



2023 Quality Summit - Rules 6th Edition

Questions Answered During Summit

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Who is responsible to input a corrective action in CMS (Complaint Management System)? CB's or Suppliers?	The expectation is the organization should be entering their corrective action response in the IATF Complaint Management System (CMS) through the portal. However, in exceptional circumstance, the certification body can also enter the details on behalf of the organization.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Can IATF CMS be used for complaints about CB performance?	No. The organization has a contract with the certification body for the audit services so any complaints about CB performance (or service) should be directed to the certification body to allow them to address the problem. If the organization is not satisfied with the outcome it can be escalated to the relevant Oversight office. If there are any ethic concerns those can be filed using the IATF Ethics and Compliance button on the IATF website.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
<p>Can you explain in more detail the changes to Section 8?</p> <p>Will the OEM's be using the IATF CA system exclusively for all non-Conformances/customer complaints?</p>	<p>The high level details for Rules 6th Edition section 8 (related to performance complaints) are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) IATF OEMs who want to file quality and/or delivery performance complaints will do so using the IATF CMS (Complaint Management System). 2) The certification body will need to conduct a special audit to investigate the performance complaint received. 3) If the certificate is suspended, the organization shall submit their response in the IATF CMS and the certification body shall review and approve it. 4) A special audit is required to verify the effective implementation of the approved corrective actions. This could result in reinstatement (lift suspension) of the certificate or withdraw of the certificate. 5) If the certificate is reinstated but there is not enough performance data to show sustained improvement in performance, the certification body shall conduct another special audit (about 3 months after lifting suspension) to ensure the improvement is occurring. If there is no sustained improvement, the certificate will be withdrawn.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
<p>If a CB has not scheduled your audit because lack of auditors would you still have your certification suspended?</p>	<p>When a surveillance audit is delayed, Rules 5th Edition requires the certificate to be suspended. If the audit could not be scheduled due to lack of CB resources, IAOb would not expect an IAOb CB to suspend the client's certificate. This is handled through the waiver process between the CB and relevant Oversight office.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Will big tech companies such as Apple, Samsung, Panasonic, Sony, etc. Be eligible for IATF 16949 certification, since they'll be Major suppliers in the industry?	Yes, if those organizations manufacturer products that meet the Eligibility requirements for IATF 16949 and they choose to be certified or are required to be certified by their customer.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
If a warehouse conducts incoming and shipping inspection; is this considered extended manufacturing site? * Control plans include incoming and shipping inspection.	No. It would be considered a remote support location to a manufacturing site(s) and would not be considered an extended manufacturing site because they are not manufacturing product. Incoming inspection and shipping does not meet the definition of manufacturing.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
What will it take to keep the current Corp scheme reductions? If auditors do not provide value add audits 20% more time will not accomplish that.	<p>Rules 6th team has flagged this as significant issue from reviewing all the stakeholder feedback from CBs and certified organizations. We will be sharing the feedback with the IATF at an upcoming meeting to determine if any changes will be required.</p> <p>If the additional audit time does not lead to more effective audits, the organization should discuss it with their certification body.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Last year you discussed that the audit days would change based on your customer performance, is this still the plan?	No. Risk based audit days methodology will not be fully incorporated into Rules 6th Edition.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
How the new corporate scheme reduction of 15% affect suppliers with multiple sites that are mid cycle (i.e., Surveillance 1 or 2) and already have a 30% reduction?	The changes will be applied for any audit conducted after the effective date of the Rules 6th Edition. The effective date has not been announced. The IATF will consider the impact of this change in reduction when determining the effective implementation date and any deviations will be explained in a Stakeholder Communique this should be published by year end 2023.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Would you consider automatic notification of suspended certificates to Tier 1, like how the IATF OEMs are notified?	Interesting concept. The IAOb would need to bring this to the IATF for consideration.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
What is being done to solve the shortage of auditors? IAOB - testing requirements are being changed?	<p>The AIAG is working to confirm more third-party CB auditor training in Q4 2023 and 2024. The IAOB is supporting those sessions as well. We are working with the Certification Bodies to recruit top talent.</p> <p>The materials will be refreshed with new versions of training and exams, to include Rules 6 updates. At this time, the testing requirements laid out in Rules 5th edition (SI3) are not planned to be changed in Rules 6th edition.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Can a company be certified to IATF 16949 without an actual automotive mass production?	No, those organizations would be required to have a Letter of Conformance. To be IATF 16949 certified, the organization needs 12 months worth of internal and external performance data.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Many Tier 1 suppliers have cross border warehouses (USA/Mexico) that are now classified as RSL's. With the new 10 mile or 1 hour rule, how is that justification for full audits due to just being outside of the new rule.	A warehouse (without any manufacturing activities) in a different country (e.g., just across the border) are remote support locations and not considered to be an extended manufacturing site. Therefore, the 10 mile and no more than 1 hour drive is not applicable.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Knowing there is already a shortage of CB auditors why did IATF choose to prohibit remote audit of design centers if the design process is entirely computer based?	Any potential or perceived CB auditor shortage was not a factor in the reason IATF limited the remote auditing methods in Rules 6th Edition. The IATF prohibited the remote auditing in cases where there is product and material handling and product design activities. They view product design activities as a significant part of product realization process and expect this to be conducted onsite.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Is there any planned change in audit day table (based on # of peoples)?	No significant changes planned in Rules 6th Table 5.2.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Regarding the 100% resolved nonconformity rule, does this apply to majors or both majors and minors?	100% resolved is an exceptional circumstance and depending on the situation could be applied to issues related to major and minor nonconformities.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Why does IAOB have their own performance complaint website outside of the IATF CMS?	The "Performance Complaint" button on the IAOB website is used to support non-IATF OEM organizations in filing an appropriate performance complaint against their IATF 16949-certified supplier if they are having ongoing quality and/or delivery issues. IAOB will work with the organization to determine if a performance complaint should be filed or not. If so, the complaint is filed in the IATF Complaint Management System (CMS) and is not handled outside of the IATF CMS system now.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Now that an organization may lose a certificate if the audit planning material is not provided in the required timing, will IATF provide a common audit planning form to ensure that risk is equal across CB's? Some require significantly more pre data than others.	Standardized audit planning form is currently not an IATF objective for 2024. Previously, a team was working on common audit plan and audit planning form in CARA (CB Common Audit Report Application), but the project was put on hold due to other higher priorities by the IATF. However, Annex 3 does provide the minimum requirements for audit planning form content.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Has NC MGMT rules for major been changed to only require evidence of containment in 15 days and the RC and CAPA due at a later time? What is the timing?	<p>For a major nonconformance, the organization shall submit within 15 calendar days of the closing meeting, implemented containment action and their effectiveness, implemented correction, root cause analysis (including methodology used, the results and impact on other processes and products), systemic corrective action plan.</p> <p>Within 60 days of the closing meeting, the organization shall submit evidence of implementation of the systemic corrective actions and the verification results.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Is pre audit planning information also required for RSL? If yes, is it also required 30 days ahead of the audit?	Yes, however, not all of the required items would be applicable.

