**UNCONFIRMED MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 21, 2017**

**NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, USA**

**These minutes are not final until confirmed by the Task Group in writing or by vote at a subsequent meeting. Information herein does not constitute a communication or recommendation from the Task Group and shall not be considered as such by any agency.**

**TUESDAY, 21-FEB-2017**

# OPENING COMMENTS – OPEN



## Call to Order / Quorum Check

The Composites (COMP) Task Group (TG) was called to order at 8:00 a.m., 21-Feb-2017.

A quorum was established with the following representatives in attendance:

***Subscriber Members/Participants Present (\* Indicates Voting Member)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME |  | COMPANY NAME |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \* | Jason | Adams | Lockheed Martin Corp. |  |
| \* | Monica | Alcala | Honeywell Aerospace |  |
| \* | Douglas | Armstrong | GE Aviation |  |
| \* | Randy | Armstrong | Raytheon Co. |  |
| \* | Kevin | Dowling | Spirit AeroSystems |  |
| \* | Patrick | Dunleavy | SAFRAN |  |
| \* | Achim | Enzmann | Airbus Helicopters |  |
|  | Ray | Fontanares | The Boeing Company |  |
| \* | Javier | Garcia-Baeza | Airbus |  |
|  | Veronica | Guerrero | The Boeing Company |  |
| \* | Brett | Hemingway | BAE Systems - MAI (UK) |  |
| \* | John | Key | Bell Helicopter | Secretary |
|  | Uwe Alexander | Kleinert | Airbus Helicopters |  |
| \* | Ronald | Kramer | Gulfstream / General Dynamics |  |
| \* | Eric | Le Fort | Sonaca |  |
| \* | Herman | Leibovich | Israel Aerospace Industries |  |
| \* | Lance | Loeks | The Boeing Company |  |
| \* | Andreas | Mastorakis | GE Aviation |  |
| \* | Angelina | Mendoza | UTC Aerospace (Goodrich) |  |
|  | John | Merritt | Lockheed Martin Corp. |  |
|  | Brian | Minchuk | The Boeing Company |  |
| \* | Rick | Ouellette | The Boeing Company |  |
|  | Scott | Palmer | Rolls-Royce |  |
| \* | Richard | Perrett | GKN Aerospace - Filton | Vice Chairperson |
| \* | Patrick | Phelan | UTC Aerospace (Goodrich) |  |
| \* | Jeremy | Phillips | Textron Aviation |  |
| \* | Minh | Quan | Triumph Group |  |
|  | María | Sánchez-Arjona | Airbus Defence & Space |  |
| \* | Kodai | Shimono | Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. |  |
| \* | Sally | Spindor | Triumph Group |  |
|  | Ranganathan | Srinivasan | ST Aerospace Ltd. |  |
|  | Fabrice | Trebeden | Airbus Helicopters |  |
|  | Andy | Williams | Gulfstream / General Dynamics |  |

