuyer.com/product/riello-sep700-ups/?gclid=CjwKCAiAz--OBhBIEiwAG1rIOoOp1-TxJH1T9h67 -ZDT1GdGPbI xeMRhmOT5Jt2L2AsbG911-GLBoCB7gQAvD BwE



£240.20 ex VAT £288.24 inc VAT

From Cllr. Manning

To Cllrs. Geen & Worth, Clerk cc Bob Castle

Date 8 Jan 2022 at 15.12

Well you will have all seen the various emails between Bob and myself. Not entirely satisfactory but I could sense how far I could push him. I think we might need to tighten up on a couple of procedures such as downloading of data. Bottom line is we are going to have to swallow the cost of a new camera, and some labour costs but let's wait for the invoice before we panic. I think Bob is right about one port of call to avoid mistakes. This can either be myself or David I would suggest, still time to talk about that later.

From Cllr Geen

To Cllr Manning cc Cllrs Worth & Tigwell

Date 09 Jan 2022 at 0825

Thank you for taking that on and getting answers. They might not be the ones we wanted to hear but we had to clarify. I've included Nigel on this reply so he can get a feel for budgeting although I realise that will have to wait until Bob Castle comes back to us.

From Cllr Tigwell

To Cllrs. Geen, Manning, Worth, Clerk

Date 09 January 2022 at 0951

Thank you for copying me in Alison. I have not seen the email chain Gregg refers to but I get the picture. As it stands, the council is in a strong position to meet these unplanned costs owing to the toilets underspend. If the costs outstrip that provision, we have healthy reserves and as the CCTV system is a headline project I have no issue with us drawing on them.

I would like a feel for where we are on the UPS. The last discussion I had with David before Christmas was that it was to be returned at our expense for refund and we would purchase an upgraded one. Is that happening or are we trying to make do?

From Cllr Manning

To Cllrs. Tigwell cc Cllrs. Geen & Worth, Clerk

Date 09 Jan 2022 at1456

Just to confirm it would appear that Ali at National Park has allowed us to piggy back on to his UPS which removes the threat of further spikes which could damage our system. I do not know how this was arranged but we do need to discuss the matter with him to find out if he is happy for it to remain like this or do we need to install our own UPS. I will try to speak with him before our next meeting.

From Cllr Tigwell

To Cllrs. Geen, Worth, Manning, Clerk

Date 09 Jan 2022 at 1531

Having read through the email chain between Gregg and Bob Castle (thank you Alison), I see insurance is mentioned several times. I am not convinced we are insured for the CCTV system. I only have records for the policy for 2020/21 but for that we only have the lengthsman equipment and defibrillators specifically

mentioned. Steve handled the renewal for 2021/22 during one of his periods back in role so he may have added the CCTV system then, but probably not as the premium barely increased (£470.59 to £472.21).

Jackie,

Would you look on the Clerk's computer for an email from Zurich Town and Parish Insurance sent around April 2021, please. The attached Zip documents attached to it should include a schedule of what is and is not included. That should tell us whether Steve expanded the scope to include CCTV.

As per my earlier email, even if we are not covered, we can afford the costs outlined in Bob Castle's emails thus year.

From Cllr Tigwell

To Cllrs. Geen, Worth, Manning, Clerk

Date 10 Jan 2022 at 1324

1. Bob's quote plus his recommended UPS broadly equate to our projected underspend and are affordable. Cost need not be a factor in your decision whether to proceed.

2. Jackie has the delegated authority to make the decision to proceed if that is what you three wish - we do not need to wait for the next meeting.

3. I remain uncertain about the status of the less capable UPS David purchased on our behalf last year. (If the worse comes to the worst we can absorb the cost and recoup some money by reselling it on eBay - David acted on Bob's advice and on our behalf so he should not be financially disadvantaged.)

4. Has Jackie had any luck in cross checking the insurance schedule yet? NB the equipment and serial numbers are now in our asset register - thank you for obtaining them.

From Clerk

To Cllrs. Geen, Worth, Tigwell, Manning

Date 10 Jan 2022 at 2134

I have managed to find a copy of the Insurance Schedule, (see attached which I hope you can open).

However, it makes no mention of CCTV equipment being covered.

I suspect that unless we add it as an additional item along with the mower and defibrillators it would not be covered under the current policy.

I am happy to contact Zurich to check if you think it necessary.

From Cllr Tigwell

To Clerk cc Cllrs. Geen, Worth, Manning

Date 10 Jan 2022 at 2146

What you have found rather confirms what I expected and that we are not covered for the CCTV equipment. I don't think there is much point in contacting Zurich. When we come to renew the insurance in April it will probably be worth getting a quote for the CCTV inclusion, but based on what we have experienced so far it might be rather expensive.

Personally, I am content for us to proceed along the lines recommended by Bob Castle. We just need to close out the issues with the UPS.

From Cllr. Manning To Cllrs. Geen, Worth, Tigwell Date: 20 January 2022 at 1140

I am still waiting for the green light to go ahead and tell Bob to change the cameras and install the UPS. Nigel has already confirmed that he is happy we have enough money in the budget but I do need the nod from everyone. Please before the

meeting next week and I will get on to Bob.

From Cllr. Geen To Cllr Manning, cc Cllrs. Tigwell and Worth Date: 20 Jan 2022 at 1146

I thought you were going to discuss with David and proceed. I hadn't realised you were waiting on anyone else. Go ahead from me.

From Cllr Tigwell To Cllr Manning cc Cllrs. Geen & Worth, DFPC Clerk Date 20 Jan 2022 at 1149 I concur with Alison, I thought you and David were proceeding already. From my perspective, please proceed. NB I have copied in Jackie.