# McGill Engineering Services Pty Ltd



Engineering, Adjudication & Arbitration Services ABN 45 106 691 169

# KARARA POWERPTY LTD TRANSMISSION LICENCE ETL 6 ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REVIEW

Prepared By Kevan McGill 25 September 2013

17 Juniper Way Duncraig WA 6023 Tel:+61 894475286 Mob: 0434 148 971

# McGill Engineering Services Pty Ltd



Engineering, Adjudication & Arbitration Services ABN 45 106 691 169

Mahendra Kuruppu Utilities Superintendent Karara Power Pty Ltd L9, 216 St George Tce PERTH WA 6000

Dear Mr Kuruppu

### Asset Management System Review Electricity Licences

The fieldwork on the asset management system review of Transmission Licence ETL 6 for the review period (27 October 2010 to 30 June 2013) is complete and I am pleased to submit the report to you.

In my opinion, the Licensee maintained, in all material aspects, effective control procedures and an effective asset management system in relation to the Transmission licence (ETL 6) for the review period on the relevant clauses referred to within the scope section of this report. There are some improvements necessary.

Yours sincerely

Kevan McGill Director

Date 25 September 2013

17 Juniper Way Duncraig WA 6023 Tel:+61 894475286 Mob: 0434 148 971

## CONTENTS

| Executive Summary4   |
|--|
| Overall Conclusion4  |
| Licence4   |
| Ams Review – Methodology And Summary5                      |
| Rating system5   |
| Asset management effectiveness summary6                    |
| Recommendations6   |
| Post Review Implementation Plan7                           |
| Asset Management System Review8                            |
| Asset Management System Review Objectives8                 |
| Statement of Independence9                                 |
| Review Period9   |
| Scope Limitation10   |
| Previous actions10   |
| Contacts10   |
| Review evidence11  |
| Overall Conclusion   |
| Findings11   |
| Asset management system review results and recommendations |

### Executive Summary

*Karara Power Pty Ltd* (Karara KPPL) holds an Electricity Transmission Licence (*ETL 6*) issued by the Economic Regulation Authority under the Electricity Industry Act 2004 (WA). The Electricity Industry Act 2004 (WA) requires the holder of a Transmission Licence to undertake a Review, and provide the Authority a report, by an independent expert on the effectiveness of their Asset Management System. This Review of the Karara Asset Management System was conducted in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Economic Regulation Authority (*Authority*) for the review period (27 October 2010 to 30 June 2013) to assess the Licensee's asset management systems.

Following development of an Asset Management System Review Plan and its approval by the Authority, Karara appointed McGill Engineering Services to undertake the Review.

The Licensee has a 330kV/132kV transmission line running from Western Power's Eneabba Substation to Western Power's Three Springs Terminal and then to Karara mine site. Western Power wheels electricity from Eneabba to Three Springs. The Licensee purchases power in bulk from Verve and is metered by Western Power at the network's entry point at Eneabba. There are no meters operated by the Licensee. The licensee currently supplies itself but there is an intention to supply other miners at Karara. Western Power will wheel power though the line for another miner. Western Power intends to purchase the Eneabba to Three Springs section in the future as part of its Mid West project.

The Electricity Licence requires Karara to provide the authority with a report following the Asset Management System Review by an independent expert on a defined time scale. This is the first review of the Karara Asset Management System.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION

In my opinion, the Licensee maintained, in all material aspects, an effective asset management system in relation to the Transmission licence (ETL 6) for the review period based on the relevant clauses referred to within the asset management review objectives (Page 8) of this report.

There are some improvements required.

### LICENCE

The licensee has no customers and the Licensee has not supplied any retailers in the review period and no small use customers. There have been no generators, retailers or other customers connected to the network in the review period. The Licensee intends to supply other miners in the future. Western Power will wheel power though the line for another miner. Western Power intends to purchase the Eneabba to Three Springs section in the future as part of its Mid West project.

### AMS REVIEW - METHODOLOGY AND SUMMARY

The overall effectiveness rating for an asset management process is based on a combination of the process and policy adequacy rating and the performance rating. The rating systems are given below followed by a summary table of the Asset Management Effectiveness

#### **RATING SYSTEM**

The definition tables for process and policy adequacy rating and the performance rating are provided below.

| Rating | Description                         | Criteria   |
|--------|-------------------------------------|--|
| A      | Adequately defined                  | <ul> <li>Processes and policies are documented.</li> <li>Processes and policies adequately document the required performance of the assets.</li> <li>Processes and policies are subject to regular reviews, and updated where necessary</li> <li>The asset management information system(s) are adequate in relation to the assets that are being managed.</li> </ul>  |
| В      | Requires some<br>improvement        | <ul> <li>Process and policy documentation requires improvement.</li> <li>Processes and policies do not adequately document the required performance of the assets.</li> <li>Reviews of processes and policies are not conducted regularly enough.</li> <li>The asset management information system(s) require minor improvements (taking into consideration the assets that are being managed).</li> </ul>         |
| с      | Requires significant<br>improvement | <ul> <li>Process and policy documentation is incomplete or requires significant improvement.</li> <li>Processes and policies do not document the required performance of the assets.</li> <li>Processes and policies are significantly out of date.</li> <li>The asset management information system(s) require significant improvements (taking into consideration the assets that are being managed).</li> </ul> |
| D      | Inadequate                          | <ul> <li>Processes and policies are not documented.</li> <li>The asset management information system(s) is not fit for purpose (taking into consideration the assets that are being managed).</li> </ul>   |

#### Asset management process and policy definition adequacy ratings

#### Asset management review effectiveness rating scale

| Rating | Description                 | Criteria  |
|--------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1      | Performing effectively      | <ul> <li>The performance of the process meets or exceeds the required levels of performance.</li> <li>Process effectiveness is regularly assessed and corrective action taken where necessary.</li> </ul>   |
| 2      | Opportunity for improvement | <ul> <li>The performance of the process requires some improvement to meet the required level.</li> <li>Process effectiveness reviews are not performed regularly enough.</li> <li>Process improvement opportunities are not actioned.</li> </ul>              |
| 3      | Corrective action required  | <ul> <li>The performance of the process requires significant improvement to meet the required level.</li> <li>Process effectiveness reviews are performed irregularly, or not at all.</li> <li>Process improvement opportunities are not actioned.</li> </ul> |

| 4 Serious action required | • | Process is not performed, or the performance is so poor that the process is considered to be ineffective. | ] |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|
|---------------------------|---|---|---|

#### ASSET MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS SUMMARY

A summary of the reviewer's assessment of both the process and policy definition rating and the performance rating for each key process in the Licensee's asset management system using the scales described below.

