**CONFIRMED MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 24, 2016**

**PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA, 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.**

**MONDAY, 24-OCT-16**

# OPENING COMMENTS

## Call to Order / Quorum Check

The Composites (COMP), Non Metallic Materials Manufacturing (NMMM), and Non Metallic Materials Testing (NMMT) Task Groups (TG) was called to order at 8:00 AM, 24-Oct.-2016.

It was verified that only SUBSCRIBER MEMBERS were in attendance during the closed portion of the meeting.

A quorum was established with the following representatives in attendance:

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME |  | COMPANY NAME |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pongpaiboon | Akapaiboon | Triumph Structures (Thailand) Ltd. |  |
| \* | Douglas | Armstrong | GE Aviation |  |
| \* | Randy | Armstrong | Raytheon Company |  |
|  | Marcus | Berry | Hill AFB |  |
| \* | Pam | Blevins | General Dynamics |  |
| \* | Tawny | Blumenshine | Cessna Aircraft Company |  |
| \* | James | Cobb | Honeywell Aerospace |  |
|  | Bob | Dawson | Honeywell Aerospace |  |
| \* | Joseph | DeVirgilio | Boeing |  |
| \* | Kevin | Dowling | Spirit AeroSystems |  |
| \* | Patrick | Dunleavy | SAFRAN |  |
| \* | Javier | Garcia-Baeza | AIRBUS |  |
| \* | Brett | Hemingway | BAE SYSTEMS, MAI |  |
|  | John | Hrycushko | Bell Helicopter |  |
| \* | John | Key | Bell Helicopter | Secretary |
| \* | Ronald | Kramer | Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. |  |
|  | Slade | Knightly | US Air Force |  |
| \* | Lance | Loeks | The Boeing Company |  |
| \* | Andreas | Mastorakis | GE Aviation |  |
| \* | Angelina | Mendoza | UTC Aerospace (Goodrich) |  |
| \* | Larry | Olsen | Northrop Grumman |  |
|  | Ashley | O'Shea | The Boeing Company |  |
|  | Scott | Palmer | Rolls-Royce Corp. |  |
| \* | Richard | Perrett | GKN Aerospace Filton | Vice Chairperson |
| \* | Jefferson | Silva | Embraer |  |
| \* | Mario | Simard | Bombardier |  |
|  | Ross | Smelser | General Dynamics |  |
| \* | Sally | Spindor | Triumph Group |  |
| \* | Konstantina | Stefanidou | Honeywell Aerospace |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME |  | COMPANY NAME |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Keith | Panuska | PRI |  |

***PRI Staff Present***

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

## Review Safety Information

## Review Code of Ethics and Meeting Conducts

## Present Antitrust Video

## Review Agenda

# review delegation status – CLOSED



John Tibma presented his data for oversight of his delegation status for the COMP Task Group. The Task Group is performing an over sight of 64% and his concurrence rate is at 96.9% with 3 out of 149 total Nonconformance Reports (NCRs) rejected for further review.

John Tibma disagrees with one of the rejections to his disposition Audit 169499 NCR #6 as the handbook and checklist do not address quality software (quality card system) and the Boeing representative rejected this as something Boeing wants but not addressed by the Task Group in either the checklist or the handbook

Motion made by Richard Perrett (GKN Aerospace) and seconded by Lance Loeks (Boeing) to not count the Audit 169499 NCR #6 rejection against the Staff Engineer. A vote was taken: 16 Green (Yea), 0 Yellow (Waive), 0 Red (Nay) - The motion passed.

Harry Coffee is the Consultant Reviewer for the COMP Task Group and is delegated. The Task Group is performing an over sight of his work at 70%, and he had a concurrence rate of 84%.

Due to the fact that Harry Coffee fell below 85%, his delegation has to be suspended and a corrective action plan has to be implemented.

**As a corrective action, Harry Coffee has resigned from the position of Consultant Reviewer and will no longer be reviewing audits once he completes his currently assigned audits.**

Dave Kennedy will be trained as an Audit Consultant Reviewer.

John Tibma then presented the data for his and our newest consultant reviewer for AC 7122, Betty Koscis, who is not delegated. The Task Group is performing an over sight of her work at 100% (as required), and she had a concurrence rate of 100%. NMMT for John Tibma was 100% concurrence.

John Tibma presented his data for oversight of his delegation status for the NMMM Task Group. The Task Group is performing an over sighting at 62.5% (5 out of 8) and his concurrence rate is at 40% with 3 out of 5 total NCRs rejected for further review.

John Tibma disagreed with the three NCRs that were rejected from Audit 171037:

Motion made by Richard Perrett (GKN Aerospace) and seconded by Lance Loeks (Boeing) to not count the Audit 171037 NCR #1 rejection against the Staff Engineer. A vote was taken: 17 Green (Yea), 3 Yellow (Waive), 1 Red (Nay) - Motion passed. This NCR will not be counted against Mr. Tibma’s status.

