



Asset Management System

Peel Renewable Energy

July 09, 2024

→ The Power of Commitment



Project name		AMS Audit and Review					
Document title		Peel Renewable Energy AMS Audit Report					
Project number		12632894					
Status Code	Revision	Author	Reviewer		Approved for issue		
			Name	Signature	Name	Signature	Date
S3	IFR	H Le	R Ozsvath		L O'Brien		22/5/2024
S4	Final	H Le	R Ozsvath		M Oosthuizen		28/6/2024
S4	Final rev1	H Le	R Ozsvath		M Oosthuizen		12/7/2024

GHD Pty Ltd ABN 39 008 488 373

999 Hay St, Level 10

Perth, WA 6000, Australia

T +61 8 6222 8222 | **F** +61 8 6222 8555 | **E** permail@ghd.com | **ghd.com**

© GHD 2024

This document is and shall remain the property of GHD. The document may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

Executive Summary

GHD conducted a review of Peel Renewable Energy's Asset Management System with respect to their Distribution licence EDL7. This is the second such review of the Asset Management System, as Peel Renewable Energy started operating in 2022.

Peel Renewable Energy became a subsidiary of Zenith Energy Pty Ltd during the period leading to this review, and is the operator of the Peel Microgrid, a microgrid in the Peel Business Park located in Western Australia's Peel region.

As Peel Renewable Energy was purchased by Zenith over the period of this audit review. We acknowledge this necessitated the update of a range of documents relevant to this review. Key relevant documents relevant to this review were updated on 3 April 2024.

The Peel Business Park is a greenfield industrial and agribusiness precinct 70km south of Perth. This business park has an overall area of approximately 1,000ha and will be developed in stages. Phase One of the development project comprises 290ha and the first part of Phase One is a 120ha subdivision known as Lot 600. With an initial 10 companies, when fully developed Lot 600 will comprise around 110 companies comprising small and large commercials and industrials. There are and will be no residential customers. This network is connected to the SWIS and has been designed for the interconnecting feeds to be capable of transferring 20MVA.

This Asset Management System review only focuses on the distribution network supplying power to customers in large industrial and agri-business precinct located in the Peel Business Park.

Asset Management Systems continually need to mature and improve, and Peel Renewable Energy's Asset Management System is no exception. GHD, applied a risk-based approach to the criteria assessed in order to prioritise areas of improvements for critical issues.

As part of GHD's risk-based approach we recognise the Peel Renewable Energy distribution network is relatively new with limited asset deterioration. There are also relevant operational practices and procedures for carrying out work on site. In this review, we found recommendations from the 2022 audit (i.e. 6/2022, 7/2022 and 8/2022) were implemented by the license holder with the other recommendations being either a work in progress or incomplete.

The review of the Asset Management System requires the assessment of practices and procedures that ensure the long-term safe and effective operation of the Peel Renewable Energy distribution network. To do this we:

- Held discussion with the relevant areas of the licence holder's business.
- Reviewed information contained in documents outlined in the Appendix; and
- Undertook a site visit of the assets.

Overall, the performance of the Asset Management System was found to require improvement across most effectiveness criteria. While there is a small number of relatively new assets these appear to have been managed without safety or major availability concerns over the past 4 years. However, it was observed that the policies and procedures comprising the Asset Management System have a significant opportunity for improvement. With specific focus on maturing a risk management framework and embedding it within the wider business functions. Weighing up the effectiveness criteria that were determined to need recommendations in this review, progress made on the previous review recommendations, the requirements in the asset management standard and Electricity Industry Act. Peel Renewable Energy's Asset Management System is assessed overall as being ineffective.

Our review identified 17 new recommendations. The two major influences drive the recommendations made:

- the lack of an effective risk management framework with its associated registers and the impact of this across the numerous processes. The previous review also made several recommendations regarding risk management, which were not implemented during the period leading to this review.
- the documentation presented was generally not updated within the stated review periods, often presented information that conflicted with other documents, or presented practices not actively carried out.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose	1
1.2	Scope	1
1.3	Method	2
1.4	Limitations	2
2.	Review Details	4
2.1	Previous Review	4
2.2	Details of the Licensee Representatives Participating in the Review	10
2.3	Details of Key Documents and Other Information Sources	10
2.4	Details of Auditors Participating in the Review	10
3.	Performance Summary	11
3.1	Assessment Rating Scales	11
3.2	AMS Review Effectiveness Summary	12
4.	Observations and Findings	15
4.1	Asset Management System Review	15
4.2	Recommendations	38

Table index

Table 1	Previous review effectiveness criteria recommendations – Resolved during current review period	5
Table 2	Previous review effectiveness criteria recommendations – Unresolved at end of current review period	6
Table 3	Details of Licensee	10
Table 4	Details of Audit and Review Team Members from GHD	10
Table 5	Asset Management Process and Policy Definition Rating	11
Table 6	Performance Rating Scale (Reviews)	11
Table 7	AMS Review Results Summary	12
Table 8	Asset Management Review Observations and Recommendations	15
Table 9	Summary of previous review recommendations – Resolved during current review period	38
Table 10	Summary of recommendations – Unresolved at end of current review period	39
Table 11	List of documents provided	47

Appendices

Appendix A Key Documents Reviewed

1. Introduction

The Economic Regulation Authority (ERA) is Western Australia's independent economic regulator that is responsible for administering the licensing schemes for gas, electricity and water services. This ensures Western Australian consumers and businesses operate in a fair, competitive and efficient environment.

Peel Renewable Energy (PRE) is a subsidiary of Zenith Energy Pty Ltd (Zenith Energy, or Zenith), and is the operator of the Peel Microgrid, a microgrid in the Peel Business Park located in Western Australia's Peel region.

PRE has an Electricity Distribution and Retail Licence (EDL7 and ERL28 respectively). Section 14 of the Electricity Industry Act 2004 requires PRE to provide the ERA with an asset management system review, conducted by an independent expert acceptable to the ERA not less than once every 24-month period.

GHD was engaged to conduct a review of PRE's Asset Management System with respect to the Distribution licence only (EDL7) to fulfil the Act requirements. The Retail licence (ERL28) is not relevant to the asset management system review so was excluded from GHD's review.

This report is an accurate presentation of GHD's findings and opinions of PRE's Asset Management System..

1.1 Purpose

Licensees are required to licence performance audit (audit) and Asset Management System review (review) conducted by an ERA approved auditor.

The purpose of GHD's review is to provide to the ERA an independent assessment of the effectiveness of PRE's Asset Management System (AMS) in relation to EDL7 and provide recommendations to address identified non-compliances. The review is intended to audit provisions outlined in the Act and is limited by the scope of our engagement.

This report presents the finding from GHD's review.

1.2 Scope

The GHD's engagement aimed to assessing the adequacy and effectiveness of performance against the requirements of the licensee. This is conducted by considering:

- a description of the review objectives and the methodology used to conduct the review.
- the period over which the review has been performed.
- details of the licensee's representatives participating in the review.
- details of key documents and other information sources examined by the auditor during the course of the review.
- any other information the auditor considers relevant to the review scope of work.

The scope involves an assessment of defined AMS criteria using a risk-based approach (similar to ISO31000:2009):

- Process compliance: Effectiveness of systems and procedures
- Outcome compliance: Effectiveness of actual performance against license standards
- Output compliance: Effectiveness of records to indicate procedures are maintained
- Integrity of reporting: assessment of the completeness and accuracy of compliance and performance documentation

The review of PRE's AMS covers the following asset management components:

1. Asset planning
2. Asset creation and acquisition

3. Asset disposal
4. Environmental analysis
5. Asset operations
6. Asset maintenance
7. Asset management information system
8. Risk management
9. Contingency planning
10. Financial planning
11. Capital expenditure planning
12. Review of AMS

Time Period Covered by this review covers the period from 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2024.

GHD has carried out this review under a limited assurance engagement.

1.3 Method

GHD's approach involved working closely with PRE to identify actions and documents as soon as possible before the review report was finalised.

- An initial discussion via teleconference with PRE and Zenith Energy to:
 - Identify the key processes and roles to be discussed
 - Discuss the review plan
- Preparation of the draft audit plan for comment by the licensee.
- Submission of the draft Audit Plan to the ERA for approval
- A start-up meeting and follow meetings via in person and teleconference with business staff responsible for the audit area and assets. The call involved:
 - Demonstration of key systems
 - Identifying documents to be sampled to confirm procedures and assess compliance with AMS criteria and license obligations
 - Review of procedures
- A site visit of assets located at Peel Business Park
- Preparation of a draft audit report for PRE's review and comment
- Preparation of a final report for submission to the ERA

There are no deviations from the AMS review plan described in the Audit Plan submitted to the ERA.

1.4 Limitations

This report: has been prepared by GHD for Peel Renewable Energy and may only be used and relied on by Peel Renewable Energy for the purpose agreed between GHD and Peel Renewable Energy as set out in section 1.1 of this report.

GHD otherwise disclaims responsibility to any person other than Peel Renewable Energy arising in connection with this report. GHD also excludes implied warranties and conditions, to the extent legally permissible.

The services undertaken by GHD in connection with preparing this report were limited to those specifically detailed in the report and are subject to the scope limitations set out in the report.

The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this report are based on conditions encountered and information reviewed at the date of preparation of the report. GHD has no responsibility or obligation to update this report to account for events or changes occurring subsequent to the date that the report was prepared.