#### Asset management effectiveness summary

| ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM                | Asset<br>management<br>process and<br>policy definition<br>adequacy rating | Asset<br>management<br>performance<br>rating |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Asset planning                      | A  | 2  |
| 2. Asset creation/ acquisition         | A  | 1  |
| 3. Asset disposal                      | В  | NR <sup>1</sup>                              |
| 4. Environmental analysis              | А  | 2  |
| 5. Asset operations                    | В  | 2  |
| 6. Asset maintenance                   | А  | 2  |
| 7. Asset Management Information System | A  | 1  |
| 8. Risk management                     | В  | 2  |
| 9. Contingency planning                | С  | 3  |
| 10. Financial planning                 | В  | 2  |
| 11. Capital expenditure planning       | В  | 2  |
| 12. Review of AMS                      | A  | NR   |

It is not implied that any assessment at "A" or "1" means that there is not scope for continuous improvement, rather that no recommendations for improvement have been recommended in this report.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

| No. | Asset<br>Management<br>Element | Finding | Recommendation |  |
|-----|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|--|
|-----|--------------------------------|---------|----------------|--|

<sup>1</sup> NR – Not Rated

| 2.0  | Asset Creation          | Improve HR standards by<br>having requirements to comply<br>with statutory obligations | Add an overt requirement to comply with statutory obligations to HR standards.   |
|------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 3.1  | Asset Disposal          | Asset disposal process incomplete.   | Develop an asset disposal process.   |
| 5.6  | Asset Operations        | Not monitoring for outages   | Commence monitoring for<br>outages   |
| 9.1  | Contingency<br>Planning | Contingency Plans not yet developed  | Develop Contingency plans<br>based on risk assessment<br>and subsequently schedule<br>testing of the contingency<br>plans. |
| 12.2 | Review of AMS           | Schedule review of AMS   | The Asset Management<br>System requires a scheduled<br>formal review every 5 years.  |

### POST REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Licensee will provide a post review implementation plan.

### Asset Management System Review

### ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REVIEW OBJECTIVES

Under the *Electricity Industry Act 2004* (the Act) section 14, the holder of a Transmission License must develop an Asset Management Plan and maintain an asset management system to manage the assets accordingly for delivery of a reliable service to its customers. The Act requires a review of the asset management system every two years (or other time approved by the *Authority*).

This report is an impartial review of the Licensee's asset management effectiveness under the Review Guidelines: Electricity, Gas and Water Licences published by the ERA.

The review conducted between July and September 2013 examined the asset management processes used by the Licensee in delivering the services to its customers. These services include lifecycle processes for:

- Asset planning;
- Asset creation/acquisition;
- Asset disposal;
- Environmental analysis;
- Asset operations;
- Asset maintenance;
- Asset management information system (AMIS);
- Risk management;
- Contingency planning;
- Financial planning;
- Capital expenditure planning; and
- Review of the asset management system.

As well as the processes, the asset management supporting systems were tested as to their use and effectiveness. Data used by the Licensee was also examined with respect to its effectiveness for asset management and the delivery of outcomes.

Tests were undertaken through interviews and investigation of the processes to assess whether they were being performed as documented.

The Licensee appointed McGill Engineering Services Pty Ltd to conduct the review of its Transmission Licence with approval from the Authority. A preliminary assessment was conducted with the Licensee's management to determine the inherent risk and the state of control for each compliance element of the Licence obligation. McGill Engineering Services Pty Ltd then prioritised the review coverage based on the risk profile of the Licensee with an emphasis on providing greater focus and depth of testing for areas of higher risk to provide reasonable assurance that the Licensee had complied with the standards, outputs and outcomes under the Licence obligations.

The review was conducted in a manner consistent with Australian Reviewing Standards (AUS) 808 "Planning Performance Reviews" and AUS 806"Performance Reviewing". McGill Engineering Services Pty Ltd evaluated the adequacy and effectiveness of the controls and performance by the Licensee relative to the standards referred in the Transmission Licence through a combination of enquiries, examination of documents and detailed testing for Electricity Transmission Licence ETL 6 for Karara Power Pty Ltd.

### STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

To the best of my knowledge and belief, there is no basis for contraventions of any professional code of conduct in respect of the review.

I have not done or contemplate undertaking any other work with the Licensee.

There are no independence threats due to:

- self-interest as the review company or a member of the review team have no financial or non-financial interests in the Licensee or a related entity;
- o self-review no circumstance has occurred:
  - where the review company or a member of the review team has undertaken other non-review work for the Licensee that is being evaluated in relation to the review/review; or
  - when a member of the review team was previously an officer or director of the Licensee; or
  - where a member of the review team was previously an employee of the Licensee who was in a position to exert direct influence over material that will be subject to review during an review/review.

There is no risk of a self-review threat as:

- no work has been undertaken by the reviewer, or a member of the review/review team, for the Licensee within the previous 24 months; or
- o the reviewer is currently undertaking for the Licensee; or
- the reviewer has submitted an offer, or intends to submit an offer, to undertake for the Licensee within the next 6months; and
- there is no close family relationship with a Licensee, its directors, officers or employees, and
- the reviewer is not, nor is perceived to be too sympathetic to the Licensee's interests.

#### REVIEW PERIOD

The review period is 27 October 2010 to 30 June 2013. This is a first review.

### SCOPE LIMITATION

The review was undertaken by examination of documents, interviews with key persons and observations and is not a detailed inspection of physical items.

### PREVIOUS ACTIONS

There are no actions to follow up as this is a first review.

### CONTACTS

The key contacts were:

- Licensee
  - Mahendra Kuruppu- Utilities Superintendent
  - Sufi Sufani Commercial Analyst
- McGill Engineering Services Pty Ltd
  - Kevan McGill

The review was conducted during May and June 2013. Kevan McGill took approximately 80 hours on the review.

| Stage   | Reviewer | Standard  |
|---|----------|---|
| 1. Risk & Materiality<br>Assessment Outcome<br>- Operational/<br>Performance Review<br>Plan   | K McGill | ASA 300 Planning<br>ASA 315: Risk Assessments and<br>Internal Controls<br>AUS 808: Planning Performance<br>Reviews<br>AS/NZS 4360:2004: Risk Management<br>ERA Guidelines |
| 2. System Analysis  | K McGill | AUS 810: Special Purpose Reports on<br>Effectiveness of<br>Control Procedures   |
| <ul> <li>3. Fieldwork</li> <li>Assessment and testing of;</li> <li>The control environment</li> <li>Information system</li> <li>Compliance procedures</li> <li>Compliance attitude</li> </ul> | K McGill | AUS 502: Review Evidence<br>AUS 806: Performance Reviewing  |
| 4. Reporting  | K McGill | ASA 300 Planning<br>AUS 806: Performance Reviewing  |

### REVIEW EVIDENCE

The following was considered in the review.