Motion made by Lance Loeks (Boeing) and seconded by Richard Perrett (GKN Aerospace) to count the Audit 171037 NCR #2 rejection against the Staff Engineer. A vote was taken: 1 Green (Yea), 17 Yellow (Waive), 0 Red (Nay) - Motion passed. This item will count against John Tibma’s count.

Motion made by Jason Adams (Lockheed Martin) and seconded by Brett Hemingway (BAE Systems) to not count the Audit 171037 NCR #3 rejection against the Staff Engineer. A vote was taken: 17 Green (Yea), 2 Yellow (Waive), 1 Red (Nay) - Motion passed. This NCR will not be counted against Mr. Tibma’s status.

OP 1115 was reviewed. Review period is not defined, only the number of times the data is to be reviewed using t-frm-07. The t-frm-07 has four tabs, 3 for each ‘quarter’s’ data, and one for year-to-date data. Using the year to date data through 30-Sep-2016 yields a concurrence rate of 94.7% (18-19).

Motion made by Andreas Mastorakis (GE Aviation) and seconded by Angelina Mendoza (UTC Goodrich) to count the year to date from t-frm-07 (which include NCR data that results in an 18 of 19 acceptance rate, 94.7%) due to the limited number of data points during the 2nd ‘quarter’. This was interpreted as meeting the review requirements of OP 1115. 17 Green (Yea), 0 Yellow (Waive), 0 Red (Nay) - Motion passed. John Tibma’s delegation for NMMM will not be suspended and Corrective Action will not be required.

John Tibma presented his Delegation Maintenance Status:

AC7118 01-Feb-2016 – 30-Sep-2016 - 119 Audits, 379 NCRs

AC7122 01-Feb-2016 – 30-Sep-2016 - 11 Audits, 21 NCRs

AC7124 01-Feb-2015 – 30-Sep-2016 - 11 Audits, 26 NCRs

Observed COMP Audit 169423

Requirements – Work 10 audits and 30 NCRs and observe 1 audit

This was reviewed with the Task Group and maintenance of this requirement was documented.

John Tibma provided information that the Task Group Appendix would be “stripped” of all non-technical data and that the Task Group will need to review what is being removed and decided whether we will let the information be removed, ask to add the requirement to the upper level documents, or defend the requirement remain within the Appendix. This will be coming within the next few meetings.

# comp/nmmm/nmmt auditor performance review – CLOSED

Data was reviewed and auditors identified as requiring observation audits.

Observation audit reports were reviewed and discussed. Only one Does Not Meets was identified and had been discussed with the auditor at the Auditor Conference during the ‘face to face’ evaluation.

# auditor consistency sub-team report out – CLOSED

Action item 219 caused the creation of a presentation to show classification training presentation by scope/checklist and formalize the method for removing restrictions from auditors.

Functional Excellence program proposal to incorporate a widely used 70:20:10 scheme and is documented within the presentation. The training information was adapted to support the 70:20:10 scheme as part of the 10% comes from training. A matrix was presented that showed the relationships between the scopes of the auditors and the training requirements that have been presented and each one is cross-referenced to the applicable procedures and sections of the relative checklists.

The 70% is recognized through experience and is done with the T1 and T2 training audits. The auditors can join industry committees and the auditor conference and the auditors getting involved with Task Group teams and action items.

The 20% is recognized to come through relationships involving soft skills while working with each other and querying each other on now to write NCRs, handle difficult suppliers, grouping of NCRs, etc. This is informal and something they have developed themselves over the years of being in the program. There is nothing in the contract or the General Auditors Handbook about a responsibility to formally mentor auditors, but maybe we should develop a new auditor (protégé) to audit to lead auditor and finally to training auditor (mentor).

Lance Loeks (Boeing) brought up a request to look at developing a “Functional Excellence Program” for the auditors? John Tibma made a comment that we need to develop a method for removing a restriction from an auditor (i.e. if an auditor is restricted from Core Processing audit, what do they need to do to get this Scope added to their audit ability?) Mr. Tibma stated that when we interview and note the deficiencies, then we decide what to do to make the deficiencies “go away” with training. Need to formalize this process. Currently, they must review them all and we ask if this was reviewed or not. Now, we need to do a test to validate if the information is being absorbed and learned within the system.

Discussion ensued on how to make this program something permanent within the PRI system. How do we determine who can or cannot be a mentor and how are they compensated for this task. Formalize the training process and who are our training auditors. John Tibma notified the Task Group that we essentially have only two training auditors as of this time, Steve Hayzlett and David Kennedy, as noted from Task Group discussion over the years on who is doing a good job and who is providing the Task Group the best service. We also want to formalize the process of auditor-to-auditor communication so that unity can be achieved when good responses are given and can be distributed among the auditor database. PRI wants to make the Mentor as the gate-keeper to avoid stifling the flow of communication for new auditors who do not want to affect their career opportunities based on the questions and queries that they have.