The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this report are based on assumptions made by GHD described in this report. GHD disclaims liability arising from any of the assumptions being incorrect.

GHD has prepared this report on the basis of information provided by Peel Renewable Energy and others who provided information to GHD (including Government authorities)], which GHD has not independently verified or checked beyond the agreed scope of work. GHD does not accept liability in connection with such unverified information, including errors and omissions in the report which were caused by errors or omissions in that information.

2. Review Details

2.1 Previous Review

The previous AMS review conducted in 2022 had listed recommendations against some of the effectiveness criteria outlined in the previous Audit Plan.

Resolved and unresolved recommendations are summarised in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

Table 1 Previous review effectiveness criteria recommendations – Resolved during current review period

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Auditors Recommendation	Date resolved	Further action required (Y/N)
3/2022	B3 2.2 - Asset creation and acquisition Evaluations include all life-cycle costs. Life-cycle costs were not evaluated.	PRE to review business case development procedure to determine and document life cycle costs for new assets.	1/1/2023	N
6/2022	C3 5.3 – Asset operations Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition No consolidated asset register was provided. Assets were recorded and maintained separately across multiple systems	PRE should develop a consolidated asset register that considers new and existing primary and secondary assets. PRE is discouraged from using separate assets registers for primary and secondary assets per current practice. The asset register should follow a standard asset naming convention (see recommendation 11) and take account of asset failure risk, life cycle costing and cost data. The asset register should allow for appropriate security provisions and disciplined application of QA/QC process to validate verify entered data. The asset register should align and coordinate with Operation IT interface systems (e.g., Trunk).	1/1/2023	N
7/2022	C3 7.1 – Asset management information system Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators Asset information management was found to be dependant on information recorded by an operational service provider (Trunk by Jarrah Solutions).	PRE should quantify the operational risk associated with reliance and continuity of supply of Trunk software through Jarrah solutions. Treatment plans should be development in preparation for an event where the service level agreement with Jarrah Solutions were to be discontinued. IT or operational interface standards should be formulated and prepared in such a way that it is supplier agnostic and easily transferable to an alternate service provider, if required.	1/3/2024	N
8/2022	B3 7.2 – Asset management information system	PRE is encouraged utilise an asset numbering procedure that ensures an aligned and consistent approach to asset identification across all contractors as the business park develops.	1/3/2024	N

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Auditors Recommendation	Date resolved	Further action required (Y/N)
	<p>Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system</p> <p>Identification and tracking of assets was dependant on Trunk by Jarrah Solutions.</p>			

Table 2 Previous review effectiveness criteria recommendations – Unresolved at end of current review period

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Auditors Recommendation	Further action required (Y/N)
1/2022	<p>B3</p> <p>1.8 - Asset planning</p> <p>Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted</p> <p>Assessment of failure on a per asset basis was found to be lacking.</p>	<p>PRE should leverage the parent company's comprehensive risk management framework and apply this to the regular assessment of risk (including threats and opportunities where applicable) related to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset failure risk • Operational risk • Maintenance risk • Asset environment risk • Asset management system risk <p>The outcome and ongoing treatment of these assessments should inform the asset replacement strategy, operational and maintenance priorities, contingency planning, emergency management plan etc.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>PRE to create risk registers to take into account asset failure.</p>
2/2022	<p>B3</p> <p>1.9 - Asset planning</p> <p>Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated</p> <p>Document reviews were observed to be overdue.</p>	<p>PRE to review the adequacy of document review process and workflow to ensure plans and documents are reviewed by the due date.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>PRE to review and update key documents</p>

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Auditors Recommendation	Further action required (Y/N)
4/2022	<p>C1 3.3 – Asset disposal Disposal alternatives are evaluated</p> <p>Details on disposal alternatives were found to be lacking in the Asset Management Plan</p>	<p>Develop disposal/replacement plans for new assets. Section 3.3.3 Decommissioning, Demolition, Abandonment and/or Disposal of the AMP to either detail or make specific reference to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposal alternative evaluation process Replacement strategy for key electrical assets. <p>An asset register of all assets</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Update the AMP to represent PREs procedures and processes around asset disposal</p>
5/2022	<p>C1 3.4 – Asset disposal There is a replacement strategy for assets.</p> <p>There was minimal contemplation of replacement strategies for assets in the Asset Management Plan</p>	<p>PRE to consider the key assets underpinning the operation of the site. The strategy should consider the asset operation and maintenance requirements, asset life cycle cost, lead times, contracting strategy, contingency plans and emergency management plan. The strategy is likely to be informed by the asset risk register.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>See recommendation 3/2022. Life-cycle costs to be assessed and documented for acquired/created assets</p>
1/2022	<p>B3 4.1 – Environmental analysis Opportunities and threats in the asset management system environment are assessed</p> <p>Internal assessments are primarily through a safety perspective. Threats to asset management system were not assessed in detail.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1/2022 applies</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Risk assessment to be performed to assess opportunities and threats to AMS.</p>

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Auditors Recommendation	Further action required (Y/N)
1/2022	<p>A3</p> <p>5.2 – Asset operations</p> <p>Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks.</p> <p>Risk assessment was done on more of a portfolio level rather than contemplating risk to assets and operational requirements.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	<p>Y</p> <p>See recommendation 1/2022. Risk assessment outcomes to drive operations tasks as required</p>
1/2022	<p>A3</p> <p>6.5 – Asset maintenance</p> <p>Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks</p> <p>Risk assessment was done on more of a portfolio level rather than contemplating risk to assets and maintenance requirements.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	<p>Y</p> <p>See recommendation 1/2022. Risk assessment outcomes to drive maintenance tasks as required.</p>
1/2022	<p>A3</p> <p>8.1 – Risk management</p> <p>Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks.</p> <p>Polices and procedures were well defined. However, ongoing management of risk was not observed.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	<p>Y</p> <p>See recommendation 1/2022. Ongoing review schedule of risk registers to be implemented and documented in risk policies.</p>

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Auditors Recommendation	Further action required (Y/N)
1/2022	<p>C3</p> <p>8.2 – Risk management</p> <p>Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored.</p> <p>Risk registers presented were not updated or monitored on an ongoing basis.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	<p>Y</p> <p>PRE to implement a risk register. See recommendation 1/2022.</p>
1/2022	<p>A3</p> <p>8.3 – Risk management</p> <p>Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed.</p> <p>Risk registers presented were not updated or monitored on an ongoing basis to monitor risk of asset failure.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	<p>Y</p> <p>Refer to recommendation 1/2022.</p>
2/2022	<p>B3</p> <p>12.2 – Review of AMS</p> <p>Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the asset management system.</p> <p>Reviews of key Asset Management System documents were observed to be out of date or having reviews overdue during the audit period.</p>	Recommendation 2/2022 applies.	<p>Y</p> <p>PRE to review and revise key documents. Refer to recommendation 2/2022</p>

2.2 Details of the Licensee Representatives Participating in the Review

The review commenced in February 2024 with the draft Audit Plan issued in March 2024. Interviews with PRE and Zenith for the review were conducted on 18 April 2024 via an in-person meeting with some attendees dialling in via video call and a following up interview on and 30 April via video call.

Details of representatives from PRE are tabulated below:

Table 3 Details of Licensee

Personnel	Organisation
General Manager	Zenith
Senior Manager Business Development	Zenith
Network Operations Manager	Zenith
Technology & Systems Lead	Zenith
Document Controller	Zenith
Regulatory Compliance Officer	Zenith
Asset Manager	Zenith
Work Management SAP	Zenith
Senior Planner	Zenith
Finance Representative	Zenith

2.3 Details of Key Documents and Other Information Sources

A list of documents reviewed in the audit and AMS review is listed in Appendix A.

2.4 Details of Auditors Participating in the Review

The review team comprised three (3) staff members from GHD.

Details of their roles in the audit/review process are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4 Details of Audit and Review Team Members from GHD

Name	Role	Summary of Task	Hours Utilised (hrs)
Henry Le	Reviewer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">AMS ReviewPreparation of report	80
Raphael Ozsvath	Lead AMS Reviewer Project Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Audit preparationAMS ReviewProject management	40
Marcel Oosthuizen	Quality control	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review documentation quality control	2

3. Performance Summary

Findings of the performance review are summarised in a table with an adequacy of control and a compliance ratings.

3.1 Assessment Rating Scales

In accordance with the 2019 Audit and Review Guidelines¹, the review of the asset management effectiveness was completed using the rating scales outlined in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5 *Asset Management Process and Policy Definition Rating*

Rating	Description	Criteria
A	Adequately defined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and policies are documented. Processes and policies adequately document the required performance of the assets. Processes and policies are subject to regular reviews and updated where necessary. The asset management information system(s) are adequate in relation to the assets being managed.
B	Requires some improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and policies require improvement. Processes and policies do not adequately document the required performance of the assets. Reviews of processes and policies are not conducted regularly enough. The asset management information system(s) requires minor improvements (taking into consideration the assets being managed).
C	Requires significant improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and policies are incomplete or require substantial improvement. Processes and policies do not document the required performance of the assets. Processes and policies are considerably out of date. The asset management information system(s) requires substantial improvements (taking into consideration the assets being managed).
D	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and policies are not documented. The asset management information system(s) is not fit for purpose (taking into consideration the assets being managed).