- Transmission Licence
- Contact details
- Asset Register
- Environmental Plans and Approvals
- Spares List
- Commissioning Plans
- Karara Mining Financial reports
- Annual compliance returns
- Reticulation plans
- Asset management plan
- Risk management policy
- Project management manual
- As constructed details
- Financial philosophy (Plan)
- HR Standards

### OVERALL CONCLUSION

In my opinion, the Licensee maintained, in all material aspects, effective control procedures and an effective asset management system in relation to the Transmission licence (ETL 6) for the review period based on the relevant clauses referred to within the asset management review objectives (Page 8) of this report. There are some improvements required.

### FINDINGS

The conclusions of each of the elements of the licence are summarised in the following tables.

# ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REVIEW RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| Asset Planning  | Process/Policy rating<br>A  | Effectiveness rating 2   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <ol> <li>Asset planning</li> <li>Asset planning strategies are focused on meeting customer needs in the most effective<br/>and efficient manner (delivering the right service at the right price).</li> </ol> |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset Planning Process/Plan ar<br>The Licensee has approximatel<br>Karara.  | nd its currency<br>y 176 km of Transmission lines b   | petween Eneabba and  |  |  |  |  |  |
| business of the company which<br>mining and are governed by the<br>usually much longer than the life  | art of the context of the licensed<br>is mining. The licensed facilities<br>life of the mine. The life cycle of<br>of a mine. Asset planning will b<br>no planning for licensed assets th | only exist to facilitate<br>Transmission assets is<br>be subservient to mine |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Licensee has developed an plan is to be reviewed 5 yearly b   | n asset management plan for the<br>by Utilities Superintendent.   | licensed assets. This  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The asset management plan co  | nsists of following parts:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose of the Asset Ma   | <ul> <li>Purpose of the Asset Management Plan (AMP)</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key Stakeholders  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Future Power Transmiss  | sion Demand   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Risk Management   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Financials  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Three Springs 330kV Transmiss   | ion Line   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Access   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supply Reliability  | 1001.)/ Cubatation to Three Covin   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| •   | 132kV Substation to Three Sprin<br>ings Terminal to Karara's Mine)  | igs reminal)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance (Three Spr     Corona and Thermal Ima   | •   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Photos and Drawings</li> </ul>   | aging   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Inspections  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spares  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emergency and Breakdo   | own   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation of Asset Perf  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service strategies and service s  | Service strategies and service standards are set out in the plan.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Given the context of the license  | d assets as part of much bigger   | assets, the plan is  |  |  |  |  |  |

appropriate for the scale and nature of the operations.

Allocation of responsibilities / statutory obligations

The organisational arrangements allocate responsibilities. There is documentation requiring compliance with statutory obligations.

Evaluation Criteria summary

- 1.1 Planning process and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and is integrated with business planning.
- Response: The AMP meets this criterion and reflects the needs of all stakeholders and is integrated with business planning.
  - 1.2 Service levels are defined

Response: The AMP defines service levels.

- 1.3 Non-asset options (eg demand management) are considered
- Response: The AMS is substantially about utilization of the current assets and no new proposals are likely outside mining development. Further asset options are unlikely and non asset options such as better utilization of the current assets will be most likely for capacity increases.
  - 1.4 Lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets are assessed
- Response: The AMP meets this criterion with lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets assessed as part of the existing mine infrastructure and any future mining proposals. Mine life, which is generally shorter than network asset life, is likely to be the determining factor of lifecycle costing. The capital cost will be considered and costed in mine project feasibility and not in terms of the electrical assets cost viability in its own right. Servicing the mines is the dominant requirement for the assets with mine profitability and metal prices being the major driving force.
  - 1.5 Funding options are evaluated
- Response: Financial decisions are often taken on mining project feasibility rather than analysis of the expected life of the electrical assets. Funding is determined by what is necessary to serve mining functions and funding provided for expansion from mining project feasibility.
  - 1.6 Costs are justified and cost drivers identified
- Response: Financial decisions are often taken on metal prices and mining project feasibility rather than analysis of the expected life of the electrical assets. Funding is determined by what is necessary to serve mining functions. Any proposal would include justification of costs and identification of cost drivers including availability and reliability of supply.
  - 1.7 Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted
- Response: The evaluation of risks addressed in the AMP cover the aspects of asset failure and consequences.
  - 1.8 Plans are regularly reviewed and updated
- Response: The AMP meets this criterion as the responsibility of review of the AMS is assigned to the Utilities Superintendent. Annual performance reviews that take place and would be the basis for the AMP review. It is proposed that there be two yearly internal reviews and 5 yearly formal reviews of the AMP.

#### Asset management process and policy definition

| Process  | $\mathbf{N}$ | Policy               | V    | Documentation     | N    |                          |
|----------|--------------|----------------------|------|-------------------|------|--------------------------|
|          |              |                      |      |                   |      |                          |
| Evidence | : inte       | erviewed Utilities S | Supe | erintendent. Docu | imer | ts: Transmission Licence |

Asset Register, Environmental Plans and Approvals, Spares List, Commissioning Plans, Karara Mining Financial reports, Reticulation plans, Asset management plan, Risk

| management policy, Risk register, Project management manual, As constructed details, Financial philosophy (Plan)  |                 |       |  |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| •   | agement perform | nance |  |  |  |  |
| Process I   | □ Availability  | □ Use |  |  |  |  |
| Issues  |                 |       |  |  |  |  |
| The asset management has to be part of the context of the licensed operations as part of the business of the company, which is mining. The licensed facilities primarily exist to facilitate mining and are governed by the life of the mine. The life cycle of Transmission assets is usually much longer than the life of a mine. Asset planning will be subservient to mine planning that is, there will be no planning for expansion of the licensed assets that are not dependent on a mining development.<br>Given this context the plan is appropriate for the scale and nature of the business. |                 |       |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation  |                 |       |  |  |  |  |
| -None.  |                 |       |  |  |  |  |