***Other Members/Participants Present (\* Indicates Voting Member)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME |  | COMPANY NAME |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \* | Bob | Baltzer | Brenner Aerostructures |  |
| \* | Natalia | Becerra Pozo | Exova |  |
|  | Mark | Bissonette | Canadian DND |  |
| \* | Kevin | Brennan | Swift Engineering |  |
| \* | Jim | Brown | Hexcel |  |
| \* | Gordon | Cameron | LMI Aerospace Everett-Merrill Creek |  |
|  | Xavier | Carteron | Toray Carbon Fibers Europe |  |
|  | John | Chesna | E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co. |  |
|  | Charles | Clinton | Meggitt Polymers & Composites |  |
|  | Pat | Durkin | TE Wire & Cable |  |
|  | Kevin | Edwards | DuPont |  |
|  | Ramsis | Farag | Auburn University |  |
|  | Bruce | Fuhrmann | Meggitt Polymers & Composites |  |
|  | Jose | Gonzalez | Meggitt Polymers & Composites |  |
|  | Melina | Granados | UTAS Mexicali |  |
|  | Jonathan | Hebben | Avcorp Composite Fabrication |  |
|  | Elizabeth | Herman | Kaman Composites-Vermont, Inc. |  |
|  | Tommy | Howland | Lee Aerospace |  |
|  | Opeyemi | Moyegun | GKN Aerospace |  |
| \* | Karen | Quinn | Orbital ATK |  |
|  | Betsabé | Ramirez | UTC Aerospace Mexico |  |
|  | Elisha | Rogers | Kaman Composites-Vermont, Inc. |  |
|  | Don | Russell | Toray Composites America Inc. |  |
| \* | Tammi | Schubert | Helicomb International |  |
| \* | Vitorio | Stana | Avcorp Industries Inc. |  |
| \* | Rhonda | Sutter | Composiflex, Inc. |  |
| \* | Arno | Toelkes | Euro-Composites |  |
| \* | Nancy E | Vancil | Toray Carbon Fibers America, Inc. |  |
| \* | Jim | Weishampel | DuPont |  |
|  | Daniel | Wienecke | Nordam Repair Division |  |
|  | Tim | Willyard | Nordam Repair Division |  |

***PRI Staff Present***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| John | Tibma |

## Safety Information

Review fire exits in meeting room

Inform PRI Staff person of any emergencies

## Review Code of Ethics and Meeting Conduct

## Present the Antitrust Video

## Acceptance of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made to approve the meeting minutes from the October 2016 Nadcap Meeting by Randy Armstrong (Raytheon Company). The motion was seconded by Patrick Dunleavy (SAFRAN). A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved as written with the correction that Tara Campbell was not in attendance at the meeting and a correction to a Supplier identified.

## Review of Voting Member Status

The following requests for additions or changes to voting membership were received and confirmed by the Task Group Chairperson pending verification of PD 1100 requirements:

* Subscriber Voting Member: UVM
* Supplier Voting Member: SVM
* Alternate: ALT
* Task Group Chairperson: CHR
* Vice Chairperson: VCH
* Secretary: SEC

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First Name** | **Surname** | **Company** | **Position:**  **(new / updated role)** | **Meetings Attended (Month/Year)** | |
| Maria | Sanchez-Arjona Cuesta | Airbus Defense & Space | UVM | February/ 2016 | June/2016 |
| Ranganathan | Srinivasan | Singapore Technology Aerospace Ltd. | UVM | February/ 2016 | June/2016 |
| Uwe | Kleinert | Airbus Helicopter | UVM | February/ 2016 | June/2016 |
| Mike | Song | Lockheed Martin | ALT UVM | October/2015 | February/ 2016 |
| Scott | Palmer | Rolls Royce | ALT UVM | Pittsburgh/ 2016 | New Orleans/ 2017 |
| Bruce | Fuhrmann | Meggitt Polymers & Composites | SVM | October/2016 | February/ 2017 |
| Charles | Clinton | Meggitt Polymers & Composites | ALT SVM | October/2016 | February/ 2017 |
| Jonathan | Hebben | Avcorp Composite Fabrication | ALT SVM | June/2016 | February/ 2017 |
| Tommy | Howland | Lee Aerospace | SVM | October/2016 | February/ 2017 |

The compliance to voting requirements per PD 1100 were reviewed. Brenner Aerospace, Integrated Technologies Inc (LMI), and Swift Engineering have not met requirements for maintaining their voting rights. Voting rights requirements will be waived per acting Chairperson Richard Perrett.

## Review Agenda

# COMP Staff report– OPEN



* + **Recent activities**
  + **Procedure Review**
  + **Mode B Review**
  + **Auditor Status**
  + **Audit Statistical Summary**
  + **Future Meeting Information**

John Tibma is currently supporting 100% of COMP audit review in a Delegated Mode.

Dave Kennedy is in training to be a Consultant Reviewer.

