

5/14/2004

SUBJ: PRODUCTION APPROVAL AND CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

- 1. PURPOSE.** This change is issued to implement revisions to certificate management functions as recommended by the Manufacturing Inspection Management Team. This change also implements the use of FAA Order 8120.13, International Cooperative Supplier Surveillance Program Procedures, and revises information to harmonize with FAA Order 8100.7, Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program.
- 2. DISTRIBUTION.** This order is distributed to Washington Headquarters division levels of the Flight Standards Service; to the branch levels of the Aircraft Certification Service; to the branch levels in the regional Flight Standards Divisions and Aircraft Certification Directorates; to all Flight Standards District Offices; to all Aircraft Certification Offices, Aircraft Certification field offices, and all Manufacturing Inspection District and Satellite Offices; to the Aircraft Certification and Airworthiness Branches at the FAA Academy; to the Suspected Unapproved Parts Program Office; to the Brussels Aircraft Certification Staff; and to the Flight Standards Service Regulatory Support Division.
- 3. DISPOSITION OF TRANSMITTAL.** After filing the attached pages, retain this transmittal.
- 4. PAGE CONTROL CHART.** See the attached page control chart.

PAGE CONTROL CHART

Remove Pages	Dated	Insert Pages	Dated
v	4/5/02	v	4/5/02
vi thru viii	4/5/02	vi thru viii	5/14/2004
1	4/19/02	1	5/14/2004
2	4/5/02	2	4/5/02
3	4/5/02	3	5/14/2004
4	4/5/02	4	4/5/02
21	4/5/02	21	5/14/2004
22	4/5/02	22	4/5/02
49	4/5/02	49	5/14/2004
50 and 51	4/5/02	50 and 51	4/5/02
52 thru 57	4/5/02	52 thru 57	5/14/2004
58	4/5/02	58	4/5/02
61 and 62	4/5/02	61 and 62	5/14/2004
65 thru 71	4/5/02	65 thru 71	5/14/2004
72	4/5/02	72	4/5/02
77	4/5/02	77	5/14/2004
78	4/5/02	78	4/5/02
83	4/5/02	83	4/5/02
84	4/5/02	84	5/14/2004
APPENDIX 7		APPENDIX 7	
1	4/5/02	1	5/14/2004
2	4/5/02	2	4/5/02
5 (and 6)	4/5/02	5 (and 6)	5/14/2004
APPENDIX 8		APPENDIX 8	
1 thru 4	4/5/02	1 thru 4	5/14/2004

/S/

Frank P. Paskiewicz
 Manager, Production and
 Airworthiness Division, AIR-200

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
SECTION 4. TECHNICAL STANDARD ORDER AUTHORIZATION (PART 21, SUBPART O)	
PART 1. GENERAL	
56. Applicability.	35
57. Privileges.	35
58. Advising the Applicant.	35
PART 2. PROCESSING AN APPLICATION FOR A TSO AUTHORIZATION	
59. Application.	38
60. Design Approval.	38
61. Preliminary DO Audit.	38
PART 3. ISSUANCE OF A TSO AUTHORIZATION OR LETTER OF TSO DESIGN APPROVAL	
62. TSO Letter of Authorization.	39
63. Letter of TSO Design Approval.	39
64.-67. Reserved.	39
SECTION 5. PARTS MANUFACTURER APPROVAL (SPECIAL GUIDANCE)	
68. General.	40
69. Marking Detail Parts of PMA Assemblies.	40
70. Identification Marking of Replacement and Modification Parts Produced Pursuant to the Enhanced Enforcement Program (EEP) as Published in Federal Register Notice, February 27, 1995.	40
71.-75. Reserved.	40
SECTION 6. MANUFACTURER'S MAINTENANCE FACILITY (PART 145, SUBPARTS A AND D)	
PART 1. GENERAL	
76. Applicability.	41
77. Privileges.	41
78. Advising the Applicant.	41
PART 2. PROCESSING AN APPLICATION FOR AN MMF	
79. Application.	41
80. Repairmen Certification.	42

Paragraph *Page*

PART 3. ISSUANCE OF THE MMF CERTIFICATE

81. Air Agency Certificate. 42
 Figure 9. Sample FAA Form 8000-4, Air Agency Certificate. 43
 82.-84. Reserved. 44

SECTION 7. EXTENSION OF A PRODUCTION APPROVAL WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

PART 1. GENERAL

85. Applicability. 45
 86. Privileges. 45
 87. Advising the Original PAH and the Associate Facility. 45

PART 2. PROCESSING A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF A PRODUCTION APPROVAL

88. Request for Extension of a Production Approval. 46
 89. Evaluating the Request. 46
 90. Coordination With the Geographic MIDO or CMO. 46

PART 3. APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF A PRODUCTION APPROVAL

91. Approval of the Request. 47
 92. Geographic MIDO Responsibility After Approval of the Request for Extension. .. 47
 93.-95. Reserved. 47
 Figure 10. Certificate Management Life Cycle Process. 48

CHAPTER 3. CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

96. General. 49
 97. Domestic Hand-Off Procedures. 50
 98. Assignment of CM Coordinator. 51
 * 99. Status of a PAH. 52
 100.-102. Reserved. 52

SECTION 2. ONGOING CM RESPONSIBILITIES

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

103. General. 53
 Figure 11. Certificate Management Responsibilities (Ongoing) – Minimum Requirements. 53

*

*

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
104. Certificate Management Plan.	54
105. Coordination of Audit Activities With Other CAA's.	54
106. Recording Noncompliances.	55
107. Reserved.	55

PART 2. RESOURCE TARGETING

108. Resource Targeting Model.	55
109. Scope.	55
110. Resource Targeting Groups.	55
111. Resource Targeting Categories.	56
112. Resource Targeting Assessment of Facilities.	56
113. Collection of Facility Assessment Data.	57
114. Identification of Resource Targeting Groups.	57
115. Modification of Resource Targeting Groups.	58
116. Disposition of Automated Files.	58
117. Resource Targeting Model Validation Plan.	59
118. Modification of the Resource Targeting Model.	59
119.-122. Reserved.	59

PART 3. DETERMINING SUPPLIER CONTROL BY A PAH OR ASSOCIATE FACILITY

123. General.	59
124. Certificate Management Activity.	60
125. Determination of Supplier Control.	61
126.-128. Reserved.	61

PART 4. PRINCIPAL INSPECTOR EVALUATION

129. General.	61
130. Recording a PI Evaluation.	63
131.-134. Reserved.	63

PART 5. AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS EVALUATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

135. General.	63
136.-138. Reserved.	64

PART 6. SUPPLIER CONTROL AUDIT

139. General.	64
140. Supplier Selection.	65
141. Directorate Supplier Control Audit List.	66
142. Coordination of Supplier Control Audits Between Directorates.	67

*

*

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>	
* 143. Notifying a PAH or Associate Facility.	67	
144. Recording a Supplier Control Audit.	67	
145.-147. Reserved.	67	
Figure 12. Sample Supplier Control Audit Notification Letter.	68	*
 PART 7. PRODUCT AUDIT		
148. General.	69	
149. Selection of Product Audit Characteristics.	70	
150. Product Audit Areas.	70	
151. Product Audit Criteria.	70	
152. Recording Product Audit Results.	71	
153. Recording a Product Audit.	71	
Figure 13. Applicability of Product Audit Criteria to Product Audit Areas (Minimum).	71	
154.-156. Reserved.	71	
 SECTION 3. RANDOM CM RESPONSIBILITIES		
 PART 1. INTRODUCTION		
157. General.	72	
158.-159. Reserved.	72	
 PART 2. EVALUATION OF CHANGES TO A PAH'S OR ASSOCIATE FACILITY'S QC OR INSPECTION SYSTEM		
160. General.	72	
161. Prioritization of Review.	72	
162. Review of Changes.	72	
163. Post-Review Actions.	72	
164.-167. Reserved.	73	
Figure 14. Sample Letter of Approval for Quality Control System Changes by a PC or TSO Authorization Holder.	74	
Figure 15. Sample Letter of Acknowledgement for Inspection System Changes by an APIS or PMA Holder.	75	*
 PART 3. INVESTIGATION OF SERVICE DIFFICULTIES		
168. General.	73	
169. Investigation.	76	
170. Corrective Action.	76	
171. Reporting a Service Difficulty Investigation.	76	
172. Foreign Manufacturers.	77	
173.-175. Reserved.	77	

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1. PURPOSE. This order contains guidance related to production approvals and certificate management (CM) of manufacturers of type-certificated products, technical standard order articles, and replacement and modification parts, including Manufacturer's Maintenance Facilities established therein, to ensure fair and uniform administration of the pertinent Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), part 21, Certification Procedures for Products and Parts (part 21).

2. DISTRIBUTION. This order is distributed to Washington Headquarters division levels of the Flight Standards Service; to the branch levels of the Aircraft Certification Service; to the branch levels in the regional Flight Standards Divisions and Aircraft Certification Directorates; to all Flight Standards District Offices; to all Aircraft Certification Offices, Aircraft Certification field offices, and all Manufacturing Inspection District and Satellite Offices; to the Aircraft Certification and Airworthiness Branches at the FAA Academy; to the Suspected Unapproved Parts Program Office; to the Brussels * Aircraft Certification Staff; and to the Flight Standards Service Regulatory Support Division. *

3. CANCELLATION. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 8120.2B, Production Approval and Surveillance Procedures, dated January 31 2001, is canceled effective October 1, 2002.

4. EFFECTIVE DATE. Chapter 3, section 1, chapter 3, section 2, part 1 and parts 3 through 7, and chapter 3, section 3 are effective on October 1, 2002. All other provisions are effective as of the date of this directive. FAA managing offices will use the results of resource targeting described in chapter 3, section 2, part 2 to schedule the ongoing CM responsibilities described in chapter 3 of this order.

5. EXPLANATION OF MAJOR CHANGES. The following list identifies the significant changes contained in this revision:

- a. The procedures for CM and production approval have been divided into separate chapters.
- b. Several definitions have been added, revised, or deleted to reflect revised CM procedures.
- c. Ongoing and random CM have been more clearly defined.
- d. Resource targeting has been adopted as a CM tool, and will no longer be limited to Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program (ACSEP) evaluation scheduling.
- e. A Category Parts List has been developed for use in performing resource targeting.
- f. The requirements that an initial ACSEP evaluation must have been performed and that the principal inspector (PI) must have performed on-site CM at the facility in the last 12 months prior to conducting a resource targeting assessment have been deleted.
- g. Resource targeting assessment of a new facility may now be based on information gathered during the district office audit.

h. The terms "finding" and "observation" have been replaced by the term "noncompliance." In addition, the process for identifying a noncompliance has been simplified.

i. FAA Form 8100-6, formerly known as Record of Findings/Observations, and FAA Form 8120-14, formerly known as Surveillance Activity Report, have been revised. In addition, the Production Subsystem Control File (referred to as FAA Form 8120-2) and the Production Certification Project Status Report (referred to as FAA Form 8120-6) have been removed from the FAA forms inventory since the relevant information is stored in the Manufacturing Inspection Management Information System (MIMIS).

j. The procedures for production approval have been gathered into one chapter and have been organized with common headings for easier reference. While the location of text may have changed, the associated production approval policy has not changed from the previous revision, except for minor editorial changes.