| Asset Cre       | ation                  | Process/Policy rating  | Effectiveness rating            |
|-----------------|------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
|                 |                        | A  | 2                               |
| 2. Asse         | t creation and acquis  | ition  | 1                               |
|                 |                        | is the provision or improvem                                 |                                 |
| outlay can      | be expected to provi   | de benefits beyond the year                                  | of outlay.                      |
| Observati       | ons                    |  |                                 |
| Policies an     | d procedures for ass   | et creation / sample creation                                | activities                      |
|                 |                        | plant is a very significant ex                               | •                               |
| time. There     | e are documented pro   | ocedures for creation of fixed                               | l assets.                       |
| Meeting st      | atutory obligations    |  |                                 |
|                 |                        | es requiring contractors to c                                | omply with statutory            |
| •               |                        |  | pliance but the existence of    |
| an overt re     | quirement to comply    | with statutory obligations is                                | recommended.                    |
| The asset       | creation processes a   | re appropriate with extensive                                | e project approval processes    |
|                 |                        | fications prepared. The Proje                                |                                 |
| compliance      | e with Australian Star | ndards and Codes and Gove                                    | rnment Acts and Regulations     |
| Evaluation      | Criteria summary       |  |                                 |
| 2.1             | •                      | ons are undertaken for new a                                 | assets, including comparative   |
|                 | assessment of non-     |  |                                 |
| Response:       |                        |  | lopment or expansion. In that   |
|                 |                        | will be comprehensive asses                                  | •                               |
|                 |                        | of the mining project. Non a<br>ed against existing capacity | sset creating solutions would   |
|                 |                        |  | cant demand management is       |
|                 |                        | ptable or satisfy the custome                                |                                 |
|                 |                        |  | sisting capacity of the current |
| 0.0             | network or upgradin    | -  |                                 |
| 2.2             |                        |  | lopment or expansion where      |
| Response.       |                        | insidered as part of the life c                              | • •                             |
|                 |                        | t circumstance there will be                                 |                                 |
|                 | •                      | he life of the asset is much n                               | •                               |
| 0.0             | •                      | e rather than the life of the T                              |                                 |
| 2.3             | •                      | nd engineering and business<br>ne resources in house and by  |                                 |
| Response.       |                        | siness decisions. There will b                               |                                 |
|                 | 5                      | ed development. Extensive u                                  |                                 |
|                 |                        | for detailed engineering des                                 |                                 |
|                 | Karara has a compr     | ehensive project approval pr                                 | ocess.                          |
|                 |                        | ehensive set of standard eng                                 | gineering specifications        |
| 0 4             |                        | components of the network.                                   | latad                           |
| 2.4<br>Response | •                      | s are documented and comp<br>ne resources in house and by    |                                 |
| iveshouse.      |                        | are documented and compl                                     |                                 |
| 2.5             | _                      | onmental/safety obligations of                               |                                 |
|                 | assigned and under     |  |                                 |

| Response: The responsibilities of the AMS are assigned to the Utilities Superintendent<br>and understood. Legal, environmental and safety are key components of new<br>project work within the organisation and are specifically required to be<br>addressed in projects. |               |  |       |                   |      |  |
|---|---------------|--|-------|-------------------|------|--|
| Asset ma  | nag           | ement process a                          | nd p  | oolicy definition |      |  |
| Process   | V             | Policy                                   | V     | Documentation     | V    |  |
| Commissi  | onin<br>Is co | g Plans, Reticulat<br>nstructed details, | ion p | olans, Asset mana | agen | nts: Asset Register,<br>nent plan, Project management<br>nts were sighted and seen to be |
| Asset ma  | nag           | ement performar                          | nce   |                   |      |  |
| Process   |               | Availability                             |       | Use               |      |  |
| Issues  |               |  |       |                   |      |  |
| The procurement processes are appropriate. There are HR standards that deal with non compliance but the existence of an overt requirement to comply with statutory obligations is recommended.  |               |  |       |                   |      |  |
| Recommendation  |               |  |       |                   |      |  |
| -Add an overt requirement to comply with statutory obligations to HR standards.   |               |  |       |                   |      |  |

| Asset Disposal  | Process/Policy rating<br>B | Effectiveness rating<br>Not Rated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3. Asset disposal<br>Effective asset disposal frameworks incorporate consideration of alternatives for the<br>disposal of surplus, obsolete, under-performing or unserviceable assets. Alternatives are<br>evaluated in cost-benefit terms.   |                            |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations  |                            |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policies and procedures for asset disposal / sample disposal activities<br>There was no disposal action in the review period other than removal of a section of line<br>which was no longer in use. Disposal processes are being developed. Removing the<br>licensed plant is unlikely during the life of the customers' mines. The sale of the Eneabba<br>to Three Springs section may be seen as an asset disposal but is only a financial<br>transaction and not because of life / condition of the asset.   |                            |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting statutory obligations<br>There are documents and policies requiring contractors to comply with statutory<br>obligations. There are HR standards that deal with non compliance but the existence of<br>an overt requirement to comply with statutory obligations is recommended. This is<br>addressed under Asset Creation.  |                            |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Evaluation Criteria summary <ul> <li>Under-utilised and under-performing assets are identified as part of a regular systematic review process</li> </ul> </li> <li>Response: The AMS meets this criterion. There is little likelihood of disposal of the system or portions thereof outside mining operation imperatives. Disposal processes are being developed.</li> <li>3.2 The reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance are critically examined and corrective action or disposal undertaken</li> <li>Response: The most likely issue is plant failures and these are critically examined. There is unlikely to be disposal of the asset but components will be disposed as they become unserviceable.</li> <li>3.3 Disposal alternatives are evaluated</li> <li>Response: The AMS meets this criterion. There is little likelihood of disposal of the system or portions thereof outside mining operation imperatives.</li> <li>3.4 There is a replacement strategy for assets</li> <li>Response: The AMS meets this criterion and allows for plant replacement. Replacement will be determined by expansion need or a finding from condition based</li> </ul> |                            |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset management process a  | and policy definition      |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Process 🗹 Policy  | Documentation              |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Evidence:</b> interviewed Utilities management plan, Project man   | •                          | •                                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Asset management performance      |        |                   |      |     |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-------------------|------|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Process                           |        | Availability      |      | Use |  |  |  |  |
| Issues                            | Issues |                   |      |     |  |  |  |  |
| Develop a                         | in as  | set disposal proc | ess. |     |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation                    |        |                   |      |     |  |  |  |  |
| Develop an asset disposal process |        |                   |      |     |  |  |  |  |