Question For: 7.3 virtual Auditing	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Mention yesterday that design functions will not be eligible for remote auditing. I'm trying to better understand because it is a conference room session and in a centrally managed QMS, it is the only way to audit the entire end-end process.	There was several stakeholder feedback items asking the same question. The Rules 6th team will be taking this feedback to the IATF to see if they would be willing to allow product design functions to be audited remotely.

Questions Answered After Summit

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
With a notable current lack of IATF auditors, how will the CBs be able to support additional audits with the requirement that all remote sites be audited by same CB?	The Rules 6th Edition does not require standalone remote support locations to be audited by the same certification body. It states that <u>only one</u> certification body can have a contract to audit any manufacturing site and/or a standalone remote support location. This means an organization can contract with more than one certification body. For example, an organization can contract with CB A to audit all manufacturing plants in USA and CB B to audit the remote support location and manufacturing sites in Europe. The requirement prohibits more than one CB from auditing the same manufacturing site or the same remote support location.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Has there been any discussion regarding Risk-Based Auditing to reduce time for suppliers with better performance?	There has been no further discussion on this topic since March 2022 and the concept to reduce audit time for good performing suppliers will not be included in Rules 6th Edition.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
I understand the new timing for Major N/C's is to protect the customers from receiving bad product but not all Majors are issued due to that (i.e. repeat of a minor). Will that timing remain the same?	The new timing requirement for major nonconformities applies to all major nonconformities, not just those that are related to actual or probable shipment of nonconforming product.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Which of the following is true for extended manufacturing location? 1. Within 10 miles "and" less than 60 min away? 2. Within 10 miles "or" less than 60 min away?	The current Rules 6th draft language says, within 10 miles <u>and</u> no more than 1 hour drive.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
If a customer approves an EMS beyond 10 miles/60min is this OK?	Any deviations from the 10 miles requirement needs to be approved through a waiver from the relevant Oversight office.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
<p>For Performance complaints from OEMs due to not meeting scorecard requirements.</p> <p>A. It is often NOT reasonable to see effectiveness of CAs with in 60 days due to methods of scorecard calculation.</p> <p>B. 60 Days is not reasonable.</p> <p>C. Are there any plans to address this topic?</p>	<p>Yes, this will be addressed in Rules 6th Edition, section 8.4.1 (Special audit following a suspended certificate). The Rules 6th draft allows the certificate suspension to be lifted following an onsite special audit if the accepted corrective action plan is found to be effectively implemented but there is not enough performance data (since corrective actions were implemented) to show sustained improvement. In this situation, the Rules allows another special audit to be conducted within another 3 months to verify if there is evidence of sustained performance improvement from looking at both internal and external metrics.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
<p>If a current extended manufacturing site decides to house some managers but the QMS belongs to the main manufacturing site, how would they address being certified?</p> <p>Would they be a remote site?</p>	<p>With Rules 6th Edition, the extended manufacturing site can have management personnel located at the extended manufacturing site, as long as, they have responsibility for both the main site and extended manufacturing site. If a current extended manufacturing site does not meet the new criteria in Rules 6th Edition, it would be considered a single manufacturing site that is providing support to another manufacturing site.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
<p>Currently, IATF allows remote audits if there is a COVID related reason. Why wait for Rules 6th release to open up remote auditing?</p>	<p>IATF already permits remote auditing per the IATF Global Waivers and Measure in Response to COVID-19 Pandemic. Rules 6th Edition was originally intended to be released in October 2023 therefore there was no need to issue Rules 5th SIs to allow remote auditing. The release of Rules 6th Edition has been delayed until March 2024 so it is unlikely there will be a Rules 5th SI will be issued after Rules 6th has been approved.</p>

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Can a factory that grows SIC boules be certified to IATF? (similar to growing silicon ingots - not transforming them into wafers) Ex: Creates the starting material.	There are current changes to the Eligibility section in Rules 6th Edition and the answer to this question will be much clearer under Rules 6th Edition.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Do the Rules differentiate between design center and design supporting offices?	No.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Why manufacturing processes names are entered separately in CARA report, although organizations business process does not identify manufacturing processes and names? This is VDA 6.3 process audit style.	To support the business logic in the CARA report the auditor needs to record the shifts times and number of shifts that were audited.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Can you explain the criteria/limitation of "Remote-of-a-Remote" Location?	The remote-of-a-remote concept is new with Rules 6th Edition. The current requirement states that indirect support locations shall be included in the manufacturing site's certification scope if: 1) the manufacturing site and the remote support location(s) cannot meet all the requirements from IATF 16949 without including the indirect support location or 2) the relevant support location(s), function(s), and process(es) are part of the formal or informal quality management system.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Extended manufacturing site - if the distance is more than 10 miles/60 min but they have the same legal entity and management team. How to apply to that site? Should be certified separately or there are some expectations?	If two related manufacturing sites (through legal entity and management team) are greater than 10 miles or greater than 1 hour drive from each other, they would be considered two separate manufacturing sites. They would not be permitted to be a single manufacturing site with an extended manufacturing site.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Is the website IATF cert validation 100% accurate now? Was 30% off before...	The IATF Certificate Validity Check portal should be 100% accurate.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
The current definition of "Manufacturing" would not permit a location that only does inspection (such as warehouse) to be independency certified to IATF 16949.	Correct. A warehouse (with no manufacturing) is considered a remote support location. Inspection (incoming or outgoing) is not considered as meeting the definition of manufacturing.

Question For: Michelle	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
What happened to "Risk Based Audit Days"?	A portion of the risk based audit day concept was included in the Rules 5th Edition, as Sanctioned Interpretation (SI) 26 and carries over into Rules 6th Edition. The other part of the risk based audit day concept was not approved by the IATF to be implemented into Rules 6th Edition.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Is there anything about auditing remote location to remote location?	Yes, it is called a "remote-of-a-remote". The remote-of-a-remote concept is new with Rules 6th Edition draft. The current requirement states that indirect support locations shall be included in the manufacturing site's certification scope if: 1) the manufacturing site and the remote support location(s) cannot meet all the requirements from IATF 16949 without including the indirect support location or 2) the relevant support location(s), function(s), and process(es) are part of the formal or informal quality management system.

Question For:	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
Has the audit timing of the design centers been aligned to match the timing requirements of manufacturing sites to eliminate the potential for mismatch and the need for multiple audits in a single location.	Yes, the current Rules 6th draft states product design functions shall be audited every twelve (12) months (-3/+3 months).

Question For: Michelle	
Question (Briefly Stated):	Answers:
As automobiles now contain more and more software there may be more software design organizations involved in the supply chain. How will a potential increase in virtual sites be considered especially regarding the remote/virtual auditing rules?	Software design organizations would be considered a remote support location to a manufacturing site or a remote to an existing support location. If the software design organization does not have a office with a postal address, it would be audited remotely from another location. The Rule 6th draft currently allows remote audit methods to be used when there are employees who normally work remotely.