6. ACRONYMS. Acronyms used in this order are as follows:

AC	Advisory Circular
ACSEP	Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program
ACO	Aircraft Certification Office
APIS	Approved Production Inspection System
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CPL	Category Parts List
CM	Certificate Management
CMO	Certificate Management Office
CMU	Certificate Management Unit
DO	District Office
DOA	Delegation Option Authorization
DMIR	Designated Manufacturing Inspection Representative
EEP	Enhanced Enforcement Program
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FIS	Fabrication Inspection System

FSDO	Flight Standards District Office	
* ICSSP	International Cooperative Supplier Surveillance Program	*
MIDO	Manufacturing Inspection District Office	
MIO	Manufacturing Inspection Office	
MISO	Manufacturing Inspection Satellite Office	
MMF	Manufacturer's Maintenance Facility	
MRB	Material Review Board	
NDT	Nondestructive Testing	
OAC	Original Airworthiness Certification	
ODAR	Organizational Designated Airworthiness Representative	
PAH	Production Approval Holder	
PC	Production Certificate	
PCB	Production Certification Board	
PI	Principal Inspector	
PLR	Production Limitation Record	
PMA	Parts Manufacturer Approval	
QC	Quality Control	
RTA	Resource Targeting Administrator	
SDR	Service Difficulty Report	
STC	Supplemental Type Certificate	
TC	Type Certificate	
TSO	Technical Standard Order	

7. DEFINITIONS. For the purpose of this order, the following definitions apply:

a. Article. Materials, parts, and/or appliances produced under the provision of a Technical Standard Order (TSO) authorization. All references in this order to "parts thereof" include TSO articles, as applicable. An article as specified in § 21.143(a) (which includes any material, part, subassembly,

assembly, system, or appliance that is used in the type-certificated product) is referred to herein as a "part thereof."

b. Associate Facility. This is a facility that has been approved as an extension to an original production approval holder (PAH). This facility is owned and operated by the same corporate management as the original PAH that controls the design and quality of the product or part(s) thereof, except for companies participating in joint-production and/or co-production business agreements. The associate facility must be listed as a manufacturing facility on the production certificate (PC) or the letter of authorization for other production approvals, e.g., Parts Manufacturer Approval (PMA) or TSO authorization (reference chapter 2, section 7 of this order).

c. Audit. A systematic and independent examination to determine compliance of an established supplier system, inspected product or part(s) thereof, or processes with purchase order requirements, technical data, or specifications.

d. Category 1 Product or Part(s) Thereof. A product or part(s) thereof whose failure could prevent continued safe flight and landing; resulting consequences could reduce safety margins, degrade performance, or cause loss of capability to conduct certain flight operations.

e. Category 2 Product or Part(s) Thereof. A product or part(s) thereof whose failure would not prevent continued safe flight and landing; resulting consequences may reduce the capability of the aircraft or the ability of the crew to cope with adverse operating conditions or subsequent failures.

f. Category 3 Product or Part(s) Thereof. A product or part(s) thereof whose failure would have no effect on continued safe flight and landing of the aircraft.

g. Certificate. A document (i.e., a certificate or approval) issued by the FAA that recognizes an applicant's or PAH's established quality control or inspection system and allows for the production of products or parts thereof in accordance with an FAA-approved design.

h. Certificate Management. The method by which the FAA ensures that a PAH remains in compliance with those pertinent regulations that govern the manufacturing of its particular products or parts thereof.

i. Corrective Action. The measures taken to resolve unsatisfactory conditions and to prevent reoccurrence.

j. Days. A reference to calendar days, unless otherwise specified.

k. Distributor. A broker, dealer, reseller, or other person or agency engaged in the sale of parts for installation in type certificated aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and in appliances.

l. District Office. The Manufacturing Inspection District Office (MIDO), and where applicable, the Manufacturing Inspection Satellite Office (MISO), Certificate Management Office (CMO), or Certificate Management Unit (CMU), having CM responsibility for a defined geographic area.

SECTION 3. PRODUCTION CERTIFICATE (PART 21, SUBPART G)

PART 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

41. APPLICABILITY.

a. Part 21, subpart G, is applicable to any of the following persons who desire to manufacture a complete product and part(s) thereof with benefit of a PC:

(1) The holder/licensee of a § 21.21 TC.

(2) The U.S. holder/licensee of a § 21.29 TC, so long as the licensing agreement clearly provides for the TC holder's and its Civil Aviation Authority's control over any design changes by the licensee. A working arrangement must also be in place between the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and the FAA defining their respective responsibilities as State of Design and State of Manufacture.

(3) The holder of an STC when the PC is used to incorporate the particular STC on completed aircraft prior to the issuance of an original airworthiness certificate (OAC). STC's incorporated after OAC are accomplished under the provisions of 14 CFR part 43, Maintenance, Preventive Maintenance, Rebuilding, and Alteration (part 43). Also, STC holders who only desire to produce the modification parts/kit should be encouraged to apply for PMA.

(4) The holder/licensee of a § 21.25 TC, when the TC issuance was predicated on submittal (by the TC applicant) and the FAA approval of the type design data required by § 21.31.

b. A PC may not be issued to the holder of a TC issued under § 21.27, or part 21, subpart C (provisional).

c. A PC may not be issued if the manufacturing facilities are located outside the United States, unless it has been determined, in accordance with § 21.137, that such location(s) would place no undue burden on the FAA.

42. PRIVILEGES. A PC holder has the privileges specified in § 21.163. In addition, a PC holder is eligible to have a qualified employee(s) designated as a DMIR in accordance with the provisions of part 183. The PC holder may also be authorized by part 183 to represent the Administrator as an ODAR. Order 8100.8 contains procedures for the administration of DMIR's and ODAR's.

43. ADVISING THE APPLICANT. The applicant should be advised that:

a. AC 21-1, Production Certificates, sets forth an acceptable means of complying with part 21, subpart G. Alternative methods and procedures may be approved when the applicant can show that the proposed methods and procedures will achieve compliance with part 21, subpart G.

b. The data required to be submitted under § 21.143 should be arranged in the format suggested in AC 21-1. In those instances where an applicant has already established quality control (QC) procedures, e.g., for military contracts, the applicant must identify those portions that comprise the QC data that will be used to show compliance with § 21.143. The data may or may not comprise a lengthy document,

depending upon the size of the manufacturing facilities and product complexity. The data must include descriptive material that adequately covers each applicable paragraph of § 21.143. A title must be provided for positive identification and a revision page or similar control is required to ensure that the original approval date and the date of each revision is recorded. A number or letter must identify each revision.

c. The PC holder who produces a completed product under part 21, subpart G, must flight test and/or production test that product in accordance with the requirements of § 21.143(a)(3).

(1) Aircraft. All aircraft must pass an approved production flight test as part of the inspection procedure required for issuance of an airworthiness certificate. A Special Airworthiness Certificate, FAA Form 8130-7, issued for such purposes provides authorization for production flight testing (reference FAA Order 8130.2, Airworthiness Certification of Aircraft and Related Approvals). The exceptions would be small airplanes and gliders manufactured under a PC and being exported without assembly or flight test under the provisions of § 21.325(b). The intent of this rule is to permit shipment of aircraft without assembly or flight test when the extent of disassembly is the same as an aircraft that has been disassembled for shipment purposes. In these instances, the manufacturer must provide FAA-approved assembly and flight test procedures as a condition of shipment.

(2) Periodic FAA Production Flight Tests. FAA production flight tests will be conducted periodically at the PC holder's facility to ensure continued compliance with all parameters as specified in pertinent type certificate data with respect to performance, flight characteristics, operation qualities, equipment operations, etc. The PI in coordination with the flight test elements may arrange these flight tests. In addition, a determination should be made in coordination with flight test elements that the manufacturer's approved production test pilots are continuing to use approved procedures and that the approved procedures remain adequate.

(3) Engines and Propellers. Engines and propellers must pass a production test approved as part of the QC data required by § 21.143(a)(3).

d. PC HOLDER'S RESPONSIBILITY.

(1) The PC holder is responsible for maintaining the QC system in conformity with the data and procedures approved for the PC, and for determining that each completed product submitted for airworthiness certification or approval conforms to the TC and is in a condition for safe operation.

(2) Section 21.147 requires the holder of a PC to immediately notify the MIDO or CMO in writing of any changes that may affect the inspection, conformity, or airworthiness of the product. These changes would include:

(a) Relocation of a portion of its facility or addition to existing facilities.

I A PC holder's manufacturing complex would normally consist of a principal facility and all associate facilities using the same quality control system approved by the FAA, for the particular type certificated product(s). Associate facilities are discussed in section 7 of this chapter.

CHAPTER 3. CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

96. GENERAL. This chapter provides guidance on the method by which manufacturing inspection ensures that PAH's and associate facilities remain in compliance with those pertinent regulations that govern the manufacturing of their particular products or parts thereof, as required by 49 USC § 44713. This method is known as certificate management. Certificate management responsibilities for a PAH or an associate facility will be accomplished by the MIDO or CMU having responsibility of the geographic area in which the PAH or associate facility is located. Certificate management is comprised of the following two functional responsibilities, each of which is further detailed in sections 2 and 3 of this chapter. Figure 10 of this chapter depicts the CM life cycle process.

* **a. ONGOING CM RESPONSIBILITIES.** The MIDO, MISO, or CMU responsible for a specific PAH or associate facility within its geographical boundaries accomplishes the following tasks on a continuing basis. Any tasks required to be scheduled and conducted at a supplier facility located in another U.S. geographical area should be handled in accordance with paragraph 97 below. For tasks required to be scheduled and conducted outside the United States, refer also to paragraph 105 of this chapter. *

(1) Schedule and conduct resource targeting assessment of PAH's and associate facilities to identify any increased potential for producing nonconforming products or parts thereof.

(2) Schedule and conduct PI and ACSEP evaluations at PAH's and associate facilities based on resource targeting assessments.

(3) Schedule and conduct supplier control audits to determine that PAH's and associate facilities are satisfactorily controlling their suppliers.

(4) Schedule and conduct product audits on production products or part(s) thereof.

b. RANDOM CM RESPONSIBILITIES. The following tasks are accomplished on an as-required basis by the MIDO, MISO, or CMU responsible for a specific PAH or associate facility within its geographical boundaries. Any tasks required to be scheduled and conducted at a PAH or supplier facility located in another geographical area should be handled in accordance with paragraph 97 below.