| Environme   | enta  | l analysis        | Pro<br>A | ocess/Policy ratir  | ng              | Effectiveness rating 2  |  |  |  |
|---|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|--|
| Environme   | 4. Environmental analysis<br>Environmental analysis examines the asset system environment and assesses all<br>external factors affecting the asset system.  |                   |          |                     |                 |   |  |  |  |
| Observatio  | ons   |                   |          |                     |                 |   |  |  |  |
|   | ee ł  |                   |          |                     | n (EMP). F      | Reporting and monitoring  |  |  |  |
|   |   |                   |          |                     |                 | nresolved issues have<br>es have been reported.                               |  |  |  |
| assets. Giv competition   | en t<br>n to <sup>-</sup>   | he close relation | ship     | to the mines there  | e are little tl | ish fires to Transmission<br>hreats of external<br>icity requirements is part |  |  |  |
| 4.1   | <ul> <li>Evaluation Criteria summary</li> <li>4.1 Opportunities and threats in the system environment are assessed</li> <li>Response: Opportunities are unlikely outside mining initiatives.</li> <li>4.2 Performance standards (availability of service, capacity, continuity,</li> </ul>  |                   |          |                     |                 |   |  |  |  |
|   | emergency response, etc) are measured and achieved<br>Response: The AMS meets this criterion with service standards defined but statistics are<br>not yet gathered. The automatic acquisition of SCADA data in the Historical<br>database is required as preliminary step. There has not been a customer to<br>apply them to. With Western Power wheeling power to the future "customer"<br>they will be responsible the power quality and supply continuity to a large<br>extent. As supply is to the mining industry, capacity is only considered on a<br>project by project basis. Forecasting for expansion is not relevant in this<br>environment. Mining expansion is not predictable in the normal sense as it is<br>heavily dependent on exploration and metal markets. |                   |          |                     |                 |   |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4.3 Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements</li> <li>Response: The Licensee's HR policy documents require compliance with statutory and regulatory obligations. There have been no noted environmental breaches for the assets covered by the licence during the review period.</li> <li>Procedures at site require environmental approval for new projects, clearing of ground, protection of threaten birdlife and other activities that impact the</li> </ul> |   |                   |          |                     |                 |   |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>environment. Policy documents were sighted.</li> <li>4.4 Achievement of customer service levels</li> <li>Response: The AMP defines the customer service levels. The Licensee has the systems to monitor outages but as not yet done so. However environmental requirements are met. There are no external customers to consider as part of the environment and outages.</li> </ul>   |   |                   |          |                     |                 |   |  |  |  |
| Asset man   | age   | ement process a   | nd       | policy definition   |                 |   |  |  |  |
| Process   | $\mathbf{\nabla}$   | Policy            | V        | Documentation       | Ø               |   |  |  |  |
| Evidence:   | inte  | rviewed Utilities | Supe     | erintendent and sta | aff on site I   | isted. Documents:   |  |  |  |

| Environmental Plans and Approvals, Reticulation plans, Asset management plan, Risk management policy, Risk register, Project management manual, As constructed details, |                 |            |                   |                 |                    |  |  |
|---|-----------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Asset manageme  | ent performance | се         |                   |                 |                    |  |  |
| Process 🗹 Ava   | ailability      | <u>ו</u> ע | Use               |                 |                    |  |  |
| Issues  |                 | <u>.</u>   |                   |                 |                    |  |  |
| There are no envir  | ronmental non-  | comp       | pliances reported | d. Karara monit | tors and considers |  |  |
| the mining environ  | ment in which i | it ope     | erates.           |                 |                    |  |  |
|   |                 |            |                   |                 |                    |  |  |
| Recommendation  |                 |            |                   |                 |                    |  |  |
| None  |                 |            |                   |                 |                    |  |  |

| Asset ope  | rations  | Process/Policy rating<br>B   | Effectiveness rating 2                        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Operations   | 5. Asset operations<br>Operations functions relate to the day-to-day running of assets and directly affect service<br>levels and costs.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observatio   | ons  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The system   | Policies and procedures for asset operation / sample activities<br>The system is operated by Western Power from the Eneabba end and by Karara at the<br>mine end. The asset operation is appropriate for the duty.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ÷ .  | pcess dictate continuous supply ptions are always going to occu  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Licensee records outages manually and will implement automatically gathering outages/ power quality information from which to extract statistics. The service levels are defined and statistics will be gathered. The feedback from statistics is more likely to affect maintenance regimes rather than operations but some improvements may be possible.  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | register is part of the<br>ard procedures.   | e maintenance system and supp  | ported by spread sheets                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Licens<br>appropriate<br>operating p   | e for the size of the r<br>procedures and prac   | es<br>wer operate the plant. The resonetwork and ongoing training is<br>tices. Plant operation and relate<br>sible faults or operating require | evident, as are the ed maintenance appears to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Evaluation Criteria summary</li> <li>5.1 Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required</li> <li>Response: The AMS meets this criterion with service standards defined. Due to the size and topology of the network there is no requirement for additional formal documentation.</li> <li>The Transmission system is static and does not require operation outside</li> </ul> |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | switching. Operational policies a<br>ility matters and those dictated  | -   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2<br>Response:   |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3<br>Response:   | Assets are documented in an Asset Register including asset type, location,<br>material, plans of components, an assessment of assets' physical/structural<br>condition and accounting data<br>e: Asset registers are contained with the appropriate information in the Ellipse |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4<br>Response:   | Operational costs a<br>Operational costs –   | ower listed as an asset.<br>The measured and monitored<br>- staffing, contracts and materia<br>The not significant to profitability            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|            | the core business being mining. The mining operations are charged for energy which includes energy infrastructure and operational costs. |   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|------------|--|---|--------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 5.5        | St   | Staff receive training commensurate with their responsibilities |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  |   | -            |                     |                   | their responsibilities. Personnel |  |  |  |
| 1 tooponoo |  |   |              |                     |                   | erations at established training  |  |  |  |
|            |  | <b>U</b>  |              | 0                   | • •               | intment under Mining              |  |  |  |
|            |  | gulations.  | 011 0        | no approvar and c   | .ppo              |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  | •   | ndar         | d isolation permit  | nroc              | cedure across all sites.          |  |  |  |
|            | Na   | 1 a la 10110 w 5 a 5 la   | nuai         | u isolation permit  | pioc              | equie across all siles.           |  |  |  |
| 5.6        |  |   |              | such as unplanne    |                   | 0                                 |  |  |  |
| Response   |  |   |              |                     |                   | ges but as not yet done so.       |  |  |  |
|            |  |   |              |                     |                   | d by Western Power                |  |  |  |
|            |  |   |              | o external custom   | ners              | to consider.                      |  |  |  |
| Asset ma   | nag  | ement process a   | ind p        | oolicy definition   |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
| Process    | $\checkmark$   | Policy  | $\checkmark$ | Documentation       | $\mathbf{\nabla}$ |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  | -   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  |   |              |                     |                   | on site listed. Documents:        |  |  |  |
| -          |  |   |              | ••                  | •                 | es List, Commissioning Plans,     |  |  |  |
|            | <u> </u>   | •   |              | • •                 |                   | management plan, Risk             |  |  |  |
| managem    | ent  | oolicy, Risk regist   | er, P        | roject manageme     | ent m             | nanual, As constructed details,   |  |  |  |
| Asset ma   | nag  | ement performa  | nce          |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  | •   |              | 1                   | •                 |                                   |  |  |  |
| Process    | $\checkmark$   | Availability  | Ø            | Use                 | Ø                 |                                   |  |  |  |
| Issues     | Issues   |   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
| The asset  | ope  | ration is appropria   | ate fo       | or the duty. Monite | oring             | of outages has not yet            |  |  |  |
| commenc    | commenced.   |   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  |   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  |   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
| Recomme    | enda   | ation   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
| Commenc    | e m  | onitoring of outag  | es           |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |
|            |  |   |              |                     |                   |                                   |  |  |  |