Jeff Bue has completed auditor training for COMP and is now an auditor.

Bruce Kriel has completed his T1 training audit but his T2 is currently on hold due to health.

John Tibma presented our COMP Auditor Status listing all the current auditors approved to perform audits for Nadcap

2017 Audit Projections

* 228 (90 – Americas, 92 – Europe, 46 - Asia)
  + 152 total scheduled through August
    - 63 – Americas, 60 – Europe, Asia – 29
    - 67% of Plan

John Tibma went over OP 1110 Audit Failure Procedure Review

* Risk Mitigation Revision (RMI)
  + Staff Engineer conducts Risk Mitigation
  + Completed RCCA balloted to Task Group
  + Supplier must pay a fee to go through RMI
* Mode B failure criteria determined in open meeting

John Tibma went over OP 1105 Audit Process and OP 1114 Task Group Operation

* Supplier Self Audit Requirement
  + Supplier must submit a self-audit to the Auditor 30 days prior to the audit start date
  + The self-audit must use the applicable Audit Criteria and scope for initial, reaccreditation, and add scope audits
  + The self-audit must document where evidence of compliance may be found.

A discussion ensued with concerns that the “no votes" were non-persuasive and that the data sent to PRI would be seen by all. The system will allow only the Auditor to see the information, and when the audit is completed, the data is erased and not maintained within the system. A comment was made that the auditors need to be aware that things can change in the 30 days, and our auditors are trained to know that corrective actions have been implemented and to perform the audit and review of the way things are at the point in time of the audit.

John Tibma presented the Mode B Failure Criteria for Initial Audits.

* Task Group tries to stay between the 95th percentile and 98th percentile
  + For Initials, we have 13 failed initial audits to date and 2 failed re-entry audits to date. The data has been unchanged since 2009.

John Tibma presented the current Mode B Failure Criteria vs the current data at the 98th percentile.

A motion was made by Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) and was seconded by Sally Spindor (Triumph) to keep the Mode B Failure Criteria for COMP Initial Audits Unchanged from the current requirements. A vote was taken:

**23 Green (Yea), 0 Yellow (Waive), 0 Red (Nay) - The motion passed and is approved.**

John Tibma presented the Mode B Failure Criteria for Reaccreditation Audits.

* Task Group tries to stay between the 95th percentile and 98th percentile
  + For reaccreditations, we have 44 failed reaccreditation audits to date and 3 in 2016. The data was last revised in 2015 but was unchanged since 2009 prior to this.
  + John presented the current Mode B Failure Criteria vs the current data at the 98th percentile.

A motion was made by John Key (Bell Helicopter) and was seconded by Sally Spindor (Triumph Group) to keep the Mode B Failure Criteria for COMP Reaccreditation Audits Unchanged from the current requirements. A vote was taken:

**21 Green (Yea), 1 Yellow (Waive), 1 Red (Nay) - The motion passed and is approved.**

John Tibma presented the top ten Non-conformance Reports (NCRs) for 2015 and the trend from 2014 that were noted in all COMP Nadcap audits.

John Tibma went over the Top 10 questions sited for NCRs during audits occurring in 2016 and compare this to the Top 10 questions in 2015.

Red Metric Review

John Tibma presented the statistics of our Task Group in a report out to the NMC Committee. The Task Group is yellow on one statistic, which is the percentage of suppliers that are on merit. Our Task Group currently only has 75% of our supply base on some type of merit, but one of the explanations for this issue is the number of Supplier Advisories that the Task Group issues, which is the most of all Nadcap Task Groups. Our Task Group is 100% in issuing On-time Certification. Our Task Group Cycle Time is green and the certificates are issued on an average of 46 days. The COMP Task Group is not required to provide any corrective action since there are no red metrics.