Table 6 *Performance Rating Scale (Reviews)*

Rating	Description	Criteria
1	Performing effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The performance of the process meets or exceeds the required levels of performance. Process effectiveness is regularly assessed, and corrective action taken where necessary.
2	Improvement required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The performance of the process requires some improvement to meet the required level. Process effectiveness reviews are not performed regularly enough. Recommended process improvements are not implemented.
3	Corrective action required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The performance of the process requires substantial improvement to meet the required level. Process effectiveness reviews are performed irregularly, or not at all. Recommended process improvements are not implemented
4	Serious action required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process is not performed, or the performance is so poor the process is considered to be ineffective.

¹ [https://www.erawa.com.au/cproot/20209/2/Audit%20and%20Review%20Guidelines%20Water%20Licences%20\(clean%20version\)%20-%20published%20on%20ERA%20website.PDF](https://www.erawa.com.au/cproot/20209/2/Audit%20and%20Review%20Guidelines%20Water%20Licences%20(clean%20version)%20-%20published%20on%20ERA%20website.PDF)

3.2 AMS Review Effectiveness Summary

The AMS review assessed the effectiveness in delivering the services required under the operating license.

The review was conducted using the asset management adequacy and performance ratings as described in Table 5 and Table 6. A summary of outcomes of the review is provided in Table 7.

Table 7 *AMS Review Results Summary*

No.	Asset management process & effectiveness criteria	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
1	Asset planning	B	2
1.1	Asset management plan covers the processes in this table	B	3
1.2	Planning processes and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and are integrated with business planning	B	3
1.3	Service levels are defined in the asset management plan	B	2
1.4	Non-asset options (e.g. demand management) are considered	A	2
1.5	Lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets are assessed	B	1
1.6	Funding options are evaluated	A	1
1.7	Costs are justified and cost drivers identified	B	2
1.8	Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted	B	3
1.9	Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated	C	3
2	Asset creation and acquisition	B	2
2.1	Full project evaluations are undertaken for new assets, including comparative assessment of non-asset options	B	2
2.2	Evaluations include all life-cycle costs	B	1
2.3	Projects reflect sound engineering and business decisions	B	2
2.4	Commissioning tests are documented and completed	A	1
2.5	Ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations of the asset owner are assigned and understood	C	3
3	Asset disposal	B	1
3.1	Under-utilised and under-performing assets are identified as part of a regular systematic review process	B	1
3.2	The reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance are critically examined and corrective action or disposal undertaken	B	1
3.3	Disposal alternatives are evaluated	B	3
3.4	There is a replacement strategy for assets	B	3
4	Environmental analysis	B	3
4.1	Opportunities and threats in the asset management system environment are assessed	C	3
4.2	Performance standards (availability of service, capacity, continuity, emergency response, etc.) are measured and achieved	B	2
4.3	Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements	C	3
4.4	Service standard (customer service levels etc) are measured and achieved.	B	1

No.	Asset management process & effectiveness criteria	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
5	Asset operations	B	2
5.1	Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	C	2
5.2	Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks	C	3
5.3	Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition	A	2
5.4	Accounting data is documented for assets	A	1
5.5	Operational costs are measured and monitored	A	1
5.6	Staff resources are adequate and staff receive training commensurate with their responsibilities	B	2
6	Asset maintenance	B	2
6.1	Maintenance policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	A	2
6.2	Regular inspections are undertaken of asset performance and condition	A	1
6.3	Maintenance plans (emergency, corrective and preventative) are documented and completed on schedule	A	1
6.4	Failures are analysed and operational/maintenance plans adjusted where necessary	A	1
6.5	Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks	B	3
6.6	Maintenance costs are measured and monitored	A	1
7	Asset management information system	A	1
7.1	Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators	A	1
7.2	Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system	A	1
7.3	Security access controls appear adequate, such as passwords	A	1
7.4	Physical security access controls appear adequate	A	1
7.5	Data backup procedures appear adequate and backups are tested	B	2
7.6	Computations for licensee performance reporting are accurate	A	1
7.7	Management reports appear adequate for the licensee to monitor licence obligations	B	2
7.8	Adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access	A	1
8	Risk management	C	3
8.1	Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks	C	3
8.2	Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored	C	3
8.3	Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed	C	2
9	Contingency planning	B	2
9.1	Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks	B	2

No.	Asset management process & effectiveness criteria	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
10	Financial planning	A	2
10.1	The financial plan states the financial objectives and identifies strategies and actions to achieve those	B	2
10.2	The financial plan identifies the source of funds for capital expenditure and recurrent costs	A	2
10.3	The financial plan provides projections of operating statements (profit and loss) and statement of financial position (balance sheets)	A	1
10.4	The financial plan provides firm predictions on income for the next five years and reasonable predictions beyond this period	A	1
10.5	The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services	A	1
10.6	Large variances in actual/budget income and expenses are identified and corrective action taken where necessary	A	1
11	Capital expenditure planning	A	2
11.1	There is a capital expenditure plan covering works to be undertaken, actions proposed, responsibilities and dates	A	2
11.2	The capital expenditure plan provides reasons for capital expenditure and timing of expenditure	A	2
11.3	The capital expenditure plan is consistent with the asset life and condition identified in the asset management plan	B	2
11.4	There is an adequate process to ensure the capital expenditure plan is regularly updated and implemented	A	2
12	Review of AMS	C	3
12.1	A review process is in place to ensure the asset management plan and the asset management system described in it remain current	C	3
12.2	Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the asset management system	C	3

4. Observations and Findings

4.1 Asset Management System Review

This AMS review observations are captured in Table 8. As per the 2019 Audit and Review Guidelines, recommendations are only given to performance ratings of 3 and 4 or process and policy ratings of C and D.

PRE was purchased by Zenith over the period this audit reviews. We acknowledge this necessitated the update of a range of documents relevant to this review. Key relevant documents relevant to this review were updated on 3 April 2024.

Table 8 *Asset Management Review Observations and Recommendations*

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
1	Asset planning Asset planning strategies focuses on meeting customer needs in the most effective and efficient manner (delivering the right service at the right price).			B	2
1.1	Asset management plan covers the processes in this table	2	The asset management plan (AMP) contemplates most of the processes within this asset management category. However, across the board, it was observed that processes described lack accountabilities or clear outcomes or are not actively carried out. The stated review periods such as annual reviews were not carried out for the AMP and various AMS documents. Recommendation 1/2024 It is recommended that the AMS, with its boundaries, be defined and the AMP updated to reflect that. Define key measures and objectives that will be used to track performance and accountabilities. There is a lack of clarity on which entities documents (Zenith or PRE) are the working documents. This can result in uncertainty in accountability or responsibility specifically to external entities. Additional uncertainty is created by relevant entity names not being accurately reflected. This needs to be clarified and documented. This recommendation is related to the previous audit recommendation 2/2022.	B	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
1.2	Planning processes and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and are integrated with business planning	4	<p>Section 5.3.4 of the AMP maps out PRE key stakeholders and associated key asset management performance drivers in a figure.</p> <p>The AMP describes qualitative actions for each stakeholder in section 5.3. Responsibilities are not always clear as to whether PRE, Zenith, or others are the responsible party for managing of the stakeholder needs. E.g. Energy retailers are identified as the responsible party for managing the interests of the consumers - this does not seem appropriate for a network service provider.</p> <p>Interdependences between deliverables and accountabilities have not been clearly defined in the AMP or other AMS documentation. It is understood that there are contractual obligations with other parties which are upheld by PRE or Zenith. A sample project deed for the microgrid with Development WA has been sighted, however accountabilities have not been clearly defined in the AMP or other AMS documents reviewed to date.</p> <p>Recommendation 2/2024</p> <p>PRE is to articulate its key stakeholders' objectives, expected service and performance measures and demonstrate the monitoring of this performance over time.</p> <p>Determine and document a stakeholder review cycle that is appropriate for PRE.</p>	B	3
1.3	Service levels are defined in the asset management plan	4	<p>Network quality and reliability of supply service levels are documented in the AMP and Network Performance and Planning Criteria Manual. Data for monitoring these was sighted for some metrics.</p> <p>Customer service level response times are listed in the Emergency Management Plan Section 8.3. It is not known whether these service levels are defined in the customer agreements and no performance monitoring of this was sighted.</p> <p>Service level agreements for the deed with Development WA or otherwise are not defined or referenced in the AMP.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to ensure all service levels are defined and actively reported and managed in a process that meets PRE's requirements.</p>	B	2
1.4	Non-asset options (e.g. demand management) are considered	4	<p>We understand from the audit interview that PRE have no capability or intent to perform load shedding or demand management as they only oversee the distribution of power to customers. It is not within the purview of PRE or Zenith to contemplate non-asset options. However, the Emergency Management Plan describes load shedding as a possible consideration with a future procedure described.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement is to clarify PREs position on load shedding and update the AMP other AMS documents</p>	A	2

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
1.5	Lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets are assessed	4	<p>Costs in the form of a project model was sighted by GHD which maps out the expected capital outlay for PRE. The sample sighted showed the model information until 2045. In addition, a financial model developed for the initial business case for acquiring the microgrid was sighted. This financial model contained a view of the expected lifecycle cost of owning and operating the microgrid.</p> <p>Cost data showing the cost of owning and operating PRE are managed in Pronto and visualised via PowerBI, a sample of which has been sighted by GHD.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to strengthen forecasts of lifecycle costs going forward. This will become more important as the assets age.</p>	B	1
1.6	Funding options are evaluated	4	<p>We understand the only two funding options available to PRE is either from Zenith or internal PRE funds for smaller amounts. It is understood that while Peel generates revenue, where this is not sufficient to fund, Zenith will fund the shortfall.</p>	A	1
1.7	Costs are justified and cost drivers identified	4	<p>Current and short term forecast costs for PRE are mapped managed in Pronto. A formal business case development procedure exists for projects exceeding a capital value of \$300k. require Zenith board level approval.</p> <p>The initial financial model developed for the business case for acquiring PRE was provided. Which lays out the cost forecast for the life of the plant.</p> <p>A purchase order record within Pronto and dated during the review period was provided. The purchase order record includes a price nomination and a description of the purpose of the upgrade. Status of the purchase order request and the approval for the record was not sighted.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to summarise and capture this process in the AMP or other AMS documents to articulate the controls in place.</p>	B	2
1.8	Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted	1	<p>PRE receives condition reports from inspections. These inform the actions needed to manage their assets in the short term.</p> <p>No medium or long-term prediction of asset failure modelling is done. This is partly because the asset base is only 4 years old. There is also a challenge for PRE to statistically model asset failures due to its small asset base. But it could rely on information from suppliers or other network service providers.</p> <p>The AMS states PRE adhere to applying Safety In Design practices. As no design work has been required for this network, examples are not available.</p> <p>Recommendation 3/2024</p> <p>Considering the small size of the PRE network limiting the opportunity to develop models of asset failures, PRE needs to develop a suitable methodology for assessing the quantity and timing of future asset failures. A suitability targeted approach would enable better planning of future CAPEX or OPEX requirements.</p>	B	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
1.9	Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated	1	<p>The AMP during the review period is a document that was owned by TasGas which was the previous parent company to PRE, the document is dated July 2022. This document was not updated within the stated review periods and contains information that does not consistently match up with contents of other documents. One example, involves detail regarding managing emergency response. Various other documents describing emergency response provide inconsistent description of roles and accountabilities.</p> <p>We sighted an updated AMP that was assimilated under the new parent company (Zenith); This AMP was approved 3/04/2024, which is outside the review period. Without active review and updates, the AMS can not be seen as being effective.</p> <p>Recommendation 4/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that the AMP is kept up to date to meet its stated review periods ensuring its content has consistency with other documents. The AMP provided was reviewed and converted to a Zenith Energy document outside of the review period.</p>	C	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
2	Asset creation and acquisition Asset creation/acquisition is the provision or improvement of assets			B	2
2.1	Full project evaluations are undertaken for new assets, including comparative assessment of non-asset options	2	<p>Zennith's procedure requires the development of a business case when the capital expenditure for a project is expected to exceed \$300k. The business case for the initial acquisition of Peel was evidenced.</p> <p>Worth noting that the bulk of the network managed by PRE is designed, installed, and commissioned, by Development WA and handed over to PRE under an agreement deed. Only augmentations requested and agreed with customers are designed, installed, commissioned by Pres.</p> <p>When such a request occurs, no process was presented describing the comparative assessments done for such a project.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to summarise and capture a process in the AMP or other AMS documents, to articulate the project assessments in place.</p>	B	2
2.2	Evaluations include all life-cycle costs	1	<p>See observation 1.5</p> <p>The initial business case for the purchase of PRE was signed, this included a view on expected asset life and costs.</p> <p>There was only one case where a material new asset was purchased. In that case the use of the replaced asset was repurposed rather than disposed of.</p> <p>Though no documented process exists for this evaluation, behaviour demonstrates consideration of lifecycle costs.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to summarise and capture this process in the AMP or other AMS documents to capture the behaviour described.</p>	B	1
2.3	Projects reflect sound engineering and business decisions	2	<p>A sample of a network augmentation (distribution transformer) was sighted. The correspondence sighted showed that Zenith demonstrated the assessment of relevant transformer technical requirements in its decision to replace the transformer.</p> <p>Pronto is used to manage and track costs to demonstrate sound business tracking for PRE.</p> <p>The AM Plan and Regulations, Codes and Standards document list standards PRE look to comply with to ensure PRE meets is safety, design, and operating requirements.</p> <p>The observation is that no project structure was demonstrated when carrying out project work. Acknowledging PRE's small size, an opportunity for improvement exists to capture an appropriate structure with accountabilities and responsibilities defined for when projects are developed and carried out.</p>	B	2
2.4	Commissioning tests are documented and completed	2	<p>A commissioning report for network augmentations during the review period (Feb 2024) was provided.</p> <p>The commissioning report documented key engineering commissioning tests required and results.</p>	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
2.5	Ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations of the asset owner are assigned and understood	2	<p>Zenith provided two documents; Network Performance and Planning Criteria Manual and Zenith Energy Workplace Health & Safety Management Plan Corporate, these describe some of the safety specific requirements that need to be managed. The documents also include general references to work health safety regulations network safety regulations do not appear to be referenced.</p> <p>The AMP gives general details on identifying and assign ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations. However, between the policy and procedure documents sighted, no compliance register was available that identifies legal / environmental, or safety obligations with assigned ownership for each obligation. Tracking of all legal / environmental, or safety obligations, in the form of a register or otherwise being used over the review period have not been evidenced.</p> <p>Recommendation 5/2024</p> <p>PRE is to develop a compliance register, identifying all obligations, due dates, with action owners.</p>	C	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
3	Asset disposal Asset disposal is the consideration of alternatives for the disposal of surplus, obsolete, under-performing or unserviceable assets.			B	1
3.1	Under-utilised and under-performing assets are identified as part of a regular systematic review process	4	<p>Primary activities for the microgrid are a rolling schedule of maintenance activities. A sample of maintenance reports during the review period was provided.</p> <p>The reports consist of checklists developed by PRE for the HV equipment and includes qualitative and binary checks with a provision for comment by the contractor to assess the condition of the assets.</p> <p>From the small number of incidents available, asset conditions issues identified are action quickly.</p> <p>One opportunity was presented, over the review period, where a material asset (distribution transformer) needed replacement. The replaced transformer was repurposed to another location, rather than simply disposed.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists as asset utilisation is not monitored. PRE is concerned with the distribution assets in which the performance is monitored on a binary “operating / not operating” basis. This has not been clearly defined in the AMP. Note; Trunk software allows for ongoing utilisation (demand vs generation dispatch) monitoring of the generation assets (solar farm and BESS) however, this is outside of the scope of the review.</p>	B	1
3.2	The reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance are critically examined and corrective action or disposal undertaken	4	<p>Generally due to the young age of the network, asset problems were not evident during the review period.</p> <p>However, a process for corrective action is in place and is understood to follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue is flagged during regular scheduled inspections performed by external contractors 2. Maintenance report is issued to PRE 3. Internal approval flow within PRE is initiated to commence corrective action 4. Work order is created 5. Contractor commences corrective actions <p>An internal report detailing a work order developed for repairing a transformer bailing arm was sighted, correspondence referencing completion of the work was sighted. Internal documentation in the form of a notice of completion for works during review period was sighted.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists as asset utilisation is not monitored. PRE is concerned with the distribution assets in which the performance is monitored on a binary “operating / not operating” basis. This has not been clearly defined in the AMP.</p>	B	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
3.3	Disposal alternatives are evaluated	1	<p>Alternatives to disposal was contemplated during the review period. A distribution transformer was repurposed elsewhere in the distribution network as opposed to being disposed. Thought the consideration of an alternative was demonstrated, this action is not mentioned in section 3.3.3 of the AMP.</p> <p>Recommendation 6/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that PRE update the AMP to capture the behaviour demonstrated of assessing disposal alternatives for assets. This is related to the previous audit recommendation 4/2022.</p>	B	3
3.4	There is a replacement strategy for assets	1	<p>Section 3.3.3 of the AMP mentions a general decommissioning strategy for the assets at PRE. However, no strategic factors or drivers are listed to define an asset replacement strategy.</p> <p>Recommendation 7/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that a replacement strategy be developed and documented in the AMP, alongside asset disposal. It is to be informed by the outcomes of an asset-based risk assessment which considers asset criticality as well as likelihood and consequences of failure. Considering the small size of PRE, this strategy is to be fit for purpose. This recommendation is related to the previous audit recommendation 5/2022.</p>	B	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
4	Environmental analysis Environmental analysis examines the Asset Management System environment and assesses all external factors affecting the Asset Management System.			B	3
4.1	Opportunities and threats in the Asset Management System environment are assessed	1	<p>An up-to-date enterprise risk register or risk framework was not sighted. Two risk registers sighted were not updated and had different risk matrixes. No review of the enterprise risk register was evidenced for the review period or following acquisition.</p> <p>Asset specific threats were identified as part of the initial safety in design, but this has not been reassessed or reviewed by PRE during the review period.</p> <p>We understand work commenced to develop a risk framework and register. This is understood to have started on 3 April 2024, which is outside of the review period.</p> <p>Recommendation 8/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that the enterprise risk framework be developed, and a risk register populated with accountabilities in line with the current organisational structure between PRE and Zenith.</p> <p>This should be conducted as part of a wider risk-based assessment identifying opportunities and threats that can impact the business and operations of PRE.</p> <p>This is related to the previous review recommendation 1/2022, 6/2022, 7/2022 and 8/2022.</p>	C	3
4.2	Performance standards (availability of service, capacity, continuity, emergency response, etc.) are measured and achieved	2	<p>Some performance metrics such as SAIDI, SAIFI and availability data have been measured by PRE and evidenced. It should be noted that the performance requirements for these metrics are not defined in the AMP or other key AMS documents.</p>	B	2
4.3	Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements	2	<p>The AMP gives general details on identifying and assign ongoing statutory and regulatory obligations. However, no compliance registers or otherwise was provided that tracks and demonstrates compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Recommendation 9/2024</p> <p>PRE is to develop a compliance register, identifying all obligations, due dates, with action owners. This is related to the previous review recommendation 5/2024.</p>	C	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
4.4	Service standard (customer service levels etc) are measured and achieved.	2	Customer service level response times are listed in the Emergency Management Plan Section 8.3. It is not known whether these service levels are defined in the customer agreements and no performance monitoring of this was sighted. A record of customer complaints and quality of supply metrics were also recorded during the review period and provided. The Network Performance and Planning Criteria Manual does include an operating envelope for quality of supply.	B	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
5	Asset operations Asset operations is the day-to-day running of assets (where the asset is used for its intended purpose).			B	2
5.1	Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	4	<p>See observation 1.3</p> <p>While the services levels of the distribution assets are recorded. References to recording and storing this information as part of ongoing operation is not referenced in the High Voltage Microgrid Operation Manual provided (manual) or the AMP.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the working manual during the review period is effective from June 2021 and contains outdated information that is not reflective of PREs current operating procedure. The latest revision of the manual is dated 3 April 2024 which is after the end of review period and has substantial changes such as excluding some condition monitoring procedures for the HV assets.</p> <p>Though the Asset Management Plan meets certain key aspects of the Electricity (Network Safety) Regulations 2015 obligations, it does not represents good industry practice. As aspects such as risk management frameworks, regular reviews are not in place.</p> <p>Recommendation 10/2024</p> <p>Ensure all obligations under the Electricity (Network Safety) Regulations 2015 are meet.</p>	C	2
5.2	Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks	1	<p>As discussed in 4.1, no effective up to date risk framework or register is in place over the review period.</p> <p>However, the very low volume of asset related incidents gives PRE the ability to respond and address the few incidents quickly - without the need to prioritise.</p> <p>This however may not be the case once assets age or Zenith expands its microgrid network.</p> <p>Recommendation 11/2024</p> <p>It is recommended, that in parallel with recommendation 8/2024, a set of risk-based prioritisation rules be developed to prioritise operational tasks in the future. As with other recommendations made, this should be fit for purpose for PREs needs.</p>	C	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
5.3	Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition	1	<p>PRE uses the asset and facility management functionality within the Pronto software.</p> <p>Pronto is used to maintain a live asset register for PRE. An exported report of the assets at PRE was provided and the software interface itself was sighted.</p> <p>The plant item descriptor includes the lot number, or location of the assets. The register also includes information of the asset type and functional location with respect to PRE in the form of a hierarchy structure.</p> <p>Full adoption of Pronto to record O&M data and integrate information from O&M software (such as Trunk, by Jarrah Solutions) is a work in progress.</p>	A	2
5.4	Accounting data is documented for assets	4	<p>Pronto is able to track costs for assets alongside internal tracking methods used by the financial teams within Zenith. An excerpt of a financial tracking register for the assets was provided (Fixed asset register). The register tracks accounting data and costs for the assets including financial depreciation of the assets.</p>	A	1
5.5	Operational costs are measured and monitored	2	<p>Pronto allows PRE and Zenith to monitor and track operational costs. A cost report demonstrating that operational costs are monitored in the form of a PowerBI portal has been sighted.</p>	A	1
5.6	Staff resources are adequate and staff receive training commensurate with their responsibilities	2	<p>A training and competency matrix was provided. The working version of the document during the review period is dated in 2022 and still retains TasGas document numbering standard.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to ensure documents are current and correctly reflect operational practices.</p>	B	2