| Asset Mai   | ntenance   | Process/Policy rating<br>A   | Effectiveness rating<br>2                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | et maintenance<br>ce functions relate to   | the upkeep of assets and di  | rectly affect service levels                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observati   | ons  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | nd procedures for ass<br>e business applicatior  | set maintenance / sample act<br>n is used by Karara  | tivities  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The asset maintenan                                   | • ·  | ontains performance measure  | es and lists significant                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| required for the Eneable                              | or the Three Springs/r<br>ba to Three Springs s  | tors to service their major ma<br>mine section. Western Power<br>section. Condition inspection<br>spares has been developed.     | r are contracted to maintain of the lines is routinely      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenan<br>type of equ<br>the operati<br>and Colleg | uipment. The resourc<br>ing procedures and p   | into the future and these acti<br>ing is appropriate and ongoir<br>ractices. High Voltage trainin<br>ng. Plant maintenance appea | ng training is evident as are<br>ng occurs at Western Power |  |  |  |  |  |
| <i>Evaluation</i><br>6.1                              | <i>Criteria summary</i><br>Maintenance policie<br>levels required  | es and procedures are docum  | nented and linked to service                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·   | Policies and proced with service standar   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 6.2 Regular inspections are undertaken of asset performance and condition<br>sponse: The Ellipse maintenance planning system fulfils this criterion by regular<br>scheduling of inspections to assess condition. Time based schedules are set<br>up for physical inspection, testing and collection of samples for condition<br>based analysis (eg Corona, thermo-graphic, etc). |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.3   | •  | (emergency, corrective and p<br>mpleted on schedule  | preventative) are   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Response:   | Response: Corrective (condition based) and preventative maintenance plans can be recorded in the Ellipse system but the line is too new for condition based issues yet. The electrical and shutdown maintenance planners run the maintenance process.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.4   | Failures are analysed and operational/maintenance plans adjusted where necessary   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Response:   | Failures are infreque<br>with outages being the<br>equipment. There we   | ent. The Licensee has not had<br>from external sources such a<br>vas no evidence of significant<br>ans within the review period. | as Western Power<br>t failure warranting                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.5<br>Response:                                      | ÷  | s applied to prioritise mainter<br>and frequencies have been c   |   |  |  |  |  |  |

| 6.6            |        | time using local experience and industry standards applied at the mine.<br>Maintenance costs are measured and monitored |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|--------|---|--------|---------------------|-------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Response       | : Ma   | Maintenance costs are recorded, measured and monitored by the site.   |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| 6.7            | Sy     | stem maintenance  | e stra | ategy, including th | ne m  | ethodology used to maintain   |  |  |  |  |
|                | the    | system and frequence  | Jenc   | cy of maintenance   | acti  | vities.                       |  |  |  |  |
| Response       | : Th   | e AMS meets this  | crite  | erion with mainter  | nanc  | e strategies defined.         |  |  |  |  |
| 6.8            | Pe     | rformance measu   | ress   | such as unplanne    | d ou  | tages                         |  |  |  |  |
| Response       | : Out  | age log including   | forc   | ed outages is to b  | be im | plemented. The Western        |  |  |  |  |
|                | Po     | wer log was sight   | ed. l  | _evel of investigat | ion i | s dependent on cause and      |  |  |  |  |
|                | im     | pact.   |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Asset ma       | nag    | ement process a   | nd p   | oolicy definition   |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Process        | A      | Policy  | J      | Documentation       | V     |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence       | : inte | erviewed Utilities  | Supe   | rintendent and st   | aff o | n site listed. Documents:     |  |  |  |  |
| Asset Reg      | jister | , Environmental F   | Plans  | s and Approvals, S  | Spar  | es List, Commissioning Plans, |  |  |  |  |
| Reticulatio    | on pl  | ans, Asset manag  | jeme   | ent plan, Risk mar  | nage  | ment policy, Risk register,   |  |  |  |  |
| Project ma     | anag   | ement manual, A   | s coi  | nstructed details,  |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Asset ma       | nag    | ement performar   | nce    |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Process        | Ŋ      | Availability  | Ŋ      | Use                 | Ø     |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Issues         | Issues |   |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| None.          |        |   |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation |        |   |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |
| None           | None   |   |        |                     |       |                               |  |  |  |  |

| Asset Management<br>Information System   | Process/Policy rating<br>A | Effectiveness rating |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <ul> <li>Asset Management Information System (MIS)</li> <li>An asset management information system is a combination of processes, data and software that support the asset management functions</li> </ul> |                            |                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations   |                            |                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policies and procedures  |                            |                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The Licensee has a competent asset management information system with a number of elements. The maintenance management system based on the Ellipse business software system (described in section 6 above). The system allows for both time based and condition based activities. The Historical database will collect SCADA data as a basis of the required statistics. The system was viewed but the automatic captured of SCADA data has not yet commenced. The Licensee uses standard financial packages.

The maintenance system links project management to scheduled tasks to standard work plans, asset register and parts inventory. Documentation and familiarity of the system appears appropriate.

Access to write to the database is controlled (passwords) and changes are tracked.

There is good documentation for data recovery procedures which include operating on the Perth office server and backing up the servers to ensure data integrity.

The reliability of the plant is evidence of good maintenances practices and that exceptions are being followed up.

Evaluation Criteria summary

- 7.1 Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators
- Response: The Ellipse system is well documented. The system is intuitive with online assistance and documentation is rarely required. The viewing of Historic data is also intuitive.
  - 7.2 Input controls include appropriate verification and validation of data entered into the system
- Response: The system is easy to use with a maintenance focus rather than a database focus and includes appropriate verification and validation of data entered into the system.
  - 7.3 Logical security access controls appear adequate, such as passwords
- Response: Logical control is adequate with hierarchical access by password. Personnel are automatically logged out of computer systems after periods of inactivity.
  - 7.4 Physical security access controls appear adequate
- Response: Physical security is adequate with the system on access controlled mine sites.
  - 7.5 Data backup procedures appear adequate
- Response: Data backup is reported by the site IT personnel to be carried out daily and weekly on all servers.
  - 7.6 Key computations related to Licensee performance reporting are materially accurate
- Response: There is minimal regular computation work. Key computations related to Licensee performance reporting are materially accurate, to the extent possible to assess with visual inspection.
  - 7.7 Management reports appear adequate for the Licensee to monitor licence obligations
- Response: No detailed management reports are generated by the Ellipse system which would assist to monitor licence obligations. The key reports are for outage logging and the capacity to develop appear adequate.

| Asset ma       | Asset management process and policy definition |                    |        |                    |       |                              |  |  |  |
|----------------|--|--------------------|--------|--------------------|-------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Process        | Ŋ  | Policy             | V      | Documentation      | V     |                              |  |  |  |
| Evidence       | : inte   | erviewed Utilities | Supe   | erintendent and st | aff o | n site listed. Documents:    |  |  |  |
| Karara Mi      | ning   | Financial reports, | , Ass  | et management p    | olan, | Financial philosophy (Plan), |  |  |  |
| Ellipse ov     | ervie  | w. Viewed Ellipse  | e, vie | wing of Historical | data  | abase.                       |  |  |  |
| Asset ma       | nag  | ement performar    | nce    |                    |       |                              |  |  |  |
| Process        | Ŋ  | Availability       | Ø      | Use                | V     |                              |  |  |  |
| Issues         |  |                    |        |                    |       |                              |  |  |  |
| None           |  |                    |        |                    |       |                              |  |  |  |
| Recommendation |  |                    |        |                    |       |                              |  |  |  |

None

| Risk manage  | ment  | Pro<br>B | ocess/Policy rati    | ng           | Effectiveness rating 2                         |  |  |  |
|--|---|----------|----------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| 8. Risk management<br>Risk management involves the identification of risks and their management within an<br>acceptable level of risk.   |   |          |                      |              |  |  |  |  |
| Observation  | 5   |          |                      |              |  |  |  |  |
| The Licensee   | <i>Policies and procedures</i><br>The Licensee has a documented risk management procedure and there is evidence that<br>risk based approaches is being carried out. |          |                      |              |  |  |  |  |
|  | e has assessed and for these threats  | •        |                      | •            | ific plant and developed of risks.             |  |  |  |
|  | ality measuremen<br>r quality surveys v   |          |                      |              | uality/reliability threats.<br>ified.          |  |  |  |
| The risk mana<br>in the last rev   | •   | nd pl    | an satisfied and c   | losed the    | non-compliance identified                      |  |  |  |
| <i>Training</i><br>There is evide  | ence of training an   | d aw     | vareness by staff c  | of risk base | ed approaches.                                 |  |  |  |
| 8.1 Ri<br>m  |   |          |                      |              | l are being applied to<br>the asset management |  |  |  |
| Response: Th<br>Ri   | ne AMS meets this<br>isk Plan set out ris   | ks, r    | isk assessment a     | nd risk mit  | •  |  |  |  |
|  | isks are document<br>onitored.  | ed ir    | n a risk register an | d treatme    | nt plans are actioned and                      |  |  |  |
| m  | -   | es th    | e Licensee. It wou   |              | k register of Karara<br>ropriate to carry out  |  |  |  |
| 8.3 Tł   | ne probability and  | cons     | sequences of asse    |              | re regularly assessed                          |  |  |  |
| •  | uring the review pe<br>ased on probability  |          |                      |              | have been assessed                             |  |  |  |
|  | jement process a  |          | · · ·                |              |  |  |  |  |
| Process 🗹  | Policy  | V        | Documentation        | $\square$    |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Evidence:</b> interviewed Utilities Superintendent and staff on site listed. Documents:<br>Asset Register, Environmental Plans and Approvals, Spares List, Commissioning Plans,<br>Reticulation plans, Asset management plan, Risk management policy, Risk register,<br>Project management manual, As constructed details,. |   |          |                      |              |  |  |  |  |
| Asset manag  | jement performa   | nce      |                      |              |  |  |  |  |
| Process 🗹  | Availability  | V        | Use                  | $\square$    |  |  |  |  |
| Issues   |   |          | I                    |              |  |  |  |  |

None

### Recommendation

None

| Contingency pl   | lanning          | Process/Policy ratio    | ng                      | Effectiveness rating 3    |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 9. Contingency planning<br>Contingency plans document the steps to deal with the unexpected failure of an asset.   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Observations   | Observations     |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Development of contingency plans / currency<br>The Licensee has good documentation of its data recovery plans.   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| The Licensee has documented the threats to specific plant but not yet developed contingencies for these threats. An inventory of spare parts has been developed.   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| The Licensee has detailed maintenance scheduled out for several years, with minor and major shutdowns allowed to deal with potential issues. Maintenance is partly conducted on condition based maintenance which monitors critical items for indicators of future failure (eg Corona, thermo-graphic assessment, tower/line inspections).   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| The maintenance regime is geared to keeping the plant operational without forced outages.  |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| The power quality measurement plan (a strategy to mitigate quality/reliability threats) is carried out by Western Power.   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| <i>Testing of contir</i><br>The plans have   | • • •            | oped to test.           |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| The company co   | onducts major in | cident training for the | emergency               | y services crews at site. |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Evaluation Criteria summary</li> <li>9.1 Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks</li> <li>Response: The AMS does not meet this criterion Critical spares are identified and being sourced. Standard spares such as insulators are on site. Contingency plans have not yet been developed.</li> </ul> |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Asset manager  | nent process a   | nd policy definition    |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Process 🗹 F  | Policy           | ☑ Documentation         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Evidence:</b> interviewed Utilities Superintendent and staff on site listed. Documents:<br>Asset Register, Environmental Plans and Approvals, Spares List, Reticulation plans,<br>Asset management plan, Risk management policy, Risk register, Project management<br>manual, As constructed details, Financial philosophy (Plan),  |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Asset management performance   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Process 🗹 A  | Availability     | ☑ Use                   | $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Issues   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Contingency plans have not yet been developed.   |                  |                         |                         |                           |  |  |  |  |

### Recommendation

Develop Contingency plans based on risk assessment and subsequently schedule testing of the contingency plans.