Future Meetings Information

June 2017 – Berlin, Germany (05 – 08 June)

* + Estrel Hotel

October 2017 – Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (23 – 27 October)

* + Omni William Penn

February 2018 – Madrid, Spain (19 – 22 February)

* + NH Euro building

# Task Group succession planning – OPEN

We need a volunteer to serve as Vice Chairperson from October 2019 to October 2021, and then to serve as Chairperson from October 2021 to October 2023

Two volunteers were recognized

• Monica Alcala, Honeywell Aerospace

• Tawny Blumenshine, Textron Aviation

A vote was taken for the two candidates.

Monica Alcala – 11 votes

Tawny Blumenshine – 12 votes

Tawny Blumenshine of Textron Aviation was voted by the Task Group to be the next Vice Chairperson when Richard Perrett takes the Chairpersonship in October of 2019, and to become Chairperson in October of 2021

# potential new ac7188 question – open



Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) renamed the action item at the request of PRI to modified scope audits. Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) presented the agenda for this section of the meeting and noted that there were multiple ways to provide comments/ideas: 1) Attendee to Conference can comment during the meetings when the questions are shown, 2) Voting Members will be sent an informal request to review updates, 3) Non-voting Members can ask the Staff Engineer for a copy of the questions and information, 4) Formal Ballot of AC7118 Rev F can be commented on.

The basic topic of this issue came from the June 2016 Nadcap Meeting where it was asked if the Task Group is interested in addressing some of the areas where we do not perform Job Audits. The areas identified tended to fall into categories where the requirement may not necessarily be flowed from engineering standards but flowed from quality standards.

The highest priority was equipment and calibration and the decision approach was to implement flexible audits. This would review the current criteria for automated ply cutters and laser projection ply machines.

Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) reviewed the timeline for this process for anticipate milestones in 2017 (Reference presentation 4.1).

Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) presented the Modified Scope Approach to implementing the new Job Audits without increasing the time or cost of the current audits. (Reference presentation 4.2). Lance Loeks broke up the AC 7118 checklist to three basic sections and showed how the revisions that would be presented was verifying that we were flowing down the requirements within AS9100 Revision D. The Modified Scope Process utilizes the concept of a “Smart Checklist”. The initial, first and second reaccreditation audits using the “Standard” checklist. The third and later audits use the “Modified Scope”. The Modified Scope removes specific questions and job audits removed from Standard checklist (greyed out) and the new modified scope Job Audits would be added. Every 3rd audit uses the “Standard” checklist.

New Job Audits would be Digital Product Definition, First Article Inspection, Operator Self-Verification, Laser Ply Projector, ATL/AFP Calibration, NC Cutter Calibration.

Modified Scope Areas would revise Receiving Inspection to only one Job Audit, Choose One for Machining and Drilling, remove hand ply-cutting and remove Sections 5 through 9 for questions. Also, adding Freezers and Storage, Autoclave and Oven TUS and Preventive Maintenance.

Summary is we are changing from a Merit based process to a Modified Scope process (Reference presentation 4.3). Equipment would be added as Measurement and Inspection equipment would require calibration and then with manufacturing equipment that was not used as inspection media, you will have verification and maintenance.

For the Laser Ply Projection Machine two questions were revised for repaired, adjusted or modified equipment and for targets used during ply projection.

For Automated Ply Cutter Machine, the word Calibration was revised to Validated unless the question was related to measurement and inspection processes. Also, addressed questions for stacked plies allowed to be cut and then added a question for contoured ply cutting beds with an N/A for flat beds.

Karen Quinn (Orbital ATK – Aerospace Structures Division) had some concerns and the Sub-Team will revisit her concerns with the new information discussed at the meeting and Ms. Quinn will update here comments to be more specific and with better supporting information.

Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) then presented the new Job Audit Questions for the new Sections presented previously. (Reference presentation 4.4) There are many questions to review and so PRI will distribute these questions for comment to the Voting Members of the Task Group. The major sections were as follows:

* General
* Laser Ply Projection Machine
  + Software Control
  + Calibration
  + Validation Checks
  + Part Setup
  + Prime Approval
* Automated Ply Cutter
  + Software Control
  + Validation Prior to Production and Maintenance Check
  + Validation Checks
  + Ply Marking
  + Part Setup
  + Prime Approval
* Automated Tape Layup Machine & Automated Fiber Placement
  + Software Control
  + Validation Prior to Production and Maintenance Check
  + Validation Checks
  + Part Setup
  + Prime Approval

ACTION ITEM: PRI to distribute Presentation 4.4 “Modified Scope Questions” to the Voting and Non-Voting members of the Task Group for review with comments due back to PRI or the Sub-Team within one month of being sent. (Due Date: 30-Apr-2017)

Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) then presented the “Grey Questions” which would not be answered during a modified scope audit. (Reference presentation 4.5) Greyed questions are to be answered in the event a nonconformance is identified during the audit. Applicable Sections to be “greyed” are:

* Section 5 – Material Control
* Section 6 – Facilities and Equipment
* Section 7 – Tooling
* Section 8 – General Fabrication Procedures
* Section 9 – Trimming and Drilling

***ACTION ITEM: Sub-Team from Action Item 243 Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) (Lead) et. al) to review the list of ‘greyed” questions and compare them to the Top 10 NCRs from 2015 and 2016. If a “greyed” question is in the Top 10, then the Sub-Team shall verify if the question is repeated elsewhere in the checklist and provide evidence to this effect. Sub-Team to report out this information during the June 2017 Nadcap Meeting in Berlin, Germany. (Due Date: 1-Jun-2017)***

***ACTION ITEM: PRI to distribute Presentation 4.5 “Greyed Question Criteria” to the Voting and Non-Voting members of the Task Group for review with comments due back to PRI or the Sub-Team within one month of being sent (Due Date: 30-Apr-2017)***

# autoclave inspection software validation – open



Sub-team to develop Handbook Clarification for AC7118 question 4.3.1 for validation of autoclave inspection software, inspection spread sheets, and other product acceptance equipment, and determine if further questions are necessary.

Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) stated that Nadcap began identifying an industry issue of supplier utilizing product acceptance software for autoclaves without validating before production use. The future is only going to bring more automation and Nadcap saw the opportunity to assist with the expectation of compliance.

Lance Loeks (Boeing Company) presented the handbook clarification proposal which is given in Presentation 5.0 “Software Validation”. The presentation highlighted the following topics for the Handbook clarification:

* Compliance and alternative processes
* Commercial Off-the-Shelf Product Acceptance Software (PAS)
* Commercial Off-the-Shelf Computer Aided Manufacturing Software (CAM) (also known as numerical control (NC))
* Supplier Developed Software
* Recommended Practices
* Specific Guidance for Autoclave PAS – What is verified by PAS and what is verified by Quality is very key.
* Additional Autoclave Compliance
* New Question for Formulas
  + 4.x Are supplier developed formulas validated and protected prior to use?
  + Handbook Clarification is noted within the presentation.

***ACTION ITEM: PRI to distribute the word version of Presentation 5.0 “Software Validation” to the Voting and Non-Voting members of the Task Group for review with comments due back to PRI or the Sub-Team within one month of being sent. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

# supplier support committee report



**Quorum was re-established after lunch with 08 Subscribing Voting Members**

# ac7118 sections 9 & 22: media grit and cutting tool specification – open



The checklist currently lacks any questions specifically addressing cutter type or sanding media. It was felt that adding this in Section 9 would address both manual and CNC operations. This section is currently titled “Trimming and Drilling”, Section 9 will need to be re-titled “Machining, Trimming, and Drilling”.

