Dear Aerospace Auditors,

Per AS9104/2A Requirements for Oversight of Aerospace Quality Management System Registration / Certification Programs, supplemental oversight may be conducted by IAQG member companies. So it was that Boeing performed such a review against AS9101F regarding one of our client audits. Two minor nonconformances were found and we detail them and our corrective actions below.

NCR 1 Objective evidence:
“On PEAR 4 Manufacture product, the process evaluation level is 3 and considering the 4 NC written during the audit affecting the production process the process effectiveness level should have been a 2.”

Certainly, scoring of Pears can be subjective. The AS9101F Table 3 – Process Evaluation requires the auditor to intersect a result based upon the Table 3 Process Realization row and the Process Results column. Going forward, in order to address this Boeing opinion, PRI Registrar auditors will interpret the writing of an NCR as a reflection of Process Realization failure and if 3 or more NCRs are written against a single Pear process, the auditor will only be able to select an intersection box and associated number from the bottom row of “planned activities not realized” (e.g., a 1, 2 or 2).

NCR 2 – Objective evidence:

“Form 5 (audit report XXXX) under section “Change to Organization/facilities/quality Management System / Scope the report does not mention anything regarding the “Design and Development” process. This process was part of the previous CB audit report Organization QMS Matrix report (Form 2, audit report YYYY) and it’s not listed under the last audit report ((Form 2, audit report number XXXX). Under audit Detail section 8.3 “design and Development” has been excluded. The certificate still shows “Design” as part of the scope.”

At the previous audit YYYY, Design was a part of the scope, matrix and cert because a unique tool was being manufactured for Boeing as part of a Boeing purchase order requirement. At the last audit XXXX, this tooling requirement was gone, and the scope needed to change removing Design. The matrix and the audit report had NA for design. However, this was erroneously not documented in the Form 5 Audit Report box 37 (Changes to Organization / Facilities / Quality Management System / Scope) but instead documented in the Audit Scope box 22 next to Box 23 Requirements Determined as “Not Applicable” and Justification. Staff did not notice this as a change and the Cert Scope was not revised.

In all the Aerospace OASIS forms available to auditors, there is no clear location to put the certification scope. In some cases, auditors are using Audit Scope box 22 to do this incorrectly, since, logically it is next to Requirements Determined as “Not Applicable” and Justifications which just makes sense that it should be the cert scope. (The audit XXXX auditor did list the cert scope in box 22 and the scope had design correctly removed.)
Going forward, PRI Registrar wants the aerospace auditors to populate Form 5 Audit Scope Box 22 to identify and contain the Audit Scope (as defined in the form instructions), and identify and contain the Cert Scope (as supported by the NA’s and justifications). If the scope has changed, then it is also to be documented in Form 5 box 37.