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
6	Asset maintenance Asset maintenance is the upkeep of assets.			B	2
6.1	Maintenance policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	4	<p>The HV LV and Solar Generations Maintenance Strategy outlines the maintenance strategy for the distribution assets. The working version of this document during the review period is dated June 2021.</p> <p>In addition, a series of maintenance checklists are referenced in the document, a sample of populated checklists, reflecting asset inspections, dated during the review period was provided.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to ensure documents are current, and information reflected in these checklists are populated within Pronto either in the form of a condition tag or notes.</p>	A	2
6.2	Regular inspections are undertaken of asset performance and condition	2	<p>See observation 6.1.</p> <p>A sample of maintenance checklists populated as part of routine inspections was provided. O&M contractor agreements were also provided which outlines the maintenance regime for the operation of the network.</p>	A	1
6.3	Maintenance plans (emergency, corrective, and preventative) are documented and completed on schedule	2	Routine maintenance activities are conducted by third party contractors in line with a contractor's agreement with PRE and no maintenance backlog was evident.	A	1
6.4	Failures are analysed and operational / maintenance plans adjusted where necessary	2	<p>We understand one asset failure occurred over the review period, in this instance the failure was clearly understood, and remediation actioned. Maintenance plans did not need to be adjusted for this incident. The relevant contractor provided a report of the incident. Section 11.1.3 of the Emergency Response Management document describes who will carry out asset failure investigations and reporting.</p> <p>The Emergency Response Management document describes how investigations will be carried out for incidents classified as emergency and crisis.</p> <p>.</p>	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
6.5	Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks	1	<p>As discussed in observations 4.1, and 5.2, no effective up to date risk framework or register is in place over the review period.</p> <p>However, the very low volume of asset related incidents gives PRE the ability to respond and address the limited maintenance task quickly - without the need to prioritise.</p> <p>This however may not be the case once assets age or Zenith expands its microgrid network.</p> <p>Recommendation 12/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that, in parallel with recommendation 8/2024 and 11/2024, a set of risk-based prioritisation rules be developed. As with other recommendations made, this should be fit for purpose for PREs needs.</p>	B	3
6.6	Maintenance costs are measured and monitored	4	<p>As mentioned in observation 5.4 and 5.5, ongoing costs are input into Pronto, financial data associated with maintenance of the network assets are aggregated through a PowerBI interface and a report of maintenance costs were sighted.</p>	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
7	Asset management information system An asset management information system is a combination of processes, data and software supporting the asset management functions.			A	1
7.1	Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators	1	Training materials for the Pronto system have been developed by Zenith were provided. In addition, correspondence showing that workshops were conducted, and additional materials developed for users provided.	A	1
7.2	Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system	1	Access to information pages within Pronto is dictated by employee role. With additional permissions having to go through an internal approval. This approval also applies for data entered IN Pronto whereby management or senior staff are required to approve changes made that fall within their purview. This access restriction between users within Pronto has been demonstrated during interviews conducted.	A	1
7.3	Security access controls appear adequate, such as passwords	2	Pronto access sits exclusively with Zenith personnel, who are based primarily at their offices in Belmont. Access to their systems and servers require password access. A excerpt showing the back-end configuration of password requirements for Pronto has been sighted, the current settings have various minimum requirements for different positions to ensure a strong password. Requirements includes but are not limited to a minimum password length, use of capital and lower-case letters and special characters. Password strength requirements increases based on the user type (i.e. administrators have higher requirements compared to other users)	A	1
7.4	Physical security access controls appear adequate	2	On site, kiosks were observed to have padlocks and the network room required key access with a sign in sheet. Zenith offices in Belmont have CCTV and requires staff card access after-hours.	A	1
7.5	Data backup procedures appear adequate, and backups are tested	4	Zenith relies on Pronto's automatic backup procedure which occurs daily. Other systems in the AMS such as Sharepoint and Expense me Pro also have their backups maintained by their respective providers. There is no regular review that validates that these backups have taken place. Backup information was provided through a query process with the software provider to validate backups dated during the review period. An opportunity for improvement exists to test and check backup procedures regularly.	B	2
7.6	Computations for licensee performance reporting are accurate	4	Regarding distribution network assets, data required to populate the distribution electricity reporting datasheets are available via Trunk. These datasheets were provided.	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
7.7	Management reports appear adequate for the licensee to monitor licence obligations	2	Standard distribution licence reporting datasheets required was provided. However, no report for monitoring progress against the previous AMS review was sited. An opportunity for improvement exists to activity monitor and report progress against the action plan that PRE will develop for the ERA	B	2
7.8	Adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access or theft by persons outside the organisation	4	Feedback from Zeniths IT Support and Systems Officer, confirm all data is hosted by Zenith or Epic IT on Zeniths behalf utilise a 3-2-1 backup strategy. We understand three copies of the data, are stored on two different types of media, with one copy kept off-site. Cloud services like Entra ID, Microsoft perform their own backups and additionally Epic IT employee a SaaS Protection service for further redundancy. Password management, Epic IT use passwords which use a "Password Vault" method to secure store these credentials. Access control, Epic IT only give Zenith users approved access to roles and permissions within Zenith Energy's IT systems, Conditional access policies are also employed to further restrict access to only specific conditions.	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
8	Risk management Risk management involves the identification of risks and their management within an acceptable level of risk.			C	3
8.1	Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks	1	<p>PRE has provided Zenith's Enterprise Risk Management Plan. This document appears to cover general work place and site-based work related risk management policies and procedures and does not appear to address and asset or site specific risks.</p> <p>No risk framework or procedure specific to the operation of the Peel assets were provided.</p> <p>Recommendation 13/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that, including the enterprise risk frame work mentioned in recommendation 8/2024, a risk management policy and procedure be defined that is specific to assets and defines a framework that can be used to manage and minimise risks. There may be internal policies and procedures that are fit for purpose, these need to be referenced accordingly in the AMP or otherwise developed for PRE's use.</p> <p>This recommendation should be considered in tandem with 11/2024 and 12/2024. The approach should be asset specific as well as fit for purpose for PRE's requirements.</p>	C	3
8.2	Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored	1	<p>Two risk registers sighted were not updated and had different risk matrixes. No review of the enterprise risk register was evidenced for the review period or following acquisition of the network.</p> <p>One of the registers appears to be an output of the safety in design phase of the network development. This register has not been reassessed or reviewed by PRE during the review period.</p> <p>As mentioned in observation 4.1, 5.2 and 6.5, no effective up to date risk framework or register is in place over the review period.</p> <p>Recommendation 14/2024</p> <p>It is recommended PRE develop a consolidated risk register which is informed by the two previous risk registers. This consolidated risk register should be separate from the previous registers and represent PRE's current treatment plans and monitoring strategy for the assets. The outcomes of this register should inform the maintenance and operating activities and be considered together with recommendations 11/2024 and 12/2024.</p>	C	3