The following two questions and Handbook clarifications were proposed:

* Question: 9.7 Is the cutting tool used as specified by the customer or internal documented procedure? YES NO
* Handbook Guidance: The tool used must match the customer specification. It shall be verified that the tool is changed at the frequency specified by the customer if required. This may be demonstrated by CNC program control, tool use log, etc.… If the customer specification is silent, the tool used shall be verified to match internal documented procedure requirements.
* Question: 9.8 Is the sanding media grit and type as specified by the customer or internal documented procedure? YES NO
* Handbook Guidance: Sanding media or file type used for edge dressing, core shaping or other processes shall match the grit size and type or file grade specified by the customer. If the customer specification is silent, the sanding media shall match the internal documented procedure requirements.

Discussion ensued on the Handbook clarification for question 9.7 and how it is defined when a tool is changed, and how much control do we expect from the suppliers? If the customer requires this, then that is the end of the story. If the Supplier deems it necessary, they will have internal procedure to follow and if all is silent, then they must meet the visual requirements and NDI requirements of the engineering definition. The question is not to dictate what the Supplier must do, but to do what you documented within your own procedure.

A motion was made by Randy Armstrong (Raytheon Company) and was seconded by Angelina Mendoza (UTC Goodrich) to add Questions 9.7 and 9.8 and the applicable Handbook clarification, as written above, to the next revision of AC7118.

**18 Green (Yea), 3 Yellow (Waive), 0 Red (Nay) - The motion passed and is approved.**

***ACTION ITEM: PRI to add Questions 9.7 and Questions 9.8 and the applicable Handbook clarification as documented in the meeting minutes above into AC7118 and AH7118 at the next revision. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

# thermal uniformity survey (tus) and ac7118 – open



Should TUS be a baseline requirement, even if the customer does not require it? This may be a Standard Industry Practice but this is not a requirement, but more than likely, it may be associated with a Subscribing Voting Member requirement. There was a long discussion on how the current question can be met with the Auditor not being a pyrometry expert to determine if their method of system accuracy to ensure requirements are met. The discussion went to we cannot impose new requirements, but was argued that you are validating that you are meeting current requirements.

It was proposed to keep the question as is, and then update the Handbook Clarification with examples of other acceptable methods that can be used in lieu of a TUS. This was debated and questions were asked how tool surveys without TUSs would work. Jason Adams of Lockheed Martin provided examples of how this is used within the aerospace industry.

It is proposed to revise Paragraph 6.4.1 as follows:

Do Instrument System Check (ISC) and Thermal Uniformity Survey (TUS) comply with customer requirements or internal requirements? YES NO NA

A motion was made by Arno Toelkes (Euro-Composites) and was seconded by Angelina Mendoza (UTC Goodrich) to add Paragraph 6.4.1 as written above, to the next revision of AC7118.

**17 Green (Yea), 5 Yellow (Waive), 1 Red (Nay) - The motion passed and is approved.**

***ACTION ITEM: Sub-Team Scott Palmer (Rolls-Royce) (Lead), Eric Lefort (Sonaca), Monica Alcala (Honeywell Aerospace), Jim Weishampel (DuPont de Nemours and Company), Gordon Cameron (LMI Aerospace), Bruce Fuhrmann (Meggitt Polymers and Composites) shall revise Handbook Clarification for the newly revised Paragraph 6.4.1 as passed by the Motion above and present their collaboration during the June 2017 Nadcap Meeting in Berlin, Germany. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

# ac7118 and testing specimen preparation – open



* AC7118 Paragraph 10.1.7 currently reads:

Are specimens prepared in accordance with customer requirements or internal documentation where no customer requirements exist? YES NO

This question has no handbook clarification.

* Is the task group expectation that the suppliers demonstrate specimen prep, that is the Auditor needs to conduct a job audit? No this is not our expectation.
* Or is the expectation a procedure review? This is up to the Supplier and we will leave it ambiguous.
* Do we need a handbook clarification to explicitly state the task group expectations? No, it will be left as it currently stands.

The discussion revolved around did we expect a “Job Audit” for this question, and the consensus was no. The auditors are not consistent with how they are auditing to this question. This was discussed the most. Natalia Becerra Pozo (Exova) suggested to look at AH7122-I to see if we have any clarifications in this checklist, and the answer was the question is spread among multiple questions and the clarifications were too fractured to use in this case.