(1) Evaluate changes to a PAH's or associate facility's quality control or inspection system that may affect the inspection, conformity, or airworthiness of the product or part(s) thereof.

(2) Investigate service difficulties that involve quality control or inspection problems.

(3) Investigate regulatory violations.

(4) Ensure that appropriate corrective actions have been proposed and taken for all noncompliances identified at a PAH or associate facility.

(5) Determine the need for unscheduled PI or ACSEP evaluations, supplier control audits, product audits, and any investigation activity necessary to ensure continued compliance with all

applicable CFR; e.g., Suspected Unapproved Parts. Make arrangements for such evaluations, audits, or investigations.

- (6) Provide guidance and assistance to the PAH and associate facility as necessary.

97. DOMESTIC HAND-OFF PROCEDURES. After receipt of the finalized Directorate Supplier Control Audit List referenced in paragraphs 141-142 of this order, the following hand-off procedures shall be used for suppliers located in the United States:

a. The MIDO or CMO shall forward a memorandum to the MIDO or CMU having geographic responsibility of the area in which the supplier is located. The memorandum shall indicate the type of audit that should be conducted, i.e., supplier control audit or product audit, and will include all pertinent information regarding the audit including, when appropriate:

- (1) The name and address of the supplier and the responsible PAH, including the PAH's project number.

- (2) The name, title, and telephone number of the person to contact at the supplier and PAH facilities who can furnish purchase order(s), QC or FIS data, technical data, and other pertinent information.

- (3) A copy of the PAH's, or supplier's, QC or FIS procedures that are required to be implemented at the particular supplier's facility, unless these documents are available to the FAA at the supplier's facility.

- (4) Any delegation of MRB and/or technical data change control authority.

- (5) Any authority permitting direct shipment to the end user.

- (6) Any other information regarding specific supplier activities that should be evaluated, such as a new process or new technology.

- (7) Information pertinent to a product or part(s) thereof to be audited, such as part number, next level of assembly, or service difficulty or warranty return history.

b. When a geographic MIDO or CMO receives a request for a supplier control audit or product audit located within its geographic boundaries, it shall:

- (1) Advise the requesting MIDO or CMO of receipt of the request within 30 days.

- (2) Add the audit to the CM plan. Notify the responsible PAH or associate facility in accordance with paragraph 143 of this order.

- (3) Submit a memorandum to each requesting MIDO or CMO upon completion of the supplier control audit or product audit. This memorandum should summarize the results of the audit, and include all applicable Form(s) 8100-6, 8100-1, and 8120-14, or printed copies of electronic equivalents. The requesting MIDO or CMO will consider its hand-off request complete upon receipt of this memorandum.

c. CORRECTIVE ACTION VALIDATION. Occasionally, it may be necessary to validate corrective actions at a supplier facility or satellite MMF located outside of the geographical boundary of the responsible CM office. When a hand-off to the geographic MIDO or CMU is appropriate for this purpose, the following hand-off procedures shall be used:

(1) The MIDO or CMO shall forward a memorandum to the MIDO or CMU having geographic responsibility of the area in which the supplier or satellite MMF is located. The memorandum shall identify whether the corrective action to be validated is a short-term or long-term action, and shall include all pertinent information regarding the corrective action to be validated. The memorandum shall also specify a date for responding to the corrective action validation request. The memorandum should include, when appropriate:

(a) The name and address of the supplier or satellite MMF and the responsible PAH, including the PAH's project number.

(b) The name, title, and telephone number of the person to contact at the supplier or satellite MMF and PAH facilities who can furnish purchase order(s), QC or FIS data, technical data, or other pertinent information.

(c) A copy of the PAH's, supplier's, or satellite MMF's QC or FIS procedures that are required to be implemented at the particular supplier's facility or satellite MMF, unless these documents are available to the FAA at the supplier's facility or satellite MMF.

(d) A copy of the noncompliance.

(e) A copy of the PAH's corrective action response.

(f) A copy of the supplier or satellite MMF's corrective action response to the PAH.

(2) When a geographic MIDO or CMU receives a request for a corrective action validation at a facility located within its geographic boundaries, it shall:

(a) Advise the requesting MIDO or CMO of receipt of the request within 30 days.

(b) Submit a memorandum to the requesting MIDO or CMO upon completion of the corrective action validation. This memorandum should summarize the results of the validation, and include all applicable Form(s) 8100-6 or 8100-1, or printed copies of electronic equivalents. The requesting MIDO or CMO will consider its hand-off request complete upon receipt of this memorandum.

98. ASSIGNMENT OF CM COORDINATOR. Many of the tasks identified in this chapter for MIO, MIDO, or CMO managers are primarily administrative. A high degree of operational efficiency may be achieved by assigning many of these tasks to a designated CM coordinator. Directorate managers should consider whether such an assignment would be beneficial for their organizations. The types of tasks that a CM coordinator could coordinate are as follows:

a. ACSEP candidate and evaluator appointment and training (refer to Order 8100.7).

b. Audit/evaluation scheduling and ACSEP team selection; obtaining additional resources when required (refer to Order 8100.7 and chapter 3, section 2 of this order).

c. Supplier control audit list (refer to chapter 3, section 2 of this order).

d. Continuous improvement program (refer to chapter 1 of this order).

e. Dissemination of general CM-related information.

f. Consolidation of resource targeting results.

* **99. STATUS OF A PAH.** For purposes of CM, the status of a PAH and its applicable project(s) can be identified as one of the following:

a. Pending. The FAA has received the production approval application and is in the process of evaluating it, but has not yet issued the production approval.

b. Active. The FAA has issued the production approval and the PAH has produced and/or shipped products or parts within the past 12 months.

c. Inactive. The FAA has determined that the PAH has not produced or shipped products or parts within the past 12 months.

d. Canceled. The FAA has completed action to revoke or otherwise terminate the PAH's production approval.

100.-102. RESERVED.

*

SECTION 2. ONGOING CM RESPONSIBILITIES

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

103. GENERAL. Parts 2 through 6 of this section provide detailed guidance for accomplishing ongoing CM responsibilities. Figure 11 of this order provides a graphic summary of the tasks associated with ongoing CM. These tasks are accomplished on a continuing basis, and are minimum requirements only. Tasks beyond the specified frequency may be performed at the discretion of the managing office when required to ensure continued operational safety.

**FIGURE 11. CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES (ONGOING)
Minimum Requirements**

ONGOING CM RESPONSIBILITY	GROUP I FACILITY			GROUP II FACILITY		
	CAT 1	CAT 2	CAT 3	CAT 1	CAT 2	CAT 3
Resource Targeting Assessment	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations
PI Evaluations	1 every 3 months (See Note 1)	1 every 3 months (See Note 1)	1 every 12 months (See Note 2)	1 every 6 months (See Note 1)	1 every 6 months (See Note 1)	1 every 12 months (See Note 2)
Supplier Control Audit	4 suppliers annually	2 suppliers annually		2 suppliers annually	2 suppliers annually	
Product Audits	2 every 12 months in conjunction w/PI evaluations; also during ACSEP evaluations	1 every 12 months in conjunction w/PI evaluations; also during ACSEP evaluations		1 every 12 months in conjunction w/PI evaluations; also during ACSEP evaluations	During ACSEP evaluations only	
ACSEP Evaluations	18-24 months	24-36 months		24-36 months	32-48 months	
ONGOING CM RESPONSIBILITY	GROUP III FACILITY			GROUP IV FACILITY		
	CAT 1	CAT 2	CAT 3	CAT 3		
Resource Targeting Assessment	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations	During PI evaluations; by telephone in outyears	During PI evaluations; by telephone in outyears		
PI Evaluations	1 every 12 months (See Notes 1 & 2)	1 every 12 months (See Notes 1 & 2)	1 every 24 months (See Notes 2 & 3)	1 every 36 months (See Notes 2 & 3)		
Supplier Control Audit						
Product Audits	During ACSEP evaluations only	During ACSEP evaluations only				
ACSEP Evaluations	32-48 months	42-60 months				

General Note: Functions associated with shaded blocks are optional based on justified need (e.g. evaluation results, history, investigation, or service difficulties).

* **Note 1:** Evaluation of all system elements applicable at the specific facility will be completed in the interval between ACSEP evaluations.

Note 2: Evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report, and the MMF system element when applicable.

Note 3: One-half of all Group III Category 3 facilities will be evaluated annually. One-third of all Group IV facilities will be evaluated annually.

104. CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT PLAN. A CM plan assists the PI in planning and tracking the performance of ongoing CM responsibilities. Each MIDO or CMU may prepare a CM plan annually for each PAH and associate facility after resource targeting has been completed, within a timeframe established by the MIO. The MIDO or CMU may subsequently amend the CM plan as necessary to include additional or reduced requirements and schedule changes. As a minimum, the CM plan should include the following:

a. Name of PAH or associate facility.

b. Current resource targeting group and category.

c. Schedules for PI evaluations, ACSEP evaluations, product audits, and supplier control audits to be conducted within the geographic boundaries of the MIDO or CMU. For supplier control audits, and product audits at suppliers, include the names of the suppliers.

d. List of hand-offs or CAA requests sent, including, as a minimum, the name of the geographic MIDO or CMO that has accepted the hand-off or the CAA that has accepted the request, the type of audit requested, the name of the facility receiving the audit, and the name of the responsible PAH or associate facility.

e. List of hand-offs or CAA requests received, including, as a minimum, the name of the geographic MIDO/CMO or CAA that has requested the hand-off, the type of audit or surveillance requested, and the name of the applicable facility.

* **105. COORDINATION OF AUDIT ACTIVITIES WITH OTHER CAA'S.** AIR-200 has developed management plans with certain CAA's that permit those CAA's to conduct audit activity on the FAA's behalf, in accordance with FAA Order 8120.13, International Cooperative Supplier Surveillance Program Procedures. Contact AIR-200 for a list of the current International Cooperative Supplier Surveillance Program (ICSSP) participants. Audit activity conducted outside the United States will be handled in accordance with Order 8120.13 when the local authority is a program participant. However, if the FAA must conduct the supplier control audits or product audits in a country that is not an ICSSP participant, the PI will perform the following activities: *

a. Notify the responsible CAA and invite CAA participation as an observer. Prepare a formal letter signed by the directorate manager, or delegated signatory. The letter should be addressed to the Production contact for the CAA. A list of CAA's and respective contacts is available from the

* International Policy Office, AIR-40. Send an electronic facsimile (FAX) of the letter 75 days prior to the audit, followed by the formal letter. Notify the CAA of any changes in the audit's schedule. The CAA's participation in the audit is not mandatory, and the choice to provide an observer is at its discretion. The letter should include the following information, as a minimum: *

(1) Identity of the facility to be audited.

(2) Type of audit to be conducted (supplier control audit, product audit, or both). Provide a general outline of what will be included in the audit.

(3) Date(s) of the audit.

(4) Number of FAA auditors participating in the audit.