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
8.3	Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed	1	<p>Zenith primarily rely on third party contractor to identify risk of asset failure during routine inspections and maintenance activities.</p> <p>The contractors' inspections results have, so far, been used to assess the probability of failures.</p> <p>No alternative process for assessing probability of failures were presented. As mentioned before the young age and small size of the network has not prioritised this. No process or policy is defined in the AMP or other key AMS documentation provided. As mentioned in observation 8.2, there is no current register of risks for the assets from an operational or safety perspective.</p> <p>Recommendation 15/2024</p> <p>It is recommended that an assessment of asset failure and consequences is performed and a schedule of reviews determined at a rate that is fit for purpose. Together with recommendation 3/2024, assessment of future asset failure and consequences allows for improved CAPEX and OPEX forecasting.</p>	C	2

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
9	Contingency planning Contingency plans document the steps to deal with the unexpected failure of an asset.			B	2
9.1	Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks	2	<p>The emergency management plan provided is dated 3 April 2024 as a revision 0. It is understood that Zenith is currently assimilating previous TasGas owned documents into their current document management system with the content of documents remaining largely unchanged.</p> <p>The working Emergency Management Plan during the review period would therefore be out of date and not specific to PRE and Zenith energy.</p> <p>No emergency testing was conducted during the review period. It is noted that the Emergency Management Plan states “two emergency exercises per utility type will be conducted each year”.</p> <p>An enterprise level document titled: Crisis Management Plan was also provided. Certain areas overlap with the Emergency Management Plan that provide conflicting information.</p> <p>An opportunity for improvement exists to ensure documents are current and correctly reflect operational practices for PRE.</p>	B	2

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
10	Financial planning Financial brings together the financial elements of the service delivery to ensure its financial viability over the long term.			A	2
10.1	The financial plan states the financial objectives and identifies strategies and actions to achieve those	5	Zenith conducts financial planning at the enterprise level for the year ahead. A budget memo issued internally layouts out directives and courses of actions to be taken internally to carry out each year's finance planning. An opportunity for improvement exists to define short- and long-term financial objectives and demonstrate that the financial planning meet these objectives.	B	2
10.2	The financial plan identifies the source of funds for capital expenditure and recurrent costs	4	The budget memo sample provided gives a breakdown on reporting actions for various cost factors such as insurance and labour. Minutes of meeting was sighted showing resolution of the acquisition arrangement between Zenith and PRE. For ongoing costs, as noted in observation 1.6, Zenith funds the shortfall from revenue generated by PRE at Peel. An opportunity for improvement exists to define this financial arrangement in a document like the AMP.	A	2
10.3	The financial plan provides projections of operating statements (profit and loss) and statement of financial position (balance sheets)	4	Financial balance information for PRE is collected in Pronto and visualised via PowerBI as mentioned in observations 1.5 and 1.7 the sample provided demonstrates that revenue and costs are tracked.	A	1
10.4	The financial plan provides firm predictions on income for the next five years and reasonable predictions beyond this period	4	A sample of the project model was provided which shows the prediction of the financial performance of PRE. It is understood that this model adminis to map out the lifecycle of the plant (PRE) and is updated regularly with updates occurring every financial quarter as part of Zenith's planning process.	A	1
10.5	The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services	4	See observation 10.4 A financial model for PRE includes current and forecasted O&M costs for various contractors into the long term. The sample provided maps out the costs to 2045.	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
10.6	Large variances in actual/budget income and expenses are identified and corrective action taken where necessary	2	<p>The financial data available in Pronto and visualised in PowerBI maps out variances in budget against actuals. Also provided is a sample of an Elemental Board Report dated during the review period. This report sighted combines financial performance reporting for PRE and Peel Energy</p> <p>Variations in budget have occurred during the review period mainly in the form of overheads for staffing at Zenith. Samples of requests for new full time employed staff outside of budget were provided.</p> <p>The samples provided include a description of the roles for new staff and justifications for the new positions with the approval and sign-off by the MD being evidenced.</p>	A	1

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
11	Capital expenditure planning The capital expenditure plan provides a schedule of new works, rehabilitation and replacement works, together with estimated annual expenditure for these works over the next five or more years.			A	2
11.1	There is a capital expenditure plan covering works to be undertaken, actions proposed, responsibilities and dates	2	See observation 10.4 The project model sample provided, shows long term capital expenditure projections. We understand this is based on the views presented in the initial business case. Actions and responsibilities to action the forecast capital plan expenditure was not sighted. The financial model lists capital expenditures and includes some additional information within the line item names on the reason for capital expenditure.	A	2
11.2	The capital expenditure plan provides reasons for capital expenditure and timing of expenditure	4	See observation 11.1 The financial model lays out the timing for capital expenditure in detail on a monthly basis and forecasts the capital costs annually. The sample provided maps this out to 2045. We understand this is based on the views presented in the initial business case.	A	2
11.3	The capital expenditure plan is consistent with the asset life and condition identified in the asset management plan	4	See observation 1.8 Condition information is reviewed by PRE as third-party inspection or maintenance reports are provided. Determining the impact of this on asset life in the financial model, is not yet done. This is primarily due to the young age of the network. An opportunity for improvement exists to inform and updated the life cycle views developed in the initial business plan. This will improve the long-term capital expenditure planning. For transparency around asset planning we also suggest the expected asset life cycles be documented in the AMP or relevant AMS documentation.	B	2
11.4	There is an adequate process to ensure the capital expenditure plan is regularly updated and implemented	2	See observation 10.4 and 11.3 As mentioned regular reviews with quarterly updates are performed for PRE as part of Zenith's planning process. Also provided is a sample of an Elemental Board Report dated during the review period. This report includes ongoing monitoring of the capital expenditure of Peel.	A	2

No.	AMS Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Observations and Recommendations	Process and Policy Rating	Performance Rating
12	Review of AMS The Asset Management System is regularly reviewed and updated.			C	3
12.1	A review process is in place to ensure the asset management plan and the Asset Management System described in it remain current	2	<p>It is understood that an internal review of the AMS is ongoing. This review has identified various AMS deficiencies during the review period and is ongoing. In addition, as noted in observation 1.9, various key AMS documents during the review period are outdated and show a document owned by TasGas, the previous owner of the network. Up to date documents show marginal changes from previous revisions and are dated after the review period.</p> <p>Recommendation 16/2024 It is recommended that PRE complete their internal review and implement internal action plans alongside all recommendations in this review.</p>	C	3
12.2	Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the Asset Management System	1	<p>No internal audits were conducted on the current AMS outside of those required by the ERA.</p> <p>It is understood that a compliance officer was brought on-board towards the end of the review period and will be undertaking internal audits. An internal audit plan was presented, however all actions scheduled are within the future review period.</p> <p>Recommendation 17/2024 It is recommended PRE maintain an effective audit plan, ensure audits are carried against this plan, ensure recommendations are presented to relevant management and actioned.</p>	C	3

4.2 Recommendations

Table 9 is a summary of the recommendations from the previous review that have been resolved during the current review period. Table 10 includes a summary of the recommendations given on actions PRE should take to address AMS process and policy ratings of C or D or performance rating of 3 or 4 that have been unresolved at the end of the current review period:

Table 9 Summary of previous review recommendations – Resolved during current review period

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Date resolved and action taken by the licensee	Further action required
3/2022	B3 2.2 - Asset creation and acquisition Evaluations include all life-cycle costs. Life-cycle costs were not evaluated.	1/1/2023 Business case development procedures used during the review period have been demonstrated by Zenith. Zenith and PRE to consider the opportunity for improvement raised.	No further action required.
6/2022	C3 5.3 – Asset operations Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition No consolidated asset register was provided. Assets were recorded and maintained separately across multiple systems	1/1/2023 Asset register is maintained in the Pronto system. Register includes asset location, asset type and functional location.	No further action required
7/2022	C3 7.1 – Asset management information system Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators Asset information management was found to be dependant on information recorded by an operational service provider (Trunk by Jarrah Solutions).	1/3/2024 Training materials for the Pronto system have been developed by Zenith were provided. In addition, correspondence showing that workshops were conducted, and additional materials developed for users provided.	No further action required
8/2022	B3 7.2 – Asset management information system Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system	1/3/2024 Access to information pages within Pronto is dictated by employee role. With additional permissions having to go through an internal approval.	No further action required

Recommendation Reference	Rating / Effectiveness Criteria / Details of deficiency	Date resolved and action taken by the licensee	Further action required
	Identification and tracking of assets was dependant on Trunk by Jarrah Solutions.	This approval also applies for data entered in Pronto whereby management or senior staff are required to approve changes made that fall within their purview.	