It was proposed to leave the question status quo, and we are comfortable with the amount of ambiguity that exists.

The consensus was to leave the Handbook clarification as is.

# silicone processing segregation – open



Andreas Mastorakis (GE Aviation) presented the proposed questions for addressing Silicone Contamination Prevention and how to control this issue within a facility that has scope accreditations to AC7118.

It was noted that the silicone that is of concern is the uncured version and not pressure sensitive tapes, cured mandrels and tooling. Change question one as a statement for the section and if no, then it would be a Section NA.

***ACTION ITEM: PRI to distribute the word version of Presentation 10.0 “Silicone Questions” to the Voting and Non-Voting members of the Task Group for review with comments due back to PRI or the Sub-Team within one month of being sent. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

# open discussion



**Topic 1: Supplier Procedures translated to English**

Airbus currently has a requirement and other subscribers may also require procedures from suppliers when English is not the native language.

Is the expectation that Nadcap auditors enforce this requirement?

How is this requirement flowed to the supplier?

Should we add a checklist question to verify this?

A motion was made by Javier Garcia-Baeza (Airbus) and was seconded by Kevin Dowling (Spirit AeroSystems) to add a question concerning Nadcap validation of dual language requirements as flow-downed by contract within AC7118.

**2 Green (Yea), 8 Yellow (Waive), 16 Red (Nay) - The motion failed and will not be added to the checklists at this time.**

**Topic 2: Re-evaluation of Capabilities to our audit duration.**

Kevin Dowling (Spirit AeroSystems) raised the issue that with the addition of adhesive bonding, ATL/AFP separation of capabilities and oven cure as capabilities, the audit duration has not been reviewed (sfrm15 and sfr16) with these revisions.

Since most Misc. Bonding Audits require curing, this pulls an oven audit into the capability list. Kevin Dowling (Spirit AeroSystems) proposed adding cure questions to the Misc. Bonding Job Audit.

***ACTION ITEM: Kevin Dowling (Spirit AeroSystems) will develop checklist questions for adding cure questions to the Misc. Bonding Job Audit and present the proposed revisions to the checklists at the June 2017 Nadcap Meeting in Berlin, Germany. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

***ACTION ITEM: Tara Campbell (Rolls-Royce) shall review the AC7118 Revision E and s-frm-15 and s-frm-16 and review the impact to the capability count to the current audit structure and the durations required and if this has an effect on the current supplier base. Ms. Campbell shall also address if Adhesive Bonding should require its own capability. A presentation and recommendation shall be presented at the June 2017 Nadcap Meeting in Berlin, Germany. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

**Topic 3: OP 1119 Revision**

OP 1119 was revised to state “If N/A answers are permissible, the circumstances where N/A is allowed should be documented in the Audit Criteria or Audit Handbook”.

The Task Group agrees we need to review the documents and see where we are.

***ACTION ITEM: Sub-Team Angelina Mendoza (UTC Goodrich) (Lead), Monica Alcala (Honeywell Aerospace), Bruce Fuhrmann (Meggitt Polymers and Composites) will review the questions within AC7118 that have an N/A, but there is no associated rational for it in the handbook. Presentation to be given at the June 2017 Nadcap Meeting in Berlin, Germany. (Due Date: 31-May-2017)***

# meeting close out

ADJOURNMENT – 21-Feb-2017 – Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: John Key, jkey2@bh.com

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| \*\*\*\*\* For PRI Staff use only: \*\*\*\*\*\*  Are procedural/form changes required based on changes/actions approved during this meeting? (select one)  YES\*  NO  \*If yes, the following information is required: | | |
| Documents requiring revision: | Who is responsible: | Due date: |
| AC7118 and AH7118 | PRI | 31-May-2017 |
|  |  |  |