* (5) Name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address of responsible PI. *

b. Provide the managing office with details of any finding or observation (noncompliance) encountered during the audit. For example, if there is a trend showing recurring test failures or nonconforming articles, it may be evidence of a system breakdown or a compliance problem at that facility. The managing office will determine if there are any system issues or major problems that should be forwarded to the applicable CAA for its consideration.

106. RECORDING NONCOMPLIANCES. Record all noncompliances on Form 8100-6, or electronic equivalent, in accordance with the guidelines listed in appendix 7 of this order. The FAA will notify a PAH of noncompliances found at its supplier. For all other circumstances, the FAA will not reveal noncompliances to a manufacturer other than the particular manufacturer involved unless a formal request has been processed in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act. Reference Order 1200.23.

107. RESERVED.

PART 2. RESOURCE TARGETING

108. RESOURCE TARGETING MODEL. In the interest of safety and effective resource allocation, a resource targeting model has been developed to identify critical impact indicators that serve to categorize facilities according to their potential for producing nonconforming products or parts thereof. The FAA will assess annually each facility subject to resource targeting based on the critical impact indicators. As a result, the resource targeting model places each facility into one of four resource targeting groups according to the potential for producing nonconforming products or parts thereof. Each directorate will use the resource targeting model and its application procedures to provide a rational and justifiable basis for effective deployment of FAA resources for ongoing CM responsibilities.

* **109. SCOPE.** Holders of an APIS, PC, PMA, and/or TSO authorization and their associate facilities are subject to resource targeting assessment. Suppliers, delegated facilities, satellite MMF's, holders of a letter of TSO design approval, and PAH's in an inactive status are not subject to resource targeting. *

110. RESOURCE TARGETING GROUPS. Resource targeting assessment of each applicable facility is based on 21 indicators that demonstrate a facility's potential for producing nonconforming products or parts thereof. See appendix 3 of this order. The assessment is also based on the category of the products or parts thereof produced. See paragraph 111 below. Resource targeting assessment results in placing a facility into one of the following resource targeting groups:

- a. **Group I:** Facilities with greatest potential to produce nonconforming products or parts thereof.
- b. **Group II:** Facilities with moderate potential to produce nonconforming products or parts thereof.
- c. **Group III:** Facilities with low potential to produce nonconforming products or parts thereof.
- d. **Group IV:** Facilities with little or no potential to produce nonconforming products or parts thereof.

111. RESOURCE TARGETING CATEGORIES. Resource targeting categories are identified as category 1, category 2, and category 3, with category 1 being the highest and category 3 being the lowest. The overall category of a facility is based on the highest category product or part(s) thereof produced by the facility. Each of the categories is defined as follows:

a. Category 1: Failure could prevent continued safe flight and landing; resulting consequences could reduce safety margins, degrade performance, or cause loss of capability to conduct certain flight operations.

b. Category 2: Failure would not prevent continued safe flight and landing; resulting consequences may reduce the capability of the aircraft or the ability of the crew to cope with adverse operating conditions or subsequent failures.

c. Category 3: Failure would have no effect on continued safe flight and landing of the aircraft.

112. RESOURCE TARGETING ASSESSMENT OF FACILITIES. The FAA shall assess facilities annually. Document facility assessment on FAA Form 8100-9, Resource Targeting Facility Assessment Sheet; or electronic equivalent; refer to appendix 2.

a. Assessment of facilities and completion of Form 8100-9 shall be completed annually no later than April 30. All MIO managers should allow enough time prior to this date for uploading the automated files described in paragraphs 113 and 114 below, and for printing and distributing the reports described in appendix 5 of this order and paragraph 114 below.

b. The validity of the information entered on Form 8100-9 is dependent upon the PI's knowledge of the status of each facility being assessed. To this end, the PI should collect the information required to complete Form 8100-9 at any time the PI is in the facility, or by telephone for Group III Category 3 and Group IV facilities in those years when PI evaluations are not scheduled. For a new facility, information obtained during the DO audit should be utilized.

c. The PI will use the Category Parts List (CPL) described in appendix 4 of this order to determine the category of products or parts thereof produced at each facility and to determine the overall category of each facility.

* **d.** When appropriate, the PI should contact each facility in order to obtain current or clarifying information relevant to the resource targeting company/facility indicators being assessed. The PI should contact each facility previously designated as inactive to determine whether the facility's status has changed.

*

e. The PI will complete Form 8100-9 in accordance with appendix 2, paragraph 2.

f. Upon completion of the requirements of appendix 2, paragraph 2, for all assigned facilities, the PI will discuss each completed form with the MIDO or CMO manager. For this purpose, the PI may print a copy of each Form 8100-9 or use an electronic copy. To the greatest extent possible, the PI and MIDO or CMO manager should agree on the final assessment ratings for each indicator and unit criticality. At the conclusion of the discussion, the PI will incorporate any changes in the automated file. The PI will then print each Form 8100-9, and sign and date each form. The PI will provide the signed forms to the MIDO or CMO manager, who will also sign and date the forms. The MIDO or CMO manager will return the signed Form(s) 8100-9 to the PI. The PI should file the signed forms in a single folder until the forms are finalized in accordance with paragraph 114b below.

113. COLLECTION OF FACILITY ASSESSMENT DATA. Each MIDO or CMO manager should designate an individual to collect and collate the completed automated assessment files and transmit them to the MIO. For the purpose of this order, the MIDO or CMO designated individuals will hereinafter be referred to as a MIDO or CMO resource targeting administrator (RTA).

a. Upon receipt of all applicable signed Form(s) 8100-9, the PI will:

(1) If the automated files are located on an individual PI's workstation, provide a copy of the respective automated files to the MIDO or CMO RTA; or

(2) If the automated files are located on the MIDO or CMO RTA workstation, notify the MIDO or CMU RTA that Form(s) 8100-9 have been signed.

b. When it has received and compiled all automated files, the MIDO or CMO RTA will combine the automated files into a single automated file. If a single automated file was initially established, the MIDO or CMO RTA will ensure that all the supporting Form(s) 8100-9 have been signed. The MIDO or CMO RTA will then transmit the single automated file electronically to the directorate MIO and to AIR-200.

NOTE: The automated files transmitted by the MIDO or CMO RTA contain only the data entered as required by appendix 2, paragraph 2. The software provided to the MIO converts this data into the appropriate resource targeting groups identified in paragraph 110 above.

114. IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCE TARGETING GROUPS. Each MIO manager should designate an individual to collect and collate the completed automated assessment files transmitted from the MIDO or CMO RTA. For the purpose of this order, the MIO designated individuals will hereinafter be referred to as a MIO RTA.

* a. The MIO RTA will upload the automated files received from the MIDO or CMO RTA to the resource targeting database. When it has received and uploaded all automated files, the MIO RTA will print and distribute a Directorate Report and an Office Report; refer to appendix 5. The MIO manager may delegate the functions of uploading the automated files and printing the Office Report, which lists the assigned resource targeting groups, to the respective MIDO manager.

(1) The Directorate Report will list all facilities assessed within the directorate and the respective resource targeting group assigned by the resource targeting model. The MIO manager will sign and date the Directorate Report, and submit it to the MIO RTA for distribution to the ACO and MIDO/CMO managers. When the MIO distributes an electronic version of the Directorate Report to the ACO and MIDO/CMO managers, the electronic mail message will include a statement that the MIO manager has approved the report.

(2) The Office Report will list the facilities assessed within each MIDO or CMO and their group assignments. It will be distributed to the respective MIDO or CMO manager.

b. Upon receipt of the signed Directorate Report, the PI will finalize Form 8100-9. Obtain the signed printed form and write in or type the assigned resource targeting group, and file Form 8100-9 in the PAH's project folder.

c. After entering the resource targeting group on Form 8100-9, update MIMIS by entering the resource targeting group and category for each facility assessed.

115. MODIFICATION OF RESOURCE TARGETING GROUPS. Circumstances may arise following the annual identification of resource targeting groups that may challenge the assigned resource targeting group for a specific facility. When any of the following conditions occur at a facility after a resource targeting group has been assigned, the PI should complete a new Form 8100-9 and process the automated assessment file as indicated in paragraph 112 above. When submitting a modified automated assessment file to the MIO, ensure that the file name is different from the file name of the automated assessment file that was previously submitted. Refer to appendix 3 for assistance in determining the significance of the following conditions:

- a. Unit criticality changes from category 1 or 2 to category 3.
- b. Unit criticality changes from category 3 to category 1 or 2.
- c. Significant change in key management.
- d. Significant turnover of critical staff.
- e. Significant increase or reduction in workforce.
- f. Deliberate non-responsiveness to corrective action requests.
- g. Significant service difficulties attributed to manufacturing or quality problems.
- h. Addition of a complex manufacturing process.
- i. Addition of a complex product or part(s) thereof.
- j. Significant quality or inspection system changes.
- k. Significant increase in the use of foreign suppliers.
- l. Movement or shift of production location or volume.
- m. Expiration of a labor contract; potential labor unrest.

116. DISPOSITION OF AUTOMATED FILES. Database tables from the MIO roll-up (File “C:\Target2\Risktbl2.mdb”) will be sent to AIR-200 to perform resource targeting model validation after the schedule of ongoing CM responsibilities for the next fiscal year is finalized, generally following the ACSEP Joint Scheduling Committee meeting, i.e., when the nationally-led ACSEP evaluations are identified. All automated resource targeting files created by the PI, MIDO or CMO RTA, and MIO RTA to identify resource targeting groupings may be deleted after the files are received (and viable receipt confirmed) by AIR-200. Do not delete any files until AIR-200 has confirmed that it has successfully opened the files.

b. Supplier Control Audit. Refer to part 6 of this section. Specifically, the PI will determine that the supplier complies with purchase order and /or quality requirements. In some instances, this activity may be handed off to another MIDO or CMU, or may require CAA assistance.

125. DETERMINATION OF SUPPLIER CONTROL. The PI may determine whether a PAH or associate facility is controlling its suppliers by reviewing the results of the PI evaluation at the PAH or associate facility, when applicable, and the results of the supplier control audits at the selected PAH/associate facility suppliers, including the results of all applicable CAA audits. This review should take place immediately following the last scheduled supplier control audit, or the PI evaluation, whichever occurs last. The PI should look for evidence that may indicate a system breakdown in supplier control by the PAH or associate facility. Request corrective action for a system breakdown in accordance with section 3, part 5, of this chapter.

126.-128. RESERVED.

PART 4. PRINCIPAL INSPECTOR EVALUATION

129. GENERAL. A PI evaluation is an evaluation conducted by a PI at a PAH or associate facility, normally by the PI assigned CM responsibility. If specific expertise is required during a PI evaluation, the PI should advise the MIDO or CMO manager. A PI evaluation shall be scheduled using the resource targeting assessment group and category assignment determined under part 2 of this section. Refer also to figure 11 of this order. ACSEP system element criteria from Order 8100.7 will be used to conduct PI evaluations. The PI evaluation will be scheduled and conducted as follows:

NOTE: The scheduling requirements listed in paragraphs a through d below are considered to be the minimum requirements. A MIDO or CMU may schedule additional PI evaluations at specific facilities when required to ensure continued operational safety.

a. Group I Facility.