Table 10 Summary of recommendations – Unresolved at end of current review period

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
1/2022	B3 1.8 - Asset planning Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted Assessment of failure on a per asset basis was found to be lacking.	PRE should leverage the parent company's risk management framework and apply this to the regular assessment of risk (including threats and opportunities where applicable) related to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset failure risk • Operational risk • Maintenance risk • Asset environment risk • Asset management system risk The outcome and ongoing treatment of these assessments should inform the asset replacement strategy, operational and maintenance priorities, contingency planning, emergency management plan etc.	This recommendation has not been addressed
2/2022	B3 1.9 - Asset planning Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated Document reviews were observed to be overdue.	PRE to review the adequacy of document review process and workflow to ensure plans and documents are reviewed by the due date.	Reviews of the AMP and other AMS documents were finalised post the end of the review period. It is understood that Zenith now has adequate staffing, resources and tools to keep documents up to date moving forward.
4/2022	C1 3.3 – Asset disposal Disposal alternatives are evaluated Details on disposal alternatives were found to be lacking in the Asset Management Plan	Develop disposal/replacement plans for new assets. Section 3.3.3 Decommissioning, Demolition, Abandonment and/or Disposal of the AMP to either detail or make specific reference to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disposal alternative evaluation process • Replacement strategy for key electrical assets. An asset register of all assets.	While behaviour was demonstrated showing the assessment of a disposed asset during the review period. The AMP did not reflect the process PRE uses to evaluate disposal alternatives.

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
5/2022	<p>C1 3.4 – Asset disposal There is a replacement strategy for assets.</p> <p>There was minimal contemplation of replacement strategies for assets in the Asset Management Plan</p>	PRE to consider the key assets underpinning the operation of the site. The strategy should consider the asset operation and maintenance requirements, asset life cycle cost, lead times, contracting strategy, contingency plans and emergency management plan. The strategy is likely to be informed by the asset risk register.	While behaviour was demonstrated showing the assessment of a disposed asset during the review period The AMP did not reflect the process PRE uses to represent their replacement strategy.
1/2022	<p>B3 4.1 – Environmental analysis Opportunities and threats in the asset management system environment are assessed</p> <p>Internal assessments are primarily through a safety perspective. Threats to asset management system were not assessed in detail.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	This recommendation has not been addressed
1/2022	<p>A3 5.2 – Asset operations Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks.</p> <p>Risk assessment was done on more of a portfolio level rather than contemplating risk to assets and operational requirements.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	This recommendation has not been addressed
1/2022	<p>A3 6.5 – Asset maintenance Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks</p> <p>Risk assessment was done on more of a portfolio level rather than contemplating risk to assets and maintenance requirements.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	This recommendation has not been addressed

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
1/2022	<p>A3</p> <p>8.1 – Risk management</p> <p>Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks.</p> <p>Polices and procedures were well defined. However, ongoing management of risk was not observed.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	This recommendation has not been addressed
1/2022	<p>C3</p> <p>8.2 – Risk management</p> <p>Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored.</p> <p>Risk registers presented were not updated or monitored on an ongoing basis.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	This recommendation has not been addressed
1/2022	<p>A3</p> <p>8.3 – Risk management</p> <p>Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed.</p> <p>Risk registers presented were not updated or monitored on an ongoing basis to monitor risk of asset failure.</p>	Recommendation 1/2022 applies	This recommendation has not been addressed

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
2/2022	<p>B3 12.2 – Review of AMS Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the asset management system.</p> <p>Reviews of key Asset Management System documents were observed to be out of date or having reviews overdue during the audit period.</p>	Recommendation 2/2022 applies.	It is understood that there is an ongoing internal review being undertaken of the AMS. Zenith is adequately staffed to complete internal reviews and engage third parties for reviews moving forward.
1/2024	<p>B3 1.1 – Asset planning Asset management plan covers the processes in this table</p>	It is recommended that the AMS, with its boundaries, be defined and the AMP be updated to reflect that. Define key measures and objectives that will be used to track performance and accountabilities. There is a lack of clarity on which entities documents (Zenith or PRE) are the working documents, this can result in uncertainty in accountability or responsibility specifically to external entities. Additional uncertainty is created by relevant entity names not being accurately reflected. This needs to be clarified and documented. This recommendation is related to the previous audit recommendation 2/2022.	<p>Reasons for the delay in review of this item has have been addressed.</p> <p>Current staffing at Zenith should now be adequate to keep documents up to date.</p>
2/2024	<p>B3 1.2 – Asset planning Planning processes and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and are integrated with business planning</p>	<p>PRE is to articulate its key stakeholders' objectives, expected service and performance measures and demonstrate the monitoring of this performance over time.</p> <p>Determine and document a stakeholder review cycle that is appropriate for PRE.</p>	This recommendation has not been addressed.
3/2024	<p>B3 1.8 – Asset planning Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted</p>	Considering the small size of the PRE network limiting the opportunity to develop models of asset failures, PRE needs to develop a suitable methodology for assessing the quantity and timing of future asset failures. A suitability targeted approach would enable better planning of future CAPEX or OPEX requirements	This recommendation has not been addressed.
4/2024	<p>C3 1.9 – Asset planning Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated</p>	It is recommended that the AMP is kept up to date to meet its stated review periods and ensure content consistency with other documents. The AMP provided was reviewed and converted to a Zenith Energy document outside of the review period.	<p>Reasons for the delay in review of this item has have been addressed.</p> <p>Current staffing at Zenith should now be adequate to keep documents up to date.</p>

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
5/2024	C3 2.5 – Asset creation and acquisition Ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations of the asset owner are assigned and understood	PRE is to develop a compliance register, identifying all obligations, due dates and action owners.	This recommendation has not been addressed
6/2024	C2 3.3 – Asset disposal Disposal alternatives are evaluated	It is recommended that PRE update the AMP to capture the behaviour demonstrated of assessing disposal alternatives for assets. This is related to the previous audit recommendation 4/2022.	It is recommended that PRE update the AMP to capture the behaviour of assessing disposal alternatives for assets. This is related to the previous audit recommendation 4/2022. This recommendation has not been addressed
7/2024	B3 3.4 – Asset disposal There is a replacement strategy for assets	It is recommended that a replacement strategy be developed and documented in the AMP, alongside asset disposal. It is to be informed by the outcomes of an asset-based risk assessment which considers asset criticality as well as likelihood and consequences of failure. Considering the small size of PRE, this strategy is to be fit for purpose. This recommendation is related to the previous audit recommendation 5/2022.	This recommendation has not been addressed
8/2024	C3 4.1 – Environmental analysis Opportunities and threats in the Asset Management System environment are assessed	It is recommended that the enterprise risk framework be developed, and a risk register populated with accountabilities in line with the current organisational structure between PRE and Zenith. This needs to be conducted as part of a wider risk-based assessment identifying opportunities and threats that can impact the business and operations of PRE. This is related to the previous audit recommendation 1/2022, 6/2022, 7/2022 and 8/2022.	This recommendation has not been addressed
9/2024	C3 4.3 - Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements	PRE is to develop a compliance register, identifying all obligations, due dates, with action owners. This is related to the previous review recommendation 5/2024.	This recommendation has not been addressed
10/2024	C2 5.1 - Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	Ensure all obligations under the Electricity (Network Safety) Regulations 2015 are met.	This recommendation has not been addressed

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
11/2024	C3 5.2 – Asset operations Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks	It is recommended, that in parallel with recommendation 8/2024, a set of risk-based prioritisation rules be developed. As with other recommendations made, this should be fit for purpose for PREs needs.	This recommendation has not been addressed
12/2024	B3 6.5 – Asset maintenance Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks	It is recommended, that in parallel with recommendation 8/2024 and 11/2024 a set of risk-based prioritisation rules be developed. As with other recommendations made, this should be fit for purpose for PREs needs	This recommendation has not been addressed
13/2024	C3 8.1 – Risk Management Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks	It is recommended that, including the enterprise risk frame work mentioned in recommendation 8/2024, a risk management policy and procedure be defined that is specific to the assets and defines a framework that can be used to manage and minimise risks. There may be internal policies and procedures that are fit for purpose, these need to be referenced accordingly in the AMP or otherwise developed for PRE's use. This recommendation should be considered in tandem with 11/2024 and 12/2024. The approach should be asset specific as well as fit for purpose for PRE's requirements.	This recommendation has not been addressed
14/2024	C3 8.2 – Risk Management Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored	It is recommended PRE develop a consolidated risk register which is informed by the two previous risk registers. This consolidated risk register should be separate from the previous registers and represent PRE's current treatment plans and monitoring strategy for the assets. The outcomes of this register should inform the maintenance and operating activities and be considered together with recommendations 11/2024 and 12/2024.	This recommendation has not been addressed
15/2024	C2 8.3 – Risk Management Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed	It is recommended that an assessment of asset failure and consequences is performed and a schedule of reviews determined at a rate that is fit for purpose. Together with recommendation 3/2024, assessment of future asset failure and consequences allows for improved CAPEX and OPEX forecasting.	This recommendation has not been addressed
16/2024	C3 12.1 – Review of AMS A review process is in place to ensure the asset management plan and the Asset Management System described in it remain current	It is recommended that PRE complete their internal review and implement internal action plans alongside all recommendations in this review.	It is understood that there is an ongoing internal review being undertake of the AMS. Zenith is adequately staffed to complete internal reviews and engage third parties for reviews moving forward.