| Financial   | planning  | Process/Policy rating<br>B   | <b>Effectiveness rating</b> 2   |
|---|---|--|---|
| The financ  |   | ent of the asset management  <br>e delivery to ensure its financi  |   |
| Observatio  | ons   |  |   |
| The Licens<br>5 year cycl<br>outlook ove<br>but is not c<br>is no incom | es and upgraded yea<br>er the next 5 years. T<br>perating as a busine<br>ne. With Western Pov   | ns<br>ting and monitoring processe<br>ar by year. Long ranges foreca<br>he Licensee is charging its m<br>ss with income streams and r<br>ver wheeling power to the "cu<br>d funded by mining operations                                    | asting provides business<br>ining parent for electricity<br>no external customers there<br>istomer" and there will be no  |
| to the pare   | nt body's executives.<br>which is a financial p   | estimates updated quarterly,<br>There is a financial philosoph<br>Man given the simplicity of the  | hy document together with   |
| Response:   | achieve the objectiv<br>The Licensed assets<br>which will determine<br>assets are part of th<br>objectives / strategie<br>continuity of supply.<br>philosophy document<br>the simplicity of the | s are a small part of the comp<br>the viability of the operations<br>at budgeting process. The ov<br>es and actions to achieve the<br>There is no income at preser<br>Int together with the budget wh                                      | any core business of mining<br>s. The licensed electrical<br>rerall budgets are related to<br>objectives of reliability and<br>nt. There is a financial<br>nich is a financial plan given |
| ·   | part of that budgetin<br>funds for capital exp<br>be funded from mini<br>those arising from S<br>for 5 years is remov<br>The financial plan plan  | s are a small part of the minin<br>g process. The overall budge<br>benditure and recurrent costs.<br>ng. Minimal capital is required<br>WIN network issues. The only<br>ing the future "customer" line.<br>rovides projections of operatin | It identifies the source of<br>All capital expenditure will<br>of for other reasons except<br>y capital expenditure planed<br>ing statements (profit and                                  |
|   | As the network is or<br>plans for the networ<br>are prepared. The L<br>(profit and loss) and<br>monitors costs with   | of financial position (balance<br>hly part of the core business o<br>k are not relevant. Detailed fir<br>icensed assets do not attemp<br>statement of financial positio<br>respect to budgets.<br>rovide firm predictions on inco          | of mining detailed financial<br>nancial plans for the mine<br>ot operating statements<br>n (balance sheets) but   |
|   | and reasonable indi<br>The licensee does n<br>customers do not ye   | cative predictions beyond this<br>not predict income for access<br>et exist and do not charge the<br>lity of the network per-se is im  | s period<br>to the network as any<br>parent miner for electricity   |

| <ul> <li>10.5 The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services</li> <li>Response: The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services.</li> <li>10.6 Significant variances in actual/budget income and expenses are identified and corrective action taken where necessary</li> <li>Response: When significant variation in expenditure or budget are noted this is investigated.</li> </ul> |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |
|---|-----|-----------------|------|-------------------|---|--|
| Asset ma  | nag | ement process a | nd p | oolicy definition |   |  |
| Process   | V   | Policy          | V    | Documentation     | V |  |
| <b>Evidence:</b> interviewed Utilities Superintendent and staff on site listed. Documents: Karara Mining Financial reports, Financial philosophy (Plan),  |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |
| Asset management performance  |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |
| Process   | Ø   | Availability    | V    | Use               | V |  |
| Issues  |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |
| None  |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |
| Recommendation  |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |
| None  |     |                 |      |                   |   |  |

| Capital explaning   | kper   | nditure      | Pro<br>B | ocess/Policy rati | ng |     | Effectiveness rating 2                           |
|---|--|--------------|----------|-------------------|----|-----|--|
| 11. Capital expenditure planning<br>The capital expenditure plan provides a schedule of new works, rehabilitation and<br>replacement works, together with estimated annual expenditure on each over the next<br>five or more years.   |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| expected  | Since capital investments tend to be large and lumpy, projections would normally be expected to cover at least 10 years, preferably longer. Projections over the next five years would usually be based on firm estimates. |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| Observat  | ions   | <b>j</b>     |          |                   |    |     |  |
| The Licen cycles and  | see<br>d up  |              | d mo     | •                 |    |     | re on 1 year and 5 year<br>ides business outlook |
|   | or i   | •            |          |                   |    | ••• | jects. The funds for<br>e mine project requiring |
| <ul> <li>Evaluation Criteria summary</li> <li>11.1 There is a capital expenditure plan that covers issues to be addressed, actions proposed, responsibilities and dates</li> <li>Response: The AMP sets out "capital expenditure" but there is no significant expenditure planned outside the removal of future "customer" line. This item is the sole issue of capital expenditure planned and is the Plan</li> </ul>                  |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| 11.2 The plan provide reasons for capital expenditure and timing of expenditure Response: The AMP does not set out "capital expenditure" as these are unlikely in the near future outside the removal of future "customer" line.  |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| <ul> <li>11.3 The capital expenditure plan is consistent with the asset life and condition identified in the asset management plan</li> <li>Response: The AMP sets out that the asset life is most likely to be governed by mine life rather than asset life. The plan responds to asset condition.</li> <li>11.4 There is an adequate process to ensure that the capital expenditure plan is regularly updated and actioned</li> </ul> |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| Response: The AMP sets out a review process. Karara has financial review processes.   |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| Asset management process and policy definition  |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| Process   | V  | Policy       | Ŋ        | Documentation     | V  |     |  |
| <b>Evidence:</b> interviewed Utilities Superintendent and staff on site listed. Documents Karara Mining Financial reports, Financial philosophy (Plan),   |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| Asset management performance  |  |              |          |                   |    |     |  |
| Process   | V  | Availability | V        | Use               | V  |     |  |

| Issues         |  |
|----------------|--|
| None.          |  |
| Recommendation |  |
| None           |  |

| Review of AMS   | Process/Policy rati      | ng            | Effectiveness rating<br>Not Rated   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Review of AMS<br>The asset management system                                    | is regularly reviewed    | and undate    | ad a start of the |  |  |  |  |  |
| The asset management system   | is regularly reviewed    | and update    | <i>.</i>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| As a supplier of electricity the se   | •                        |               | ased and needs an AMS.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| There is ongoing review of the a  | asset management pla     | an.           |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation Criteria summary   |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12.1 A review process is  | in place to ensure tha   | t the asset   | management plan and   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | ent system described     |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Response: The AMP assigns re  | esponsibility for review | of the AMS    | S to the Utilities  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Superintendent.   |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12.2 Independent reviews  | ( <b>b</b> )             | are perform   | ned of the asset  |  |  |  |  |  |
| management systen<br>Response: The AMP is too new                                   |                          | but such a    | raviaw should be  |  |  |  |  |  |
| scheduled at 2 yearl  |                          | but such a    |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset management process a  | nd policy definition     |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Process 🗹 Policy  | Documentation            | I             |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence: interviewed Utilities   | Superintendent and st    | aff on site l | isted. Documents:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transmission Licence, Asset Re  | •                        |               | ••  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commissioning Plans, Karara Mining Financial reports, Reticulation plans, Asset     |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| management plan, Risk management policy, Risk register, Project management manual,  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| As constructed details, Financial philosophy (Plan),                                |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset management performance  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Process     Availability  | □ Use                    |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Issues  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Asset Management System requires a scheduled internal reviews in 2 years and    |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| formal review every 5 years.  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scheduled internal reviews in 2 years and formal review every 5 years for the Asset |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management System.  |                          |               |   |  |  |  |  |  |