(1) Category 1 or 2 Facility.

(a) A PI evaluation will be conducted at each category 1 or 2 facility at least once every three months.

* (b) Evaluation of all system elements applicable at the specific facility will be completed at least once in the interval between ACSEP evaluations (i.e., 18-24 months and 24-36 months, respectively). A few of the system elements should be evaluated during each PI evaluation. Initial emphasis should be placed on evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report. *

(2) Category 3 Facility.

(a) A PI evaluation will be conducted at each category 3 facility at least once every 12 months.

(b) Evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report, and the MMF system element when applicable, will be completed at least once in the 12-month period.

b. Group II Facility.

(1) Category 1 or 2 Facility.

(a) A PI evaluation will be conducted at each category 1 or 2 facility at least once every six months.

* (b) Evaluation of all system elements applicable at the specific facility will be completed at least once in the interval between ACSEP evaluations (i.e., 24-36 months and 32-48 months, respectively). A few of the system elements should be evaluated during each PI evaluation. Initial emphasis should be placed on evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report. *

(2) Category 3 Facility.

(a) A PI evaluation will be conducted at each category 3 facility at least once every 12 months.

(b) Evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report, and the MMF system element when applicable, will be completed at least once in the 12-month period.

c. Group III Facility.

(1) Category 1 or 2 Facility.

(a) A PI evaluation will be conducted at each category 1 or 2 facility at least once every 12 months.

* (b) Evaluation of all system elements applicable at the specific facility will be completed at least once in the interval between ACSEP evaluations (i.e., 32-48 months and 42-60 months, respectively). A few of the system elements should be evaluated during each PI evaluation. Initial emphasis should be placed on evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report. *

(2) Category 3 Facility.

(a) A PI evaluation will be scheduled so as to evaluate one-half of all Group III Category 3 facilities one year, and the other half the following year. This will result in a facility being evaluated at least once every 24 months.

(b) Evaluation of the top four problem system elements applicable at the facility, as identified by the current annual ACSEP report, and the MMF system element when applicable, will be completed at least once in the 24-month period.

b. Group II Facility.

- (1) **Category 1 Facility.** A supplier control audit will be conducted at two suppliers annually.
- (2) **Category 2 Facility.** A supplier control audit will be conducted at two suppliers annually.
- (3) **Category 3 Facility.** A supplier control audit is not required.

c. Group III or IV Facility. A supplier control audit is not required.

140. SUPPLIER SELECTION. Selection of suppliers subject to supplier control audits will be performed as follows:

a. After completing resource targeting, each PI will identify the number of supplier control audits to be performed by using the guidance described in paragraphs 139a through 139c above.

b. Next, the PI must obtain access to the PAH's supplier listing.

c. The PI will select candidates for supplier control audits using a random sampling method in order to minimize biasing the results. For supplier selection purposes, a random number generator method will be used. Each MIO will determine the method of generating random numbers, using the Internet as a possible source. The PI will use these randomly generated numbers to determine which suppliers receive an audit. Using the random number generator method, the PI will select the appropriate minimum number of supplier control audits required.

d. The PI will match the randomly generated numbers to the PAH's or associate facility's supplier control listing. For example, Company ABC was rated as a Group I, Category 1 facility and has 50 suppliers on its supplier control listing. The minimum number of supplier control audits for a Group I, Category 1 facility is four. Using the random number generator method, the PI selects the first four numbers from the generated list, which for the purpose of this example would be 5, 8, 14, and 24. The PI will then count down the supplier listing and choose the 5th, 8th, 14th, and 24th suppliers on the list.

- * **e.** The PI will screen each of the suppliers selected, taking into consideration the following factors: part complexity or criticality, recipient of a supplier control audit in the previous year, significant service difficulty activity at a supplier, inspectability upon receipt, delegation of major inspections, direct ship authority, delegation of MRB, or supplier performance. If, based on these factors, the PI decides not to audit a selected supplier, the PI should select the next number on the generated list and screen that supplier against the listed factors. Continue this process until the required number of suppliers is selected. *

NOTE: In cases where the PAH or associate facility supplier base is less than or equal to the minimum number of supplier control audits required, the PI will schedule and conduct a supplier control audit at each of the PAH's or associate facility's suppliers. When the results of the supplier control audits indicate a continuing trend of effective supplier control by the PAH or associate facility, the PI may elect to reduce the number of supplier control audits to be conducted.

f. There may be reasons such as part complexity or criticality, size of the PAH's or associate facility's supplier base, significant service difficulty activity at a supplier, delegation of major inspections, or supplier performance where the PI may want to do more than the minimum number of supplier control audits. The PI should remember, however, that the purpose of the supplier control audit is to determine that a PAH or associate facility is satisfactorily controlling its suppliers, not to evaluate the performance of the supplier. Specific supplier issues should be evaluated using the product audit described in section 2, part 7 of this chapter.

141. DIRECTORATE SUPPLIER CONTROL AUDIT LIST. Each MIDO or CMO will prepare a supplier control audit list annually to document the results of the selection of suppliers described in paragraph 140 above.

a. The supplier control audit list shall include the name and address of the selected supplier, the name and address of the responsible PAH or associate facility, the scheduled date of supplier control audits to be conducted by the MIDO or CMO, and identification of any supplier control audits that may be handed off to other directorates or may require the assistance of a CAA in a bilateral country.

* **NOTE: When feasible, the MIDO or CMO should schedule the supplier control audit for a time when the supplier has an active purchase order from the PAH or associate facility. A supplier control audit may be scheduled in conjunction with an ACSEP evaluation, provided the audit (1) occurs in the same fiscal year, (2) does not divert resources, and (3) is conducted and reported separately from the ACSEP evaluation.**

*

b. Each MIDO or CMO will forward a completed supplier control audit list to the MIO manager no later than May 15 every year. This list will be used to plan resource allocation in the next fiscal year. The MIO manager will ensure that the lists submitted by each MIDO or CMO are reviewed for completeness and for identification of duplicate suppliers. When the same supplier is selected by different MIDO's or CMO, the MIO manager should ensure that only one audit is scheduled at that supplier; however, compliance to the requirements of all applicable PAH's or associate facilities should be audited at that supplier. The MIO manager should also determine which MIDO or CMO will conduct the audit, and whether representation from other MIDO's or CMO's is required. When all discrepancies with the lists are resolved, the MIO manager will ensure that a consolidated directorate supplier control audit list is prepared.

c. The completed directorate list will be distributed to all other MIO managers no later than May 30 every year. All MIO managers should ensure that supplier control audit lists received from other directorates are reviewed to identify duplicate suppliers, potential hand-offs that affect their offices, and supplier control audits to be conducted by the FAA at multiple international suppliers in the same country.

142. COORDINATION OF SUPPLIER CONTROL AUDITS BETWEEN DIRECTORATES.

Discussion of duplicate suppliers and hand-offs between directorates should occur during a joint scheduling telcon by June 15 every year.

* **a. Duplicate Suppliers.** Telcon participants should ensure that only one audit is scheduled at a supplier. The participants should determine whether all affected PAH's will be evaluated as part of the audit and identify audit participant(s).

b. Hand-Offs. The directorates should accept and support hand-offs of supplier control audits that are scheduled within the minimum requirements of paragraph 139 above. MIO managers should ensure that supplier control audits that are handed off to their directorates are added to their directorate supplier control audit lists and scheduled. Updated directorate supplier control audit lists should be provided to the other MIO managers before the ACSEP Joint Scheduling Committee meeting. There should be no hand-offs of supplier control audits that are scheduled beyond the minimum number required, unless an agreement is made with the MIO of the directorate where the supplier is located. Contentious hand-offs, such as those that have significant resource implications, should not be scheduled at this time. Participants should discuss contentious hand-offs and agree on an appropriate solution. *

c. Supplier Control Audits to be Conducted by the FAA at Multiple International Suppliers in the Same Country. Telcon participants should identify one FAA office as a lead office to coordinate all audit activities, including notifying the responsible CAA and inviting its participation. The participants should also determine whether representation from other MIO's is required.

d. MIO managers will provide the finalized Directorate Supplier Control Audit List to the MIDO's and CMO.

143. NOTIFYING A PAH OR ASSOCIATE FACILITY. Prior to conducting a supplier control audit, the MIDO/CMO that will be conducting the audit will notify the responsible PAH or associate facility. The PI should prepare a notification letter and send it to the PAH no later than 50 days prior to the audit. If changes occur after the notification letter has been sent, notify the PAH by letter or other appropriate means. If a supplier control audit has been handed off as described in paragraph 97b of this order, the office receiving the request will send the notification letter to the PAH or associate facility and provide a copy to the requesting office. Figure 12 contains a sample notification letter.

144. RECORDING A SUPPLIER CONTROL AUDIT. A supplier control audit shall be recorded on Form 8120-14, or electronic equivalent, by the person conducting the audit. One form shall be completed for each supplier control audit conducted. Each hand-off is considered a separate supplier control audit. Prepare this form in accordance with appendix 8 of this order.

145.-147. RESERVED.

FIGURE 12. SAMPLE SUPPLIER CONTROL AUDIT NOTIFICATION LETTER.

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

July 13, 2001

Molly Brown
c/o Tight Weave Manufacturing
1600 Lind Ave SW
Fort Worth, TX 76137

Dear Ms. Brown:

* The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), in accordance with its responsibilities under Title 49, United States Code, Subtitle VII, part A, and applicable regulations, has selected Structural Components located in Seattle, Washington, for the conduct of a supplier control audit. The audit is scheduled to be conducted on November 12, 2001, by an FAA representative from the Seattle Manufacturing Inspection District Office (MIDO). This audit will determine that your supplier complies with purchase order and/or quality requirements, including any statistical sampling that may be utilized. *

The FAA requests that you inform a representative at Structural Components of this audit. Also, please inform the Seattle MIDO at (425) 227-2170 of any security requirements so that we may obtain the appropriate clearance. In addition, please provide the name, title, address, and telephone number of an individual at Structural Components who will serve as the company point of contact for this audit.

If you have any questions concerning the scheduling or conducting of this audit, please contact the undersigned at the above telephone number.