Recommendation no.	Rating / Criteria no. / Description / Details of deficiency	Recommendation	Action taken by the licensee by end of review period
17/2024	C3 12.2 Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the Asset Management System	It is recommended PRE maintain an effective audit plan, ensure audits are carried against this plan, ensure recommendations are present to relevant management and actioned.	It is understood that there is an ongoing internal review being undertake of the AMS. Zenith is adequately staffed to complete internal reviews and develop action plans and implement them moving forward.

Appendix A

Key Documents Reviewed

Table 11 *List of documents provided*

File name
0427 - Board Minutes (signed)_Redacted.pdf
113335 PRE Nov 23 Maint Report.pdf
113335-PRE_ Maint Report_FEB 2024.pdf
114141- PRE_Zenith Energy_ PBP Lot 38 Upgrade.pdf
1917-ERP-01 Reverse Current Trips Investigation_0.pdf
20200728 Nilsen Executed Contract.pdf
2023-Distribution Electricity-Licence-Reporting-Datashee.pdf
2023-Electricity-Licence-Reporting-Data.pdf
2023-NQR Electricity-Licence-Reporting-Datashee.pdf
25 OCTOBER 2023 BOARD PACK_Redacted.pdf
4 OCTOBER 2023 BOARD PACK_Redacted.pdf
AA20S1&EQC5_RevA_2023ProtectionAndDCSystemsMaintenanceReport.pdf
AA20S1&EQC5_RevA_2023ProtectionAndDCSystemsMaintenanceReport.pdf
AA20S1E5C2TBA1&EQC3_RevA_BatteryDischargeTestReport.pdf
AA20S1E5W1Q07KFA1&EQC2_RevA_ProtectionRelayTestReport.pdf
Asset Management Plan (Electricity) PEEL.pdf
Avora - Peel Business Park O&M Visit (180523).pdf
Backflow Test Report BC2070664 (300523).pdf
CE - Tech & Systems Lead.pdf
CE Customer Service Manager.pdf
CE SNR Manager.pdf
CKE01_PRE-043 Contractor Monthly KPI Record - Mar2024.pdf
Combined Earth Continuity Test Report.pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist for 415V Switchboards.pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist for High Voltage Cables.pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist For Low Voltage Cables.pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist For Online Testing of HV Assets.pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist for RMU.pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist For Substation and Equipment Earthing (1).pdf
Combined Maintenance Checklist For Transformer.pdf
Combined Substation Inspection Sheet.pdf
Copy of L21 Plant Items 03042024.xlsx
Copy of Stage 1 Only model 18112020 - Copy.xlsx
DWA Microgrid Operation Annual Report YE2023 vF.pdf
Emergency Management Plan (EMP) – PRE.pdf
Entry Log - Peel Renewable Energy.pdf
FAR Feb24 - Connected Energy.xlsx

FW Lot 38 8002 - Substation changes - Preliminary Quotation.msg
FW_ Elemental Board Pack - Wednesday 25 October 2023 meeting.msg
FW_ Elemental Board Pack - Wednesday 4 October 2023 meeting.msg
FW_ New Roles for CE.msg
FW_ Peel Audit - Document Requests.msg
FW_ Pronto and IT information for auditors.msg
FY24 Zenith Budget Process Memo.pdf
FY25 Budget memo_Redacted.pdf
GHD AMS review April 2024 - Finance requirements.xlsx
High Voltage Microgrid Operation Manual - PRE.pdf
HV LV and Solar Generations Maintenance Strategy - (PEEL) - WA.pdf
HV LV and Solar Generations Maintenance Strategy (PEEL).pdf
IR & US Report - Peel Business park Nambeelup Aug 2022 (v1.0).pdf
Maintenance Checklist for 22kV RMU (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for 22kV Switchboard Busbar Zone (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist For 415 V Main Incomer Air Circuit Breakers (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist For 415 V Main Incomer Air Circuit Breakers (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for 415V Switchboards (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for Distribution Transformer Oil Type - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist For Distribution Transformer Oil Type - PEEL.pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Generation Connection HV Switchgear - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist for Generation Connection HV Switchgear - PEEL.pdf
Maintenance Checklist for High Voltage Cables (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for High Voltage Cables (PEEL).pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Low Voltage Cables - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist for Main HV Switchboard.docx
Maintenance Checklist for Monthly Inspections - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist for Online Testing of Assets - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist For Protection System (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist For SCADA Control and Communication System (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for Solar Generation and Battery Storage - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist for Solar Generation High Voltage Cables (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for Substation and Equipment Earthing - PEEL.docx
Maintenance Checklist For Substation Battery Equipment (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD002 SXB (1).pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD031.pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD033 SXC.pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD037 SXE.pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD038 SXD.pdf

Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD201 SXA SR001 (1).pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL) EP HVD201 SXA SR001.pdf
Maintenance Checklist for Substation Equipment Inspections (PEEL).docx
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park Feb 2023.pdf
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park Feb 2024.pdf
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park May 2023.pdf
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park Nambeelup Aug 2022 (v1.0).pdf
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park Nov 2022.pdf
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park Nov 2022.pdf
Maintenance Report - Peel Business Park - May 2023.pdf
Memo from GM Finance re financials.docx
Metrology Procedure.pdf
Microgrids- Weekly Operations Registry-ZEN-PTH-21218 - Copy.xlsx
Network Performance and Planning Criteria Manual - NNPC (Peel).pdf
Network Performance and Planning Criteria Manual - NNPC (Peel).pdf
Nilsen Incidents 2022 to 2024.docx
Nilsen maintenance schedule 24-04.docx
NILSEN Maintenance schedule.docx
Note to GHD re asset performance.docx
Note to GHD re Bailing arms.docx
Peel - request to Elemental Board for initial funding .msg
Peel action register and internal audit plan - Copy - Copy.xlsx
Peel action register and internal audit plan .xlsx
Peel action register and internal audit plan 1.xlsx
Peel Business Park Lot 38 Cable Theft Repairs report.pdf
Peel Business Park Microgrid Project Deed - Eighth Amending Deed (250823 Signed).pdf
Peel Business park Nambeelup (IR & US).pdf
Peel capex opex forecast.msg
Peel capex opex forecast.xlsx
Peel financial models exist - GM email.docx
Peel Health Safety Management Plan.pdf
PEEL Micro Grid Project - Enterprise Risk Register - Copy.xlsm
PEEL Micro Grid Project - Enterprise Risk Register - Copy.xlsm
PEEL Micro Grid Project - Enterprise Risk Register - Copy1.xlsm
Peel model.xlsx
Peel Nambeelup Infrared Report.pdf
Peel Renewable Energy - NRC Incident Call Details (030823).pdf
Peel Streetlight Inspection 09-05-2022.pdf
Peel Streetlight Inspection Aug 2022 (v1.0).pdf

Peel Streetlight Inspection.pdf
PEEL-Drawing Register.xlsx
Permit System - Peel - Copy.docx
PO Lot38.msg
Power BI Cost Reporting - Peel GHD Audit Apr24 (003).PNG
PRE (Tas Gas) FSA Technical Risk Assessment - Copy.xlsx
pre 2024 Asset Management Plan (Electricity) PEEL.pdf
PRE Post Audit and Post Review Implementation Plans Response (081223).pdf
PRE Post Audit and Post Review Implementation Plans Response (240331)_Final.pdf
Priority Restoration Register 18 August 2023.pdf
Pronto and IT back-up.docx
Pronto back-up review period.msg
Re Epic documentation back up and access control.msg
RE Peel AMS Review - Post site visit.msg
Re Pronto and IT information for auditors.msg
RE Pronto back up during review period.msg
RE Pronto Xi Service Engineer Notification - Service Call# 1014338.msg
Requisition Step By Step Guide training evidence.msg
Revised Planned Outage Notice - Peel Renewable Energy Bells Engines 26072022.pdf
SAFT - Intensium High Energy (IHE) NMC Battery Insulation Test (120723).pdf
Sample Pronto back-up during review period.msg
Service and Technical Installation Rules.pdf
Training and Competency Matrix (Peel).docx
Training Competency Matrix (Peel).pdf
Variation from budget.msg
Work Management - Pronto Lvl 1 Maintainer v1.1a.docx
Work Management - Pronto Lvl 2 Supervisor v1.1a (1).docx
Zenith Energy Crisis Management Plan.pdf
Zenith Energy Document Control Archiving Procedure.pdf
Zenith Energy Enterprise Risk Management Plan.pdf
Zenith Energy Environmental Policy.pdf
Zenith Energy Management of Change Procedure.pdf
Zenith Energy Occupational Health and Safety Policy.pdf
Zenith Energy Quality Policy.pdf
Zenith Energy Workplace Health Safety Management Plan Corporate (2).pdf

