VORTEX GRID SYSTEMS INC.

Vendor Review Memorandum: Similar Supplier Names and Component Records

Document control	Value
Record ID	FR-006
Memorandum reference	VRM-2026-09
Issued by	Finance Controls and Procurement Assurance
Date	2026-06-09
Reviewer	Noor Patel, Director of Finance Controls
Status	Approved operating memorandum
Revision	1.1; section 6 added 2026-07-15 without amending sections 1 to 5

1. Purpose

This memorandum documents a review of supplier records in which short commercial names created a risk of conflating distinct counterparties. The review concerns Aurora Components LLC, vendor identifier SUP-441, and Aurora Circuit Works Ltd., vendor identifier SUP-778. The suppliers are separate legal entities with different contract files, payment instructions, tax records, and component catalogs. The similarity of their commercial names does not establish affiliation, common ownership, or interchangeable supply obligations.

Aurora Components LLC supplies sealed sensor housings used in field-environment installations. Aurora Circuit Works Ltd. supplies printed circuit assemblies used in gateway repair kits. Both suppliers may appear in operational discussions about a service interruption because both categories of components can be present at the same customer site. That overlap is not a basis for assigning a component defect, invoice, shipment, or technical finding to either supplier without the specific purchase and part references.

2. Review trigger and record observations

During a routine quarterly reconciliation, Finance Controls found two internal notes using the short name "Aurora" without a vendor identifier. One note referred to a late shipment of sensor housings; the other referred to a pricing discrepancy in a circuit assembly invoice. The notes were filed in separate operational folders but were included together in a management summary. The summary did not state which supplier was responsible for each item. No payment was issued incorrectly, and no customer communication named either supplier. The issue was nevertheless material because the summary could have implied that one supplier caused both events.

Procurement reviewed the purchase orders, receiving records, invoices, and service-kit references. The sensor-housing shipment was associated with SUP-441 and purchase order PO-60731. The circuit-assembly pricing discrepancy was associated with SUP-778 and purchase order PO-61108. The records show distinct legal names and products. The review found no source record establishing that the two companies were connected or that either event caused a customer service issue.

3. Findings and qualified conclusions

The review concludes that the two suppliers must be recorded separately in every procurement, finance, quality, incident, and customer-review record. The review does not conclude that either supplier provided defective goods. It does not conclude that the late shipment affected a particular maintenance event, nor that the invoice discrepancy affected product reliability. Those statements would require a separate technical or commercial finding with its own evidence and approver.

The review further concludes that the management summary’s use of "Aurora" was ambiguous. The summary remains a historical record of what was presented, but it is not adequate for a supplier-specific decision. Finance Controls will issue a dated clarification attached to the summary. The clarification will preserve the original wording, identify the two underlying records, and state that the short name referred to different suppliers in different passages. It will not rewrite the original summary or claim that the original wording named a single supplier.

4. Required control changes

Effective immediately, purchase orders, invoices, supplier scorecards, and vendor review memoranda must include the legal supplier name and vendor identifier in their heading or first tabular row. A short name may be included as an alias only after the legal identity. Templates used by engineering and field services must include the vendor identifier when a supplier is named as part of an incident observation, replacement part, or maintenance action. Customer Operations may use a generic phrase such as "supplier review is under way" during an unresolved investigation, but may not name a supplier as the cause of a condition unless the approved conclusion authorizes that wording.

Procurement will maintain the vendor-identity reference list and will alert Finance Controls when a newly onboarded supplier’s public name is likely to be confused with an existing supplier. Finance Controls will reconcile aliases in approved records without deleting original alias text. Engineering will maintain component part references in technical records. When a component reference is missing, the record owner must state the uncertainty rather than selecting a likely supplier by name similarity.

5. Relationship to incident and project records

This memorandum applies to sourcing and record identity. It does not amend the North Harbor incident review, the Meridian project charter, or any customer statement. If a future incident identifies a supplier observation, the incident coordinator must cite the relevant supplier ID, part reference, and source record. The coordinator may record competing technical opinions about a component, but a procurement note or invoice is not by itself proof of a technical cause.

The Meridian Evidence Exchange project will incorporate this memorandum’s heading and reference requirements into its supplier-identity guide. That project may report that the control is implemented or pending; it may not merge the two vendor records into a single supplier profile for convenience. Any future correction concerning a supplier must cite the exact prior record and state whether it changes identity, scope, payment, shipment, or technical conclusion.

6. A separate and unrelated supplier review (added 2026-07-15)

This section was added after the memorandum was approved. It changes no finding above and exists only to stop a second supplier matter being read into this one.

Readers of this memorandum have twice been directed to it while asking about Kestrel Meter Systems GmbH, vendor identifier SUP-903. That supplier is not within the scope of this review. SUP-903 supplies metering register modules and firmware support to a different customer estate, was procured under different purchase orders, and invoices in euro. Nothing in the Aurora review examined a Kestrel part, price, shipment, or firmware behavior, and nothing in it may be cited about one.

Finance Controls opened memorandum VRM-2026-14 to cover the Kestrel questions arising from a July metering export. That review is open at the date of this document. It has produced no finding, and the existence of an open supplier review is not itself an adverse finding about the supplier. Anyone who needs a position on SUP-903 must wait for VRM-2026-14 and cite it directly. Combining two supplier reviews because both concern suppliers would repeat exactly the error this memorandum exists to prevent.

7. Approval

The Director of Finance Controls approves this memorandum for use by Procurement, Finance Controls, Engineering, Field Services, and Customer Operations. The first control review is due 2026-09-30. Exceptions require written approval from both the Director of Finance Controls and the General Counsel, including a stated duration and the records affected.

Approved electronically by Noor Patel on 2026-06-09. Section 6 added and initialled by the same reviewer on 2026-07-15; the approval date of the memorandum itself is unchanged.