Sincerely,

Julia Gotta

Julia Gotta
Seattle Manufacturing Inspection
District Office

cc: Fort Worth MIDO

PART 7. PRODUCT AUDIT

148. GENERAL. A product audit evaluates the effectiveness of the PAH's or associate facility's quality control or inspection system and the airworthiness of products utilizing critical and certain non-critical characteristics and/or processing attributes generated during the manufacturing process. The product audit may be initiated at any point in the manufacturing process after inspections have been completed. The product audit is conducted at a production approval holder or associate facility, but may also be conducted at a supplier facility where a product or part(s) thereof is manufactured. If specific expertise is required during this audit, the PI should advise the MIDO or CMO manager. If a product audit is required in another geographic MIDO or CMU, the PI will comply with the hand-off procedures in paragraph 97. Product audits will be conducted in conjunction with every scheduled ACSEP evaluation. In addition, product audits are conducted in conjunction with scheduled PI evaluations as follows:

NOTE: The scheduling requirements listed in paragraphs a through c below are considered to be the minimum requirements. See also figure 11 of this order. A MIDO or CMU may schedule additional product audits at specific facilities when required to ensure continued operational safety.

a. Group I Facility.

(1) Category 1 Facility. Two product audits will be conducted in conjunction with two PI evaluations that are conducted annually. Additionally, a product audit will be conducted in conjunction with each scheduled ACSEP evaluation.

(2) Category 2 Facility. A product audit will be conducted in conjunction with one PI evaluation annually. Additionally, a product audit will be conducted in conjunction with each scheduled ACSEP evaluation.

(3) Category 3 Facility. A product audit is not required.

b. Group II Facility.

(1) Category 1 Facility. A product audit will be conducted in conjunction with one PI evaluation annually. Additionally, a product audit will be conducted in conjunction with each scheduled ACSEP evaluation.

(2) Category 2 or 3 Facility. A product audit is not required during a PI evaluation. However, a product audit will be conducted in conjunction with each scheduled ACSEP evaluation at a Category 2 facility only.

c. Group III or IV Facility. A product audit is not required during a PI evaluation. However, a product audit will be conducted in conjunction with each scheduled ACSEP evaluation at a Group III Category 1 and 2 facility only.

149. SELECTION OF PRODUCT AUDIT CHARACTERISTICS. The product audit will be conducted utilizing critical characteristics and/or critical processing attributes generated during the manufacturing process, as well as certain non-critical characteristics and/or non-critical processing attributes. These characteristics and attributes are defined as follows:

a. Critical characteristics are those where failure to maintain conformity could cause loss of function and create an unsafe condition. Critical process attributes are those where lack of conformity directly affects the product or part(s) thereof and could cause failure or create an unsafe condition. The selection of the critical characteristics and/or critical process attributes shall be governed by utilizing the following:

(1) Known service problem areas, obtained from the Aviation Data Systems Branch, AFS-620, prior to the start of the product audit. Service Difficulty Reports submitted after January 1, 1995, may be accessed at the FAA web site.

(2) Characteristics/attributes that are operator controlled.

(3) Characteristics/attributes classified as critical as defined by the PAH's or associate facility's Engineering Drawings, Process Specifications, Test Specifications, and Quality Control Procedures.

b. In addition to critical characteristics and/or critical processing attributes, the PI may select certain non-critical characteristics and/or non-critical processing attributes, such as radiuses, surface finishes, machine to cast features, cad plating, NDI, etc.

150. PRODUCT AUDIT AREAS. The product audit may be divided into one or more of the following areas:

- a.** Final Product.
- b.** Subassembly.
- c.** Detail Parts.
- d.** Raw Material.

151. PRODUCT AUDIT CRITERIA. The audit criteria used in the performance of a product audit to establish conformity to TC Data are listed below. This audit criteria is a minimum and not all-inclusive. Figure 13 indicates which criteria are applicable to each product audit area, as a minimum.

a. Operational/functional. Verify that sub-assembly or final product conforms to the functional/operational test criteria; e.g., revalidating test results, test setup, rig approval, certified equipment, use of approved procedures, certified test parameters, use of required rig, calibration.

b. Dimensional. Compare actual recorded measurement(s) of the selected characteristic with the approved design data. Verify characteristics are inspected using the correct calibrated tooling, gauging, fixtures, etc., surface finish dimensions and radius meet drawing tolerances, inspections are performed in proper sequence (following work instructions); e.g., review or revalidate inspection records.

NOTE: This is not a physical reinspection by the PI. Rather, it is the FAA witnessing of a physical reinspection by the PAH, associate facility, or applicable supplier.

c. Visual. Inspect part for obvious external defects; e.g., corrosion, burrs, handling damage, scratches.

d. Identification. Compare actual identification plates, tags, markings etc. with approved design data or purchase order requirements and verify that identification is maintained throughout the product line; e.g., part numbers, serial numbers, lot numbers for raw material, inspection stamps. For software revision verification, verify software part number can be displayed on screen or software load verified by documentation review.

e. Documentation. Verify the latest revision level or changes, proper work instructions, completed operations, proper authorizations; proper use of statistical sampling; e.g., certificate of conformance, work travelers, blueprints, specifications, first article inspection records.

f. Special Processes. Verify special processes are in accordance with approved process specifications. Verify operator qualification/certification; e.g., test coupons, training requirements for operators, test set-ups, documentation. Verify oven surveys/calibration. For a chemical process such as plating, verify that control has been established over tank cleanliness and chemical concentration.

g. Material. Verify that the PAH has verified that incoming raw material meets its specification requirements.

152. RECORDING PRODUCT AUDIT RESULTS. All product audit activity will be recorded on Form 8100-1. When unsatisfactory conditions are identified, prepare Form(s) 8100-6, or electronic equivalent, and attach applicable objective evidence.

153. RECORDING A PRODUCT AUDIT. A product audit shall be recorded on Form 8120-14, or electronic equivalent, by the person conducting the audit. However, Form 8120-14 is not required for an ACSEP evaluation. When a product audit is conducted in conjunction with a PI evaluation or a supplier control audit, it may be recorded on the same form prepared for those activities. When a product audit is conducted as a stand-alone activity, one form shall be completed for each product audit completed. Prepare this form in accordance with appendix 8 of this order. Attach Form 8100-1 and any applicable Form(s) 8100-6, or printed copy of electronic equivalent, and objective evidence. Any corrective action required should be accomplished in accordance with chapter 3, section 3, part 5 of this order.

FIGURE 13. APPLICABILITY OF PRODUCT AUDIT CRITERIA TO PRODUCT AUDIT AREAS (MINIMUM)

PRODUCT AUDIT CRITERIA	PRODUCT AUDIT AREAS			
	FINAL PRODUCT	SUBASSEMBLY	DETAIL PARTS	RAW MATERIALS
Operational/functional	X	X		
Dimensional	X	X	X	X
Visual	X	X	X	X
Identification	X	X	X	X
Documentation	X	X	X	X
Special processes		X	X	X
Material		X	X	

154.-156. RESERVED.

SECTION 3. RANDOM CM RESPONSIBILITIES

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

157. GENERAL. Parts 2 through 7 of this section provide guidance for accomplishing random CM responsibilities. The tasks discussed below are accomplished on an as-required basis.

158.-159. RESERVED.

PART 2. EVALUATION OF CHANGES TO A PAH'S OR ASSOCIATE FACILITY'S QC OR INSPECTION SYSTEM

160. GENERAL. The cognizant MIDO/MISO/CMU must thoroughly review applicable changes to the quality control or inspection system required for the applicable production approval that may affect the inspection, conformity, or airworthiness of the product or part(s) thereof. Refer to appendix 1, paragraph 2, of this order for additional guidance. Any inadequacies in the quality control or inspection system must be identified to the PAH for corrective action.

NOTE: The approval or acceptance of changes at an associate facility will remain with the office having CM responsibility for the original PAH. If the original PAH has delegated responsibility to approve changes to the associate facility, the CM office of the associate facility will approve the changes.

161. PRIORITIZATION OF REVIEW. Review of a facility's changes to its quality control or inspection system should be prioritized according to its resource targeting grouping. For example, the changes at a facility rated as Group I will be reviewed prior to the changes for a facility rated as Group II, III, or IV. Reviews of changes from facilities in the same resource targeting group will be prioritized by date of notification or receipt of applicable data.

162. REVIEW OF CHANGES. The cognizant MIDO/MISO/CMU should review changes to the quality control or inspection system to ensure that:

a. The quality control or inspection system will continue to adequately provide for the consistent acceptance of only those products or parts thereof which are in conformity with the approved design data and in a condition for safe operation.

b. The quality control or inspection system will continue to meet the intent of the pertinent rules, and can be realistically implemented.

NOTE: The conditions identified in paragraphs 162a and 162 b above may often be verified through data review alone. In some instances, however, on-site inspection or review may be required.

163. POST-REVIEW ACTIONS. The cognizant MIDO/MISO/CMU will:

a. Identify any inadequacies found in the changed quality control or inspection system and request corrective action from the PAH.

c. Violations. When the service difficulty report and the subsequent investigation indicate that a violation exists, the investigating and reporting procedures in Order 2150.3 will also be followed.

d. Delegation Option Authorization (DOA) Reports. Upon notification by the FAA, DOA holders are required by § 21.277 to investigate and report to the FAA the results of their investigation and any action taken or proposed. These reports should be forwarded to the MIO and geographical ACO, which should initiate any actions deemed appropriate for the particular service difficulty involved.

172. FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS. Foreign manufacturers are exempted from the reporting requirements of § 21.3. When foreign manufactured products or articles approved under §§ 21.29, 21.183(c), 21.500, or 21.502 are involved in service difficulties, the MIO in the directorate that the service difficulty occurred will require an investigation. A complete report will be provided to the MIO and Standards Staff of the Directorate having geographical responsibility over the particular country where the product or article manufacturer is located. Upon receipt and evaluation of the report, the MIO having geographical responsibility will bring the matter to the attention of the CAA for further investigation and corrective action as necessary. If critical parts, processes, or methods are involved, airworthiness directives or alert bulletin action should be considered. If the condition is serious and affects safety and if adequate corrective action is not immediately forthcoming from the foreign manufacturer or CAA, action under § 13.19 would also be necessary. Coordinate such enforcement action through the Assistant Chief Counsel, Enforcement Division, AGC-300, AIR-40, and the State Department.

173.-175. RESERVED.

PART 4. INVESTIGATION OF REGULATORY VIOLATIONS

176. ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS ON SAFETY-RELATED OR SYSTEMIC NONCOMPLIANCES. The performance of CM responsibilities often results in identifying noncompliances by a PAH with the CFR or FAA-approved data. These noncompliances may be safety-related, systemic, or isolated. See appendix 7, paragraph 2g(1) through (3). The PI should exercise good judgment in determining whether or not the objective evidence identifies a safety-related or systemic noncompliance to the CFR or to FAA-approved data before initiating any enforcement action prescribed in Order 2150.3. Isolated noncompliances do not constitute a quality control or inspection system breakdown. Nevertheless, the PI should evaluate each noncompliance in accordance with Order 2150.3, chapter 2. The initiation of enforcement actions in these instances would only serve to dilute the effectiveness of the FAA compliance and enforcement program. However, when isolated noncompliances are noted, the PI must request prompt corrective action from the PAH using the procedures in part 5 of this section.

177. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES. The principal objective of the FAA compliance and enforcement program is to promote aviation safety and to protect the public interest by obtaining compliance with both the statutory and the regulatory requirements. The program ranges from educational and remedial efforts, including administrative action, to punitive legal enforcement remedies, including criminal sanctions in the most serious cases. The PI should follow Order 2150.3 for any safety-related or systemic noncompliances with the CFR. The PI should also follow Order 2150.3 when a PAH is found to be in noncompliance with FAA-approved data. Since PC and TSO authorization holders are required by the CFR to have data describing the quality system, normally in

the form of a manual, the manual is considered part of the approved data. Data deficiencies found after the FAA originally approves the data are not a basis for taking enforcement action. When such deficiencies are found, the PI should send a separate letter to the PAH requesting that appropriate corrective action be taken in a timely manner. If the PAH does not, the PI should then initiate enforcement actions as deemed appropriate.

178. MULTIPLE ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS. When a number of safety-related or systemic noncompliances have been noted at a PAH's facility, such as those resulting from an ACSEP or PI evaluation, the PI should process them as one enforcement action. However, when different types of enforcement actions are involved, the PI should initiate a separate enforcement action for each type of enforcement action to be taken. For example, if an evaluation results in four systemic noncompliances where administrative action is indicated, and three systemic noncompliances where legal action is deemed appropriate, the PI should process two separate enforcement actions.

179. TIMELINESS. To ensure that enforcement actions have the maximum effect as a compliance tool, Order 2150.3 establishes a six month goal for preparing and processing all enforcement investigation reports. This goal includes time for legal processing and preparing of notices when required. Each directorate may elect to use a performance management tool to measure the process and make improvements when necessary.

180. INVALID ALLEGED VIOLATIONS. The PI should advise the PAH when an alleged noncompliance, as cited in a Letter of Investigation (LOI), has been later determined to be invalid. In such cases, a Letter of Notification, Closing of Investigation, should be sent to the PAH.

181. VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE PROCEDURES. Primary responsibility for monitoring the quality control or inspection system and ensuring compliance with the CFR lies with the PAH. The FAA recognizes that the PAH is in the best position to monitor the effectiveness of its own operations and system and that the FAA cannot continuously monitor every aspect of the PAH's quality control or inspection system. The FAA encourages the PAH to monitor its own system and to maintain a reporting and correction policy consistent with the FAA's reporting and correction policy. The FAA should strongly encourage the PAH to implement an internal audit program that will assist the PAH in detecting noncompliances within its system. If the PAH elects to take advantage of the reporting and correction policy, the PI and PAH should develop a definitive agreement that describes how the PAH will implement the reporting and correction policy. The agreement should define the process to be used, and should be referenced within the FAA-approved quality manual for PC and TSO authorization holders. Although the PAH may terminate the agreement at any time, doing so does not relieve it of the responsibility to take appropriate action when it or the FAA discovers noncompliances with products or noncompliances within the quality control or inspection system. If a PAH elects to self-disclose a noncompliance that has left its control, and meets all criteria identified in Order 2150.3, Bulletin 92-2, Reporting and correction policy and implementing guidance for holders of production approvals, the FAA may mitigate or alleviate civil penalties.

182.-184. RESERVED.

188. CORRECTIVE ACTION VALIDATION. Corrective action validation should determine that the proposed corrective action was correctly implemented and that the corrective action completely eliminated the noncompliance. The PI should schedule a visit to the responsible facility and/or supplier facility to evaluate corrective action commitments. The PI should schedule the visit far enough in the future to ensure that the facility and/or supplier have fully implemented the corrective action and that the action has become a routine element of the quality control or inspection system, or of a delegated facility's design approval system when applicable. A visit to the facility may coincide with a scheduled audit or evaluation, when appropriate. Occasionally, the PI may be required to validate corrective actions at a supplier facility or satellite MMF located outside of the geographical boundary of the responsible CM office. In this case, the PI may elect to visit the supplier facility or satellite MMF to validate the corrective action or request the geographic MIDO or CMU where the supplier or satellite MMF is located to validate the corrective action. See paragraph 97c of this order. If the facility is located in a bilateral country, the PI may formally request that the responsible CAA validate the corrective action; include the information from paragraph 97c(1) of this order as applicable. Document results of completed corrective action validations in the facility's Enforcement Investigation Report file.

189.-191. RESERVED.

PART 6. UNSCHEDULED AUDITS, EVALUATIONS, OR INVESTIGATIONS

192. GENERAL. Section 2 of this chapter provides for scheduled PI evaluations, product audits, supplier control audits, and ACSEP evaluations. However, any one of these audits or evaluations may be performed on a non-scheduled basis at the discretion of the managing office whenever necessary to ensure continued operational safety. Section 3 of this chapter discusses investigation of service difficulties and regulatory violations. Other random investigations may arise for purposes such as suspected unapproved parts or whistle blower allegations.

193. NON-SCHEDULED CM AUDITS/EVALUATIONS. The managing office will determine the type of audit or evaluation that will provide the best assessment of the applicable situation. A non-scheduled CM audit or evaluation will be planned, conducted, and reported in accordance with section 2 of this chapter to the greatest extent practicable. Appropriate emphasis on planning the audit or evaluation should be provided despite the reduced time that may be available between the decision to conduct the audit or evaluation and the actual conduct of the audit or evaluation. Situations that may warrant a non-scheduled CM audit or evaluation may include:

- a. Accidents and incidents.
- b. Deliberate violations.
- c. Repetitive SDR's.
- d. Excessive owner/operator complaints.
- e. PAH's or associate facility's refusal/failure to take appropriate corrective action.
- f. PAH's or associate facility's inability to control suppliers.

g. Renewal of a PAH's or associate facility's production activity after a prolonged period of inactivity.

h. Relocation of production facility.

i. Surveillance Requests from CAA's. A U.S. manufacturer that has entered into a supplier, subcontractor, or other similar relationship with a foreign manufacturing entity (e.g., a manufacturer of aircraft, aircraft engines, or propellers; a repair station; or an air carrier) may produce, identify and deliver civil aeronautical products and parts thereof to that entity without obtaining an FAA design and production approval under part 21. The purchase order or similar contract/procurement agreement, from the foreign manufacturer to the supplier manufacturer should provide any evidence of the sales relationship to the FAA as needed. These products or parts thereof are to be produced in support of a design approval issued by a CAA, to include modifications made to a type design by repair stations or air carriers (e.g., TC, STC, CAA-approved modification). The regulatory responsibility for control or oversight of a U.S. manufacturer acting strictly as a supplier to a foreign manufacturing entity resides with the CAA having oversight of that design and/or production approval. The FAA assumes no regulatory responsibilities for these programs, and will only provide assistance in surveillance of the U.S. supplier through a special written arrangement with the CAA under the provisions of the bilateral airworthiness agreement.

(1) A CAA request should include clear, concise, and specific instructions to the FAA that includes the following: company name, address, phone number, and point of contact; details concerning the extent of surveillance to be conducted on behalf of the CAA; and, documentation to be submitted to the CAA. The responsible geographic MIO or CMO shall assure that the request is complete before assigning it to a MIDO, MISO, or CMU.

(2) The responsible geographic MIDO, MISO, or CMO shall review all completed documentation being submitted to the CAA to ensure the requirements of the CAA request have been met. On completion of the review, and incorporation of any applicable corrections, the responsible geographic MIDO, MISO, or CMO shall prepare a cover letter to accompany the documentation and forward it to AIR-40 for review and comment. After incorporating any applicable corrections to the cover letter, the completed documentation and cover letter shall be forwarded to the MIO manager for signature. The MIO manager shall forward all documentation to the requesting CAA.

(3) When the CAA conducts its own surveillance activities at a U.S. manufacturer, the FAA may be invited to observe or participate. The responsible geographic MIDO, MISO, or CMO should consider accepting the CAA invitation only when there is no impact on scheduled ongoing CM activities or other random CM activities with higher priority.

j. Any other situation as deemed necessary in the interest of safety.

194. OTHER RANDOM INVESTIGATIONS. Suspected unapproved part notifications will be investigated in accordance with the current issue of Order 8120.10. Any other investigations that may be required will be conducted in accordance with available specific guidance. In the absence of specific guidance, the managing office will determine the type of investigation that will provide the best assessment of the applicable situation. In some situations, a specific CM audit or evaluation may be appropriate.

**APPENDIX 7. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR
FAA FORM 8100-6, NONCOMPLIANCE RECORD**

1. PURPOSE. This appendix provides instructions for completing Form 8100-6 or electronic equivalent for all audit and evaluation activities.

2. SPECIFIC GUIDANCE. Figure 1 shows Form 8100-6 with numbered blocks. The form shall be prepared as a stand-alone document. **WRITE THE NONCOMPLIANCE AGAINST THE RESPONSIBLE PAH or ASSOCIATE FACILITY.** Prepare the form by inserting in:

a. Block 1. When the activity is an ACSEP evaluation, enter the ACSEP Number/Report Number. For all other activity, enter "N/A."

b. Block 2. The project number(s) applicable to the production approval(s) activity.

c. Block 3. A check mark in the appropriate box to indicate the type of activity that was conducted.

* **d. Block 4.** Under "System Element Evaluated," enter the name of the system element in Order 8100.7 to which the noncompliance is relevant. Under "Evaluation Criteria Number," enter the evaluation criteria number from Order 8100.7, appendix 6 or 7. For new criteria, insert the system element number assigned by Order 8100.7, appendix 6 or 7. Do NOT insert more than one number.

NOTE: More than one noncompliance may be recorded for an evaluation criteria number. When an evaluation criteria contains several statements of condition, it is possible to find noncompliances to some or all of those conditions. When multiple statements of conditions under one criteria are affected, a Form 8100-6 or electronic equivalent should be completed for each condition. When noncompliances are recorded for a common condition, only one Form 8100-6 or electronic equivalent should be completed.

*

e. Block 5. The reference controlling document. The controlling document is defined as the FAA-approved or accepted data, purchase order/quality requirements from a PAH or associate facility, or internal procedures used in producing the product or part(s) thereof. Enter the complete reference number, or, as a minimum, the document title and effective date. (Examples: ABC Company Quality Manual dated March 5, 1976; XYZ QOI 32-6 dated June 23, 1990; BCD Drawing No. 9825333-2 dated May 20, 1989.) Insert a check in the "Yes" or "No" block, as appropriate, to indicate whether the controlling document is FAA-approved.

**APPENDIX 7. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR
FAA FORM 8100-6, NONCOMPLIANCE RECORD (CONT'D)**

NOTE: If an APIS or PMA holder's quality manual is submitted to the FAA as evidence of compliance to part 21, it is not considered to be FAA-approved data. The "NO" block should always be checked for these documents. Purchase orders and/or quality requirements flowed down to a supplier by a PAH or associate facility are generally not considered to be FAA-approved data. In some cases, quality requirements for use at a supplier facility are specifically approved by the FAA prior to use. Determine the approval status of any referenced PAH supplier quality requirement before checking the "YES" or "NO" block.

f. Block 6. The applicable CFR part or section that establishes the responsibility of the PAH (i.e., § 21.165 or § 21.607). For an APIS or PMA facility, insert the specific paragraph reference from §§ 21.125(a)(1) through (a)(10) or § 21.303(a), (h), (h)(1) through (h)(9), j, or k, or other applicable CFR (e.g., § 45.15) to which the observed condition is directly traceable. If the observed condition is not directly traceable to one of these requirements, leave the block blank. For ACSEP evaluations only, insert the applicable CFR part or section that establishes the responsibility of any delegated facility evaluated (i.e., § 21.245, § 21.445, or SFAR NO. 36, § 6(a)(2)). Insert the applicable CFR reference for each approval type affected.

NOTE: When a facility holds multiple production approvals, and a noncompliance is found that applies to more than one of those approvals, use the highest level quality requirement; for purposes of this order, the quality levels, from highest to lowest, are PC, TSO authorization, APIS, and PMA.

g. Block 7. A check mark in the appropriate box to indicate the type of noncompliance found. A noncompliance is indicated when it is discovered that a PAH's or associate facility's operating practices are inconsistent with the CFR, FAA-approved data, or internal procedures. Internal procedures refer to a PAH's or associate facility's procedures that are not included as part of the FAA-approved data. A supplier's operating practices found to be inconsistent with a PAH's or associate facility's purchase order requirements are considered to be noncompliances by the PAH or associate facility. A noncompliance is classified into one of the following four categories:

(1) Safety-Related Noncompliance: a noncompliance to the CFR, FAA-approved data, the facility's internal procedures, or purchase order requirements that compromises immediate continued operational safety and requires immediate corrective action. This includes any noncompliance to § 21.3, including an isolated noncompliance. For an ACSEP evaluation, record a safety-related noncompliance only when the responsible PI determines that immediate action is required.

NOTE: The PI should formally submit any safety-related noncompliance to the responsible PAH or associate facility in writing within 72 hours of discovery. If the noncompliance affects delivered products or services, the PI will secure from the responsible PAH or associate facility a list of the end users affected and immediately notify the cognizant ACO, MIO, MIDO, or CMO.

**APPENDIX 7. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR
FAA FORM 8100-6, NONCOMPLIANCE RECORD (CONT'D)**

FIGURE 1. SAMPLE FAA FORM 8100-6

This form is a representation of the original form and not to be construed as the original form.

*

 U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration		Noncompliance Record		ACSEP No./Report No. (1) N/A
				Project No. (2) PT900NE
Type of Activity: <input type="checkbox"/> DO Audit <input type="checkbox"/> PI Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> ACSEP <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier Control Audit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product Audit <input type="checkbox"/> Other (3)				
System Element Evaluated: (4) Manufacturing Processes Evaluation Criteria Number: 413	Controlling Document: (5) RC Purchase Order #94 of 11/23/1997 FAA-approved data? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		Applicable CFR Section: (6) 21.607	
Type Of Noncompliance: Safety-Related <input type="checkbox"/> Systemic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Isolated <input type="checkbox"/> Certification-Related <input type="checkbox"/> No. 1 (7)				
Required Condition: (8) RC Purchase Order (PO) #94 for rotor support couplings states: "J&J Machining Co. shall comply with RC Quality Manual, Section 4, and purchase raw materials exclusively from YOYO International Material Broker. Terms of purchase will include a request for a metallurgical lab report with each shipment. These reports will be retained by J&J Machining Co. for a minimum of 2 years." J&J Machining Co. Quality Manual, paragraph 12.4(c), states: "All raw material purchase orders shall include a statement requiring suppliers to furnish a metallurgical lab report with each shipment. The reports will be retained by J&J Machining Co. metallurgical lab in accordance with paragraph 23.6."				
Encountered Condition: (9) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussed with Facility (10) Ten J&J Machining Co. purchase orders for raw materials to be used for the manufacture of rotor support couplings under RC PO #94 were reviewed (J3-122; J3-114; J3-221; J3-98; J3-301; J3-110; J3-245; J3-15; J3-278; J3-184). All ten POs were issued to YOYO International Material Broker as required by RC PO #94, and all included the statement for furnishing a metallurgical lab report with each shipment. All raw material shipments were completed between January 1997 and March 1998. The J&J Machining Co. metallurgical lab files were reviewed to determine whether metallurgical lab reports had been furnished with each shipment required by the ten POs. Only one metallurgical lab report was found to be on file (shipment under PO #J3-122). Attachments: RC Purchase Order #94 RC Quality Manual, Section 4 J&J Machining Co. Quality Manual, paragraphs 12.4(c) and 23.6 J&J Machining Co. PO # J3-122; J3-114; J3-221; J3-98; J3-301; J3-110; J3-245; J3-15; J3-278; J3-184				
Typed Name and Signature of Recorder: (11) Julia R. Gotta <i>Julia Gotta</i>		Office Symbol (12) ANE MIDO 42	Date (13) 5/1/01	
FAA Form 8100-6 (2-02)		FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (when filled in) Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552		

*

**APPENDIX 8. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR FAA FORM 8120-14,
PRODUCTION APPROVAL/CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY REPORT**

- 1. PURPOSE.** This appendix provides instructions for completing Form 8120-14 or electronic * equivalent. This form is used to document all activity, except ACSEP evaluations, at PAH's, associate * facilities, and their suppliers. When combined with the respective Form(s) 8100-6, a complete report of the activity conducted is available for subsequent planning.
- 2. SPECIFIC GUIDANCE.** Figure 1 shows Form 8120-14 with numbered blocks. Prepare the form by inserting in:
- a. Block 1.** The name and address of the PAH or associate facility as recorded on the production approval.
 - b. Block 2.** The project number(s) applicable to the production approval(s).
 - c. Block 3.** The name and address of the supplier as recorded on the PAH's documentation.
 - d. Block 4.** A check mark in the appropriate box(es) to indicate the type of production approval.
 - e. Block 5.** A check mark in the appropriate box to indicate the type of activity that was conducted.
 - f. Block 6.** The starting date and the ending date of the activity that was conducted.
 - g. Block 7.** The title, revision number, and date of any quality manual submitted to the FAA by the PAH or associate facility. The applicable CFR may also be entered. If no quality data is submitted, enter the applicable CFR. For a supplier, enter the applicable purchase order or quality requirements from the PAH or associate facility.
 - h. Block 8.** The date that applicable quality data submitted by a PAH or associate facility is approved by the FAA. If quality data is not subject to FAA approval, enter "N/A."
 - i. Block 9.** An "X" in the column next to the system element evaluated when the result of the activity is satisfactory. If the system element is not applicable at a facility, enter "N/A." If the system element was not evaluated, enter "N/E."
 - j. Block 10.** The respective Form 8100-6 noncompliance numbers for the system element evaluated, when the result of the activity is unsatisfactory.
 - k. Block 11.** The nomenclature and part number(s) of the product or part(s) thereof audited.
 - l. Block 12.** An "X" in the column next to the product or part(s) thereof audited when the result of the activity is satisfactory.
 - m. Block 13.** The respective Form 8100-6 noncompliance numbers for the product or part(s) thereof audited, when the result of the activity is unsatisfactory.

**APPENDIX 8. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR FAA FORM 8120-14,
PRODUCTION APPROVAL/CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY REPORT
(CONT'D)**

- n. Block 14.** The specific purchase order or quality requirement audited.
- o. Block 15.** An "X" in the column next to the specific purchase order or quality requirement audited when the result of the activity is satisfactory.
- p. Block 16.** The respective Form 8100-6 noncompliance numbers for the specific purchase order or quality requirements audited, when the result of the activity is unsatisfactory.
- q. Block 17.** Enter the names, titles, and office symbols of all FAA personnel who participated in the activity.
- r. Block 18.** The typed or printed name and signature of the person conducting the audit or PI evaluation. In most cases, this will be the PI responsible for the PAH or associate facility.

* **NOTE: When Form 8120-14 is used to document a PI evaluation or DO audit with multiple team members, the signature in block 18 is that of the team leader. This form, with the above signature, can then be used to support the continued appointment as an ACSEP team leader in accordance with Order 8100.7, chapter 2, paragraph 21b(1).**

*

- s. Block 19.** The office symbol of the person completing this form.
- t. Block 20.** The date that this form is completed.

**APPENDIX 8. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR FAA FORM 8120-14,
PRODUCTION APPROVAL/CERTIFICATE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY REPORT
(CONT'D)**

FIGURE 1. SAMPLE FAA FORM 8120-14 (FRONT)

This form is a representation of the original form and not to be construed as the original form.

*

 U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration		Production Approval/ Certificate Management Activity Report	
Manufacturer/Address: RC Couplings, 10001 Admiral Square, Haverhill MA 01830 (1)		Project No.: PQ 1234NE (2)	
Supplier/Address: N/A (3)			
Production Basis: (4)			
PC <input type="checkbox"/> APIS <input type="checkbox"/> TSO authorization <input type="checkbox"/> FMA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Production Approval/Certificate Management Activity: (5)			
DO Audit <input type="checkbox"/> PI Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product Audit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplier Control Audit <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>			
Activity Dates: From 4/1/2003 To 4/2/2003 (6)			
Quality Data—Title, Revision, Date, and/or CFR Section Involved: (7) RC Quality Manual, Rev. C, 1/27/1997			
Date of FAA Approval of Quality Data: N/A (8)			
PI EVALUATION OR DO AUDIT RESULTS			
SYSTEM ELEMENT		SATISFACTORY <i>"X" if applicable</i>	UNSATISFACTORY <i>List FAA Form 8100-6 Noncompliance No. (c)</i>
1. Organizational Management		(9)	(10)
2. Design Control			
3. Software Quality Assurance			
4. Manufacturing Processes			
4a. Manufacturing and Special Manufacturing Processes			#1 and #2
4b. Material Receiving, Handling & Storage			
4c. Airworthiness Determination			
5. Manufacturing Controls			
5a. Statistical Quality Control (SQC)			
5b. Tool and Gauge			#3
5c. Testing			
5d. Non-destructive Inspection			
5e. Nonconforming Material			
6. Supplier Control			
7. MMF			
PRODUCT AUDIT RESULTS			
PRODUCT AUDITED <i>(Nomenclature/Part Number)</i>		SATISFACTORY <i>"X" if applicable</i>	UNSATISFACTORY <i>List FAA Form 8100-6 Noncompliance No. (c)</i>
Rotor support coupling, (11) PN RC25 - 1000		(12)	#4 thru #6 (13)
FAA Form 8120-14 (10-02)		FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (when filled in) Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552	

*