It was suggested that an informal mentoring program be enacted with the mentors reporting out to John Tibma on the general issues and advice that was given. This is now leading towards getting the auditor to do more work with no pay, and they believe they are currently underpaid and under-appreciated. We currently give them more money for Auditor/Lead Auditor/Training Auditor, but there is nothing for being a mentor.

John Tibma then presented the data of Supplier Comments from the audits conducted during the time between our meetings.

All feedback was generally positive from the suppliers concerning their audit experiences. Many of the auditors were called out by name and would be welcomed back to the facility.

John Tibma presented the data for the audits for the rest of 2016 fiscal year and 2017 fiscal year. This data was also sent to the Subscribing Voting Members by e-mail earlier this month.

John Tibma provided the list of audits and highlighted the ones that have the auditors we should try and concentrate on.

# supplier maturity rating – CLOSED

Lance Loeks asked the question “Should we pilot the use of a simple form for the auditors to complete in order to assess supplier maturity rating?” The form would rate the following:

- Procedure Implementation

- Facility

- Management of Change Principles

Maturity could be rated as Bronze, Silver and Gold

Maturity could be used to supplement Supplier Merit determinations (with applicable procedure revisions)

This could also be noted within the Nadcap QML listings

Discussion occurred but did not gain much traction as it is a very subjective and opinionated system based on multiple auditor observations of the supplier.

Javier Garcia-Baeza (Airbus) commented that we need a longitudinal trending data for each supplier as a forward-looking merit and maturity rating opportunity. John suggested a standard report that would allow the subscribers to review the trend analysis of their suppliers. Patrick Dunleavy (SAFRAN) commented that the Nadcap program was not sold as they are being classified against the entire Nadcap Supplier base by the auditors. This comparison may or not be fair based on the complexity of the work and the amount of work they do for the industry.

Jason Adams (Lockheed Martin) suggests that the subscribers would have the ability to have an SAP report created that they could create an internal system of maturity rating and each company can make their own internal rating program. Jason is against the system for maturity rating.

Andreas Mastorakis (GE Aviation) states a program based on purely Nadcap data and where you stand within the database, but is the database fair and why would we not raise the bar for what it takes to be a Nadcap Supplier and make everyone Gold?

Lance Loeks (Boeing) thinks this will raise the awareness of the suppliers and make them attempt to approve. It was argued that this is a noble idea, but we could be creating an issue.

The summary. Maturity rating – No. Data Mining with a Standard Report for a tool to analyze your data for NCR information for your suppliers – Yes!!!

It was later determined that subscribers currently have the ability generate reports from eAuditNet that provide this data using SAP Business Objects. Training on this functionality will be scheduled during the February 2017 closed Nadcap Meeting.

# open discussion – CLOSED

**Topic 1: Succession Plan**

**Richard Perrett will be taking over as Chairperson October 2019. We need to select a Vice Chairperson to serve with Richard.**

The Task Group was non-committal due to the time commitment out through 2023 and they would need to speak to company leadership to verified their individual program commitments within their company.

**Topic 2: CAM Manufacturing Risk Mitigation team Volunteers**

**A team is required and must be formed by 25-Oct.-2016. They currently work to Boeing and Lockheed Martin specification for a third party.**

Volunteers – Jason Adams (Lockheed Martin) (Lead)

Marcus Berry (Hill Air Force Base)

**Topic 3: Human Factors**

**Lance Loeks commented that AS9100 now allows human factors as part of the Root Cause/Corrective Actions. Does the Task Group want to allow this to be something that our Staff Engineer accepts.**

John Tibma commented that once you allow this, it is abused and every issue and RCCA process through a Supplier will be considered a Human Factor issue. There is legitimate use of this as there are human errors (90%/10%) within any process or operations involving people.

The Task Group believes our Staff Engineer should not allow Human Factors at this time.

**Topic 4: Root Cause/Corrective Action Effectiveness**

Lance Loeks stated that we should limit the time for the verification of effectiveness for any RCCA with the knowledge that there are atypical situations that could be a longer time frame.

Konstantina Stefanidou (Honeywell Aerospace) brought up the 30/60/90 rule used at her company, and from that and Angelina Mendoza (UTC Goodrich) comments that things could be shorter and longer depending on the severity and scale of the finding, PRI proposed the following:

“Verification audit between 30-90 days is Task Group expectation. Objective evidence of audit schedule or other follow-up verification tools is expected.”

The Task Group gave a general consensus of approval of requesting this be a focus on future audits.

ACTION ITEM: John Tibma will add ‘verification of previous audit corrective actions’ topic to 2017 Auditors Conference Agenda (Due Date: 22-Oct-2017)

ADJOURNMENT – 24-Oct-2016 – Meeting was adjourned at 3:25 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: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |