CNRMC M-4700.10
13 Jan 14

QUALITY ASSURANCE SPECIALIST

DESK GUIDE

(This page intentionally blank)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
NAVY REGIONAL MAINTENANCE CENTER
9170 SECOND STREET, SUITE 245
NORFOLK, VA 23511-2352

FOREWORD

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3
(b) CNRMC Fleet Desk Guide (FDG)

This Quality Assurance Specialist (QAS) Role-Based Desk Guide (RBDG) provides the QAS with standardized procedures to assist in execution of his or her duties and responsibilities outlined in reference (a). Augmented by reference (b), it contains procedures for executing all phases of the maintenance availability end-to-end (E2E) process. This desk guide is provided as another tool to assist Quality Assurance specialists in the performance of their duties.

This RBDG can be accessed and downloaded through the CNRMC web portal at https: https://dodcac.portal.navy.mil/navsea/CNRMC/fdg/default.aspx. Any recommended changes should be submitted using the change request/feedback form located on the website, or forwarded to:

Commander, Navy Regional Maintenance Center
9170 Second Street, Suite 245
Norfolk, VA 23511-2393
ATTN: Code 710

This Desk Guide is not intended to cover all aspects of quality assurance but is used as a reference for use by the QASs.

W. J. GALINIS

Distribution:

Electronic only, via NRMC intranet
https://dodcac.portal.navy.mil/navsea/CNRMC/fdg/default.aspx

(This page intentionally blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(This page intentionally blank)

PROCEDURE 1

Planning

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3
(b) CNRMCINST 4700.9
(c) Fleet Desk Guide 460 (Work Item Review)

1. Purpose. Provide the procedure and identify responsibilities for performing the planning functions for Project Quality Assurance Specialist (QAS).

2. Discussion. The planning actions required to determine a contractor's compliance with contract requirements shall be systematic and consider the contractual requirements and relative importance of the product.

3. Action

a. Per reference (a) the Project QAS will be the quality advocate for all areas (contractor, Alteration Installation Team (AIT), and I-Level as applicable) of work during the availability and will be responsible for developing and monitoring the accomplishment of the Quality Management Plan (QMP) per reference (b), through the duration of the availability. As the quality advocate, the availability QAS should be focused on managing the present and future, with consideration of past performance and continuing trends and deficiencies as compiled in the Quality Data Evaluation (QDE).

b. The Project QAS shall prepare a Quality Management Plan (QMP) for all Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) availabilities and other availabilities (Continuous Maintenance Availability (CMAV), Window of Opportunity (WOO), etc.) scheduled for six (6) weeks in length or greater. Waterfront Operations shall provide input and assist in determining the specific content of the plan and shall perform assigned duties in regards to the oversight of the contractor during execution. The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for execution of the QMP.

c. A general quality oversight plan is required for all availabilities scheduled less than six (6) weeks in length based on review of the current QDE to identify high risk areas and provide direction for targeted oversight.

d. The Project QAS has the responsibility to support

project management teams in developing the QMP (A-30) and executing the QMP. If any action item of the QMP requires a certain department's support and assistance, the applicable department head or division head shall be notified by routing of the QMP at the start of the availability. All department heads are required to provide support for and endorsement of the QMP to ensure its successful application.

e. The Project QAS participates in Work Item Review per reference (c).

PROCEDURE 2

Procedure Review

Ref: (a) NAVSEA Standard Item 009-09
(b) CNRMCINST 4700.5
(c) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3
(d) FDG 530 (Process Control Procedures)
(e) FDG 730 (Engineering Service Request)
(f) FDG 732 (Condition Found Report)

1. Purpose. To establish the method for verifying that the contractor's documented procedures and written process controls comply with contractual requirements and to provide a standard work flow process for promulgation of contractor-generated PCPs and EPCPs.

2. Discussion

a. Standard items, technical publications/technical manuals, and specific work requirements of the specification invoke the requirements for contractors to develop procedures; Process Control Procedures (PCPs) and Expanded Process Control Procedures (EPCPs). Procedures/PCPs/EPCPs are invoked on specific technical work processes where the performance of inspections and tests alone cannot ensure a quality product.

b. The PCP/EPCP submission requirements for the contractor are contained in references (a) and (b). These requirements allow limited time between submission of the procedure and start of affected work; therefore, expeditious review by the government is required. Procedures may be required by documents other than reference (a). These include: Tech Pub 248, Tech Pub 271, etc.

c. Procedures/PCPs/EPCPs shall be entered into the Quality Audits Automated Information System (QAAIS)/Navy Maintenance Database (NMD) or Quality Assurance (QA) database by the Project Quality Assurance Specialist (QAS).

d. Revisions or corrections to procedures will be required of the contractors, as necessary, to ensure the procedure can be used as a working instruction for the contractor's personnel at the job site.

3. Action

a. All procedures developed by the contractor shall be submitted to the Project QAS for logging, review and distribution to other departments for review as applicable per references (d) and (e). The Project QAS shall forward all deficiencies found to the contractor for correction. The reviewer shall indicate all Procedures/PCPs "Acceptable For Use" or "Unacceptable For Use" as appropriate, and distribute copies. EPCPs shall be signed for review and approval in accordance with the requirements of reference (b). If the procedure is re-submitted with uncorrected deficiencies, the Project QAS will issue the contractor a Method A Corrective Action Request (CAR) per reference (c). If the procedure is still unacceptable after the issuance of a Method A CAR, the QAS shall elevate the CAR to a Method B.

b. The QA Department shall maintain a listing of approved procedures, submitted by each Multi-Ship/Multi-Option, Master Ship Repair Agreement, Agreement for Boat Repair (MSMO/MSRA/ABR), Commercial Industrial Services (CIS) and Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contractor in QAAIS, NMD or other QA database as applicable.

(1) Review standard procedures required by the work specifications and maintain a copy on file.

(2) Enter all procedures/PCPs/EPCPs into QAAIS, NMD or other QA database as applicable upon receipt. EPCPs will be entered into a separate tracking log in accordance with reference (b) and maintained by the Project Support Engineer or other engineering department representative as designated by the Chief Engineer (CHENG).

(3) Review all PCPs/EPCPs to the requirements of references (a) and (b) as applicable. For those PCPs specifically designated by Code 130, or whenever assistance is required, the PCP will then be sent to the applicable code(e.g. Code 106 or Code 200) within the Regional Maintenance Center (RMC). The applicable code will then review the PCP and provide any comments back to the Project QAS for action. When the PCP is determined to be acceptable, the Project QAS will stamp and sign the PCP as approved. The routing/review/approval process for EPCPs will be as specified in reference (b). If the PCP is submitted in NMD as an attachment and there are no discrepancies noted by reviewers, it may be approved via the Condition Found Report(CFR) under which it is submitted. Per reference (f), the PM answers all CFRs including approving a PCP.

(4) Once the procedure/PCP/EPCP is approved, inform the contractor and a copy is maintained for use by the Project Team. If submitted in NMD, the contractor will receive notice of approval via NMD CFR answer.

(This page intentionally blank)

PROCEDURE 3

Procedure Evaluation

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3

1. Purpose. To establish and assign responsibilities for verifying the contractor is complying with the written quality procedures and the procedures are accomplishing the intended purpose of controlling product quality.

2. Discussion

a. Procedure Evaluation (PE) is defined as the comparison of a written procedure/process to the actual work at the job site to determine if the procedure is being followed. This can be performed as one complete evaluation from start to finish or can be performed as one or more partial evaluations. NOTE, the complete evaluation of the procedure is not required as this will often be resource limiting. PE is accomplished by the cognizant QA representative (QAS, Shipbuilding Specialist (SBS), or Environmental Safety & Health (ESH)) by physical evaluation, examination, concurrent witnessing, or monitoring of various aspects of the process.

b. PE shall be conducted utilizing standard PE Attribute Lists from the CNRMC portal. The Attribute List shall be used as a tool to support the evaluation but is not intended to limit the scope of the evaluation.

3. Action

a. Conducting and Recording of PE shall be conducted and recorded as follows:

(1) QAS determines critical areas in the production process by shipboard evaluation, interface with the SBS and contractor to determine PE scheduling.

(2) The QA Representative performs in-process evaluations using PE Attribute Lists associated with the procedure being evaluated.

(3) Initiate Corrective Action (CA), if required, in accordance with Volume VII, Chapter 11, paragraph 11.5.6. of reference (a).

(4) Inform the PM and cognizant contractor representative of any nonconformities discovered during the evaluation.

(5) The results of all PE will be entered into QAAIS/NMD or the QA database as applicable.

(6) Cognizant **QA Representative is** responsible for recording PE.

(a) Project QAS shall enter PE observations directly into QAAIS, NMD or QA database as applicable upon completion.

(b) The QA Representative shall provide hard copies of the PE documented observations to Project QAS weekly upon completion for incorporation into QAAIS, NMD or QA database as applicable.

PROCEDURE 4

Product Verification Inspection

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3

1. Purpose. To assign responsibilities for performing and documenting Product Verification Inspection (PVI).

2. Discussion

a. PVI is accomplished by the cognizant QA representative by physical examination, verification, testing, concurrent witnessing, or monitoring of various aspects of the repair or overhaul process. Flexibility for adjustments in the frequency of inspections will depend on nonconformity rates and problem areas that develop based on contractor quality history.

b. PVI should be conducted utilizing the NAVSEA attribute lists provided on the CNRMC portal. Attribute Lists are available for each major work process with multiple individual attributes listed on each list. It is not intended that all attributes on the list be observed but rather the list is to be used as a guide for the observation based on the current status of the work item.

3. Action

a. In-Process Surveillance PVI shall be conducted and recorded as follows:

(1) Perform in-process PVI using Attribute Lists associated with inspections to be performed using Appendix B as a guide.

(2) If a minor non-conformance is detected that can be easily corrected on-the-spot, it shall be annotated as a defect and a remark added that it was corrected on-the-spot. A Method “A” CAR will be issued to document the defect.

(3) If the non-conformance is not minor or cannot be corrected on-the-spot, and it meets the definition of a major nonconformance in accordance with Volume VII, Chapter 11, paragraph 11.5.6.1.b of reference (a), it will be annotated as a defect and a Method “B” CAR will be issued. A comment will be included in the PVI documentation to reference the CAR serial number corresponding to the documented defect. The corrective

action will then be accomplished with the necessary closed loop verification in accordance with the CAR process of paragraph 11.5.6 of reference (a).

(4) Inform the PM of any nonconformance documented during the in-process PVI.

b. Government Point (G-POINT) PVI shall be conducted and recorded as follows:

(1) Conduct the G-POINT.

(a) It is necessary to ensure that a uniform and consistent process (see Appendix A) is used by the government when providing oversight of contractor tests and inspections involving G-POINT. To facilitate consistent implementation, the following G-POINT policy shall be used by government representatives providing oversight of G-POINT.

1. The Government representative witnessing any test/inspection involving a G-POINT shall print and sign their name on top of the Contractor's original QA ticket and print "Concur" or “Do Not Concur." This will identify that they concur/do not concur with contractor results of the test/inspection accomplished. If the contractor is using an electronic documentation system, this may be done electronically if the system identifies the Government representative and whether he/she concurred or did not concur with results. If the Government representative does not concur, a CAR shall be initiated. The results of the G-POINT will also be documented using NMD.

2. Additionally, for preservation/nonskid of critical coated area G-POINT, the government representative shall also sign, in the blocks designated for the government representative, on the appendices required by Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) Standard Item (NSI) 009-32 or electronically using the Coating Quality Assurance Toolkit (CQATK) data base. This signature represents that the government representative has validated that all information/data/results, from the previous G-POINT to the current G-POINT, identified on the appendices are complete and all requirements were met (or that a deviation/ waiver was approved supporting any non-conformance to requirements).

3. Two files (hard storage or electronic) for G-POINT tickets shall normally be established; one for

preservation/ non-skid of critical coated areas (which will also contain in-process appendices unless using the paperless CQATK program), and a second for all other G-POINT tickets.

4. Witnessing a G-POINT represents that the Government representative has verified (by personal observation) the actions (measurements, readings, etc.) taken by the contractor for acceptance or rejection of the test or inspection. For preservation G-POINT, where actions such as Dry Film Thickness (DFT) measurements or conductivity readings are performed to accept or reject areas over 1,000 square feet, the Government representative shall verify a minimum of 30% of those measurements or tests and validate 100% of the documentation (all readings identified on the appendices).

5. If the Government representative responsible for witnessing a CNO/CMAV G-POINT does not attend, they shall provide justification for not attending by annotating the reason in the comments section of the G-POINT log in NMD. For Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts, the Contracting Officer Representative (COR) will document the reason for not attending in the task order file folder.

(2) Use the applicable attribute checklist for the type of work being inspected to document the G-POINT PVI.

(3) Document any nonconformances identified with a CAR. A comment will be included in both the PVI documentation and the NMD G-POINT log to reference the CAR serial number corresponding to the documented defect/nonconformance.

(4) Inform the Project Manager and cognizant contractor representative of any non-conformities discovered during the G-POINT PVI.

(5) Document PVI observations in QAAIS, NMD or QA database as applicable using Appendix A as a guide.

c. Cognizant QA representative is responsible for conducting and recording PVI. Appendix 2 has useful information on how to prepare and conduct PVI (surveillances).

(1) QA Representative shall provide hard copies of the PVI documented observations to the Project QAS weekly upon completion for incorporation into QAAIS, NMD or QA database as applicable.

(2) Project QAS will enter the PVI data directly into QAAIS, NMD or QA database as applicable.

APPENDIX A

Definitions and Examples

1. Observations. The QA Representative recording verification of one specific function for one specific component that is being worked by the contractor.

a. Some examples of an observation are:

(1) Hydrostatic test of a valve

(2) Blue check of a valve

(3) A liquid penetrant test on a valve seat

(4) Fit-up on a weld joint

(5) Continuity of an electrical circuit

b. The QA representative recording the observation will record the equivalent of one observation in the Quality Assurance Automated Information System (QAAIS)/NMD or QA database as defined in the Attribute List. For example: One Observation = One seat leak test per valve.

c. This type of clarifying remark will normally be included for all observations recorded against large or cumbersome volumes of material.

d. The following examples apply to welding, brazing, painting, and surface preparation: (See QA Attribute List for the specific unit of product).

(1) Welding - One observation - Five linear feet/each joint.

(2) Brazing - One observation - Each brazed joint.

(3) Painting and Surface Prep - One observation – Fifty square feet.

2. Nonconformity - a departure of a quality characteristic from its intended level or state that occurs with a severity sufficient to cause an associated product or service not to meet a specification requirement.

a. Examples of nonconformities are:

(1) Nondestructive Testing (NDT) that is not properly performed.

(2) The contractor's inspector failed to detect nonconformance during the contractor's inspection.

b. For the purposes of recording PVI, the following examples are not considered nonconformities.

(1) A preliminary inspection, such as an "open and inspect", reveals deficiencies and the deficiencies are documented by the contractor and forwarded to RMC for evaluation. In this situation, the contractor is tasked by the contract to determine where and what the defects are.

(2) The contractor has documented the nonconformance and is in the process of taking corrective and/or preventative action. However, the government reserves the right to issue a CAR if the nonconformance is related to safety, environmental, or damage to government property or is considered to be significant/critical or may have major quality impact.

c. There should never be a situation where the number of defects is greater than the number of observations.

APPENDIX B

Surveillances

1. Surveillance programs provide an excellent method for activities to review in-process work and every day practices to determine if deficient conditions or areas exist. Surveillance is designed to observe in-process work on a particular job.

2. The following steps should be considered minimum requirements for surveillance:

a. Personnel assigned to conduct a surveillance must be knowledgeable and trained in how to conduct surveillance.

b. Personnel assigned to conduct a specific surveillance must be knowledgeable in the area to be monitored.

c. Once assigned, the individual should prepare for the surveillance as follows:

(1) Assemble the reference material for the surveillance (e.g., Technical Work Document, EPCP, Work Specification (Work Spec) and process instruction).

(2) Review reference material. This review may indicate other documentation that must be reviewed. This review should concentrate on the specific steps or portions of the procedure, which will be monitored during the surveillance.

(3) Based on the review, standard attribute checklists may be modified, which are tailored to the area to be monitored.

(4) Individual assigned must stay abreast of the job progress to ensure that the surveillance is conducted as required to observe the critical aspects. It serves no purpose to conduct the surveillance, if the job has progressed to a point of insignificant importance (e.g., surveillance of a valve repair after valve is repaired and being reassembled).

d. Once all preparations are complete, the surveillance should proceed as follows:

(1) Upon arrival at the job site, inform individuals performing the job that a surveillance is being conducted.

(2) Position yourself so the job can be monitored but not to interfere with individual(s) performing the work.

(3) Ensure that all key elements/attributes are observed. The focus must be on adherence to technical requirements. In those instances where a safety issue is noted, stop work immediately and notify the PM and ACO. For incorrect assembly, or violation of a technical requirement critical to the job, identify this to the individuals performing the job and notify the PM and ACO.

(4) Look beyond the items on the checklist, if used, for evidence that work is being done correctly.

(5) Once the surveillance is completed, inform the individuals performing the job of any violations or comments noted during the surveillance. Findings will also be discussed with the appropriate supervisor.

(6) Write up surveillance findings and provide a copy to the QAS and the PM. Any contractor nonconformances identified shall be documented on a CAR working through the assigned QAS, as applicable.

e. It is important that personnel involved in the surveillance program understand that they must focus their efforts towards improvement of the program by being objective and thorough when performing a surveillance. Identification of deficiencies should lead to effective corrective action and an overall improvement in the QA program.

PROCEDURE 5

Corrective Action

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3
(b) NAVSEAINST 4700.17
(c) FDG 741 (Corrective Action Request)

1. Purpose. To assign responsibilities, provide direction, and establish a uniform system for implementing the Corrective Action (CA) program.

2. Discussion

a. All contractor work presented to the government is expected to conform to contract specification requirements unless requests for waivers or deviations have been approved. The primary vehicle for the identification and correction of contractor work that does not conform to contract requirements is the contractor's internal CA program. When this program fails, the government shall take appropriate action as discussed below. This applies to "in-process" work being performed by the contractor. The contractor is required to comply with all contractually binding requirements during all phases of the availability planning and execution process.

b. Any breakdown in the contractor's quality system requires action by RMCs to assure product quality is not compromised. To achieve systematic assurance of compliance throughout all phases of the contractor's operation, the basic causes of nonconformities must be identified and prompt CA executed. The correction of the nonconformity alone does not satisfy this goal. CA as described in this section employs the "closed loop" concept (i.e., appropriate measures must be taken to identify the cause and prevent the recurrence of nonconformities). The contractor will be required not only to correct specific nonconformities but also to initiate Preventive Action to eliminate causes of nonconformities. Contractor response for major nonconformities shall include Root Cause Identification, CA taken to correct the specific nonconformance and, most importantly, Preventive Action taken to preclude recurrence. RMCs will determine the effectiveness of the contractor's action. In addition to the CAR, a Trouble Report may also be required per reference (b) for significant problems that affect ship safety, cause significant damage to the ship or its equipment, delay ship deployment, incur substantial cost

increase or involve significant lessons learned for other activities.

(1) A nonconformance (or nonconformity) is a departure from a contractually invoked procedural or technical requirement. The non-conformance may be in the area of Quality, Management, Environmental or Safety. There are three basic types of nonconformance.

(a) Minor nonconformities – A minor nonconformity (Method A) is a defect or flaw that will probably not impair the performance or life of a product; or, result in unsafe conditions for the user. Generally, a minor nonconformity is administrative in nature or can be corrected on the spot; at most, the contractor can be reasonably expected to correct it within one day. Examples include (not intended to be all inclusive):

1. Non-docking related late reports.

2. Repeated housekeeping violations.

3. Potential safety discrepancies such as a hot work chit not posted on site.

4. Minor repetitive administrative discrepancies with submittals of work specifications, PCPs, reports, etc.

5. Minor Objective Quality Evidence Discrepancies.

6. G-Points called out during normal working hours that are not ready for inspection at the designated time.

(b) Major nonconformities – A major nonconformity (Method B) is one which judgment and experience indicate could seriously impair the performance or life of the product and/or result in hazardous or unsafe conditions for the user, or continues to occur after previous Method “A” (minor) CARs have failed to cause the initiation of appropriate CA. Examples include (not intended to be all inclusive):

1. Late dry-dock related reports

2. Repeated Method A nonconformities in the same area.

3. Safety discrepancies that pose an immediate threat or danger.

4. Serious injury to personnel.

5. Damage to Government property or ship's systems that impact the product or performance.

6. Contractor's actions that result in the issuance of a trouble report.

7. Technical authority violations such as unauthorized substitution of materials or unauthorized changes to ship's systems

(c) Systemic/Critical nonconformities. A systemic or critical nonconformity (Method C or D) is one, which is related to system failures that require the highest level of management action. When the previous methods fail to obtain satisfactory results or when the severity of the situation warrants, a Method C letter shall be issued from the Quality Assurance Director or the Appropriate Department Head notifying the contractor's appropriate level of management that a systemic or critical problem exists and immediate management action must be taken to comply with the provisions of the contract. In addition, when a Method C letter fails to obtain satisfactory results or when the severity of the situation warrants, a Method D letter shall be issued by the Commanding Officer or the Contracting Officer notifying the contractor's top level of management that a systemic or critical problem exists and immediate management action must be taken to comply with the provisions of the contract.

3. Action

a. Issuing CARs:

(1) Whenever a minor nonconformity is discovered by the government, the following steps shall be taken:

(a) The Government Representative shall notify responsible contractor representative of the upcoming CAR, explaining in detail the specifics of the nonconformance.

(b) The Government Representative who found the nonconformance shall prepare a CAR directed to the prime contractor and clearly indicate the type and area of

nonconformity and how the contract has been violated. If a subcontractor is responsible for the discrepancy, the CAR will include that subcontractor's name. The originator will call the QAS or CAR administrator to obtain a serial number and provide appropriate details of the CAR.

(c) The QAS will make a copy of the CAR for his or her records. If there is no assigned QAS associated with the work, contact the QA Office for the review process.

(d) Prior to distribution, the originator shall present the CAR to the designated PM/Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for notification of the nonconformity or carbon copy (cc) the PM or ACO if routing the CAR to the contractor via E-Mail. The QAS will then ensure a copy of the CAR is provided to the appropriate level of the contractor's management/designated QA representative for action and have the contractor indicate Receipt/Acknowledgement of the CAR. The CAR should be issued to the contractor within one working day of being generated. If there is a delay in issuing the CAR, ensure the PM/COR and QAS are advised. All originators of this form shall coordinate with the QA Department on the status and clearance of all CA and indicate if follow-up action is necessary.

(e) When the contractor has taken satisfactory CA, and that action has been verified by a Government representative, the originator will complete the "Verification and Evaluation of Reply" section of the original CAR by checking the block "Contractor (KTR) actions verified", signing the block and forwarding a copy to the contractor. No written response will be required from the contractor. The originator will keep a copy and forward the cleared original to the QA Department (Code 130), who will close the document in QAAIS/NMD or QA database.

(2) Whenever a major nonconformity is discovered by the government or when CARs issued for minor nonconformities have not obtained satisfactory results, a CAR will be issued for a major nonconformity. The following steps will be taken:

(a) QAS shall notify responsible contractor representative of the upcoming CAR, explaining in detail the specifics of the nonconformance.

(b) The Government Representative who found the nonconformance shall prepare a CAR directed to the prime contractor and clearly indicating the type and area of

nonconformity and how the contract has been violated. If a subcontractor is responsible for the discrepancy, the CAR will include that subcontractor's name. At the bottom of the CAR, note the number of days the contractor has to provide a written response. Per NSI 009-04, normally the contractor should reply within three business days. Keep all original contractor responses for attachment to the original CAR. The originator will call the CAR administrator to obtain a serial number and provide appropriate details of the CAR.

(c) The originator will present the prepared CAR to the assigned QAS for review prior to being issued. The purpose of this review is to verify the technical accuracy of the CAR and the severity level of the CAR. The QAS will make a copy of the CAR for his/her records as well as notification to the QA Manager and Project Support Engineer (PSE) (only for CARs potentially impacting certification). If there is no assigned QAS associated with the work, contact the QA Office for the review process.

(d) Prior to distribution, the originator shall present the CAR to the designated Project Manager/ Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for notification of the nonconformity or cc the PM or ACO if routing the CAR to the contractor via E-Mail. The QAS will then ensure a copy of the CAR is provided to the appropriate level of the contractor's management/designated QA representative for action and have the contractor indicate Receipt/Acknowledgement of the CAR. The CAR should be issued to the contractor within one working day of being generated. If there is a delay in issuing the CAR, ensure the PM/COR and QAS are advised. All originators of this form shall coordinate with the QA Department on the status and clearance of all Corrective Actions and indicate if follow-up action is necessary.

(e) The Contractor's written response on the original CAR will then be returned to the RMC originator/ designated representative. RMC representative will sign the Receipt/Acknowledgement block of the CAR. Contractor's written response must identify a root cause and address both corrective action to correct the specific nonconformance and preventive action taken to preclude future occurrences. Originator will then monitor work site to ensure planned corrective/preventive action is or was executed successfully and within the allowed time frame.

(f) When satisfactory CA has been taken by the contractor and verified by the originator (or other government representative), originator will complete the "Verification and Evaluation of Reply" section of the original CAR by checking the block "KTR actions verified," then signing and dating. The originator will then forward a copy to the contractor, keep a copy and forward the cleared original, with all original contractor responses attached, to the QA Department (Code 130) who will close the CAR in RMC's QAAIS/NMD or QA database and file the original in the master file.

1. If the contractor's proposed corrective/preventive actions require additional time to complete, the originator will document in the "Verification and Evaluation of Reply" block the Estimated Completion Date (ECD) to complete the actions but will not sign the block.

2. Once the ECD is reached and the actions have been verified, then the originator will proceed as previously described in paragraph (f) above. The originator shall keep the assigned QAS informed on the CAR status. Follow up action and estimated completion dates will be tracked by Code 130.

(g) Progress calculations are not to include the work item affected until satisfactory CA has been taken by the contractor.

(3) Whenever a systemic or critical nonconformity is discovered by the government or when RMC CARs issued for major nonconformities have not obtained satisfactory results, the following steps shall be taken:

(a) When determined by RMC Management, a letter signed by the Quality Assurance Director, responsible Department Head or RMC's Commanding Officer shall be forwarded to the contractor's top level management informing them a serious systemic or critical problem exists at their facility and immediate CA must be taken to comply with the provisions of the contract. The letter shall request immediate correction of observed nonconformances and their underlying cause. The originator will call CAR administrator for a CAR serial number, which will include the "C" or "D" designation to indicate level of criticality. A copy of each Method "C" or "D" letter will be furnished to RMC's Contract Department and the PSE (for method B, C, and D CARs that have impact on certification). Note: Method "D" letters shall be signed out by the Commanding Officer or Contracting Officer.

(b) Progress calculations are not to include the work item affected until satisfactory CA has been taken by the contractor.

(4) CARs are generally NOT to be issued:

(a) For any desired CA that cannot be directly related to a current active job order.

(b) To identify problems with unsatisfactory government-furnished specifications, drawings, or materials.

(c) When the contractor has identified, noted and documented the nonconformance utilizing his own Quality Management System. However, the Government reserves the right to issue a CAR if the nonconformance is related to safety, environmental, damage to government property, or is considered to be significant/critical or may have a major quality impact. Additionally, if the nonconformance was identified by the Government vice the contractor, the Government reserves the right to issue a CAR even if the contractor issues an internal CAR.

b. When CA on the part of the contractor is required, one or more of the above methods shall be used. When CA for nonconformity is escalated to a higher level, such as from minor to major nonconformance, the lower level action will be cleared and annotated "CA has been elevated to "Method _____ Serial #____." The method of CA selected will depend upon the severity of the defect, whether a pattern exists for this type of defect, or if an unsatisfactory response has been received for a previous request for CA.

c. Ship's Force (S/F) may request a CAR to be initiated. This request shall be made via the S/F Overhaul Coordinator to Project QAS (or PM if no QAS is assigned). Utilizing and verifying information provided by S/F, the Project QAS will write and issue a Government CAR if deemed appropriate. In the event the CAR is not issued, the Project QAS will explain the reason for rejection to the S/F Overhaul Coordinator.

d. Follow-up and clearing of CARs.

(1) CARs requiring written contractor's responses shall be followed-up by the originator to ensure answers are received within the time frame specified on the CAR, determined from the contractor's Receipt/Acknowledgement date. If the contractor

requests additional time and it is granted by the Government, this action shall be documented by the Government on the original CAR.

(2) Ensure all CARs reflect the contractor's CA was performed satisfactorily, other action taken to close the CAR, or the CAR was elevated to a higher level. The Verification and Evaluation of Reply section must be completed as described in section 3a(1)(e) of this RBDG.

(3) The cleared original shall be provided to CA/PM. Any follow-up action that is required shall be identified by the originator including an estimated time of completion.

(4) The CA/PM will query the QAAIS/NMD or QA database on a bi-monthly basis for CARs that are open greater than 30 days. The originator of the CAR will be contacted by the CA PM to request status/resolution of the CAR. If the CAR cannot be closed/resolved at the originator level, it will be elevated to the originator's supervisor/division head/department head for resolution. CARs that remain open pending the verification of corrective/preventive actions will not be considered to be delinquent. Per Volume VII, Chapter II, 2.8.13 of reference (a), the ACO shall provide assistance to obtain resolution when the contractor does not agree they are in violation as cited in the subject CAR.

(5) Cancelling and Withdrawing CARs

(a) Cancelling. If determined after serialization (but prior to issuance) that a CAR is invalid, the originator should draw a diagonal line in red ink through the CAR and along that line, annotate with the word "CANCELLED" and the reason for cancellation, sign and date. Forward the cleared original to the QA Department (Code 130).

(b) Withdrawing. When requested by the contractor for a re-evaluation of a CAR, the CAR will be sent to Code 130 for review. Code 130 will investigate/discuss the CAR with the contractor, originator, and PM/COR in determining if the CAR is warranted or not. Upon completion of the review, Code 130 will provide a recommendation.

1. If the CAR was generated by Code 130, the originator will act on the recommendation.

2. If the CAR was generated by a department other than Code 130, and the originator/PM disagrees with the Code 130 recommendation, Code 130 will discuss with the appropriate Division Head/Department Head for concurrence/non-concurrence with the recommendation. If the appropriate Division Head/Department Head concurs, the recommended action will be implemented. If he or she does not concur, then Code 130 will forward to Code 100 for resolution.

3. If determined that the CAR is to be withdrawn, the originator should draw a diagonal line in red ink through the CAR and along that line, annotate with the word “WITHDRAWN” indicate the reason for withdrawal, sign and date.

(This page intentionally blank)

PROCEDURE 6

Quality Data Evaluation

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3
(b) CNRMCINST 4355.1

1. Purpose. To establish procedures and assign responsibilities for the collection, evaluation, maintenance and utilization of quality data. Quality data will be collected, analyzed, evaluated and used as an effective management tool. Information will be organized and maintained by the QAAIS/NMD or QA database. Quality Data, issued in the form of Quality Data Evaluation (QDE) reports, are provided for management review and QAS utilization. Management uses these data to determine if adjustments in the allocation of resources are necessary and the Project QAS uses the data to determine if adjustments to the application of basic elements of the Contract Administration Quality Assurance Program (CAQAP) are necessary.

2. Discussion

a. The analyses and reports generated per reference (a) will aid in the organization of data collected during the administration of ship repair contracts to identify areas of concern within the contractor’s quality system.

b. Quality data may include, but is not limited to, the following:

(1) PVI/PE/PR Data.

(2) CA Requests.

(3) Contractor Performance Assessment Report Data.

(4) Trouble reports, critique reports, casualty reports, letters of concern, and other data pertaining to the quality output of MSRA/ABR/CIS contractors.

(5) Audit results.

c. QA Department (Code 130) is the control point for quality data. Information will be analyzed, and evaluated to determine the course of action required for resolution of deficiencies and other quality problems. Reports will be

generated identifying the contractor's quality results and any significant quality problems. QDE reports will be generated for each preceding quarter as described below.

3. Action

a. The Project QAS shall:

(1) Gather information at the job site and input PR, PE and PVI data (as applicable) into QAAIS/NMD or the QA database weekly, and ensure CA status is up to date. Ensure all data is in the system by the last Friday of each month.

(2) Utilize information from the QDE to determine PE/PVI areas to be more frequently monitored.

(3) Continually analyze the collected quality data for evidence of recurring nonconformities and apparent causes. Propose CA measures to the appropriate codes, as necessary, to resolve such deficiencies.

(4) Make recommendations, via the Code 130 Department Head, to Contracts Department based on recurring problems in specific areas of concern that may affect job order performance.

(5) Prepare quality data summaries at the end of each job order for inclusion in the Past Performance Information (PPI) Survey and for data for Contractor Performance reports per reference (b).

PROCEDURE 7

Quality Audits

Ref: (a) COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3

1. Purpose. To examine/evaluate contractor and RMC systems, processes, and products to determine/assess their effectiveness.

2. Discussion. Quality audits are conducted to determine the effectiveness of the quality system, analysis of the process, or assessment of product conformance. Audits are a management tool used to determine a contractor's/RMC's ability to provide a quality product allowing less emphasis on end item inspections and more focus on process control and improvement.

3. Action

(a) Code 130 is responsible for conducting internal and external quality audits at a periodicity as specified in reference (a).

(1) Code 130 will conduct internal audits in accordance with Volume VII, Chapter 11 of reference (a) to determine RMC contract oversight compliance by departments with quality related directives and operating procedures/processes. A report documenting findings will be forwarded to the appropriate code(s) for action. Affected codes will provide responses/actions taken to correct any findings documented on the internal audit report.

(2) Code 130 will conduct external audits per reference (a) to determine contractor compliance with NAVSEA 009-04, ISO 9001-2008, and other contractually invoked requirements. A report documenting findings will be sent to the contractor directing corrective and preventive actions are taken and reported for any findings associated with the audit. Once the Corrective and Preventative Actions have been completed, follow-up actions should be scheduled. When all corrective and follow-up actions (as required) are completed, the audit will be closed and Code 132 Branch Head shall ensure the contractor is informed through formal correspondence that all actions taken by the company are complete and satisfactory.

(3) To provide CNRMC visisbility in RMC internal workings on prescribed processes, the local NRMO representative

shall be copied on all initial reports issuance, department responses, and completed closure actions.

PROCEDURE 8

Project QAS

Ref: (a) CNRMCINST 4700.9
(b) Fleet Desk Guide 460 (Work Item Review)
(c) CNRMCINST 4355.1
(d) CNRMCINST 4700.5
(e) NAVSEA TS9090-310 Alterations to Ships Accomplished by Alteration Installation Teams
(f) NAVSEA Standard Item 009-04
(g) NAVSEA Standard Item 009-01

1. Purpose. To provide a systematic and uniform approach to oversight of private contractors' QA programs.

2. Discussion

a. Under the requirements of NAVSEA Standard Item 009-04, contractors are required to develop and implement a comprehensive quality management system, and to institute and maintain appropriate records and documentation in support of that system.

b. The Project QAS shall be thoroughly familiar with the contractor's approved quality management system and shall determine the effectiveness of that system through routine surveillance along with surveillance conducted by the SBS. Observations made through routine surveillance shall be entered into the QAAIS/NMD or QA database for future evaluation. The Project QAS shall actively encourage a strong and self-sustaining contractor CA system. The contractor's internal CA system is an important tool used to identify defects within that contractor's work processes. The government CA shall normally be initiated only when that system fails.

3. Action

a. The Project QAS is required to be the project team point of contact for all issues concerning quality during the availability to which he or she is assigned.

b. The Project QAS is responsible for:

(1) Develop, maintain, and update a QMP or general Quality Oversight Plan for all CNO availabilities and other availabilities (CMAV, WOO, etc.) per reference (a).

c. The contractor will submit the required Test and Inspection Plan (TIP) the timelines established per reference (f). This TIP should include more than the required checkpoints; it shall include all inspections embedded in invoked standard items or work specifications. The Project QAS will gather comments from the Project Team and complete the review prior to start of the availability, periodically throughout and at availability close-out. At each review, the QAS shall enter a PVI utilizing NAVSEA Standard Attribute List #41 “Test and Inspection Plan” into QAAIS/NMD or QA database and the QMP. Issue CARs on deficiencies found as required.

d. Project QAS shall also conduct periodic reviews of the following for their availability:

(1) Scheduled check points “missing results”.

(2) CARs that have not been authorized/issued.

(3) CARS that have remained open beyond five working days.

(4) Report the results of these reviews to Code 132 Division Head or CAR coordinator, the PM and the cognizant responsible Code or organization for CA.

e. In addition the Project QAS will:

(1) If assigned, participate in Bid Specification and Work Specification review with the Project Team (PT) members for quality and technical requirements per invoked milestones and Work Item Review per reference (b). Provides feedback to PT, PM and Contract Specialist for incorporation into work specification requirements.

(2) Regularly attend scheduled meetings on each availability assigned, assess contractor capabilities, monitor contract performance, provide technical support to the ACO, and participate in claims avoidance.

(3) Maintain a Significant Events Log. The SBS provides a copy of the log to the contracting officer and PM at the completion of the availability.

(4) Review all new EPCPs for technical compliance, quality oversight, and compliance with reference (d) prior to

submittal to the NSA CHENG for final approval. Review completed EPCPs for completeness and compliance prior to certification.

(5) Ensure that a complete record of all procedures/PCPs/EPCPs submitted for review from contractor is maintained and ensure procedure reviews are accomplished. Reference (d) provides specific local NSA EPCP log instructions. The QAS is responsible for ensuring a copy of the approved procedures are available for the PT as well as entering the procedure information into NMD/QAAIS.

(6) Per reference (c) complete Past Performance Information (PPI) Surveys within 14 days of completing each availability and provide written reports to Contracts Department in support of Award Fee Evaluations and Contract Performance Assessment System (CPARS).

(7) Conducts Procedure Reviews for PCPs submitted by contractors.

(8) Maintain a copy of all CARs generated by the government, as well as those written by the contractor (when requested by the government per NSI 009-04). Maintain a status of all CARs generated by the government and update the PM.

(9) Inform PMs of quality problems that are or have the potential to affect their ship (cost, schedule, system operation, etc.).

(10) Accomplish S/F QA Interface training prior to each CNO availability.

(11) Request to be included on distribution of G-Point notifications from contractor and assist SBSs as functional responsibilities permit, in the coverage of G-Points.

(12) Perform random surveillance of Alteration Installation Team (AIT) work while evaluating the prime contractor to verify compliance with reference (e). When AIT non-conformities are discovered, they are to be addressed to the PM and the On-site Installation Coordinator (OSIC). If it is determined that the non-conformity warrants the issuance of a Government CAR, and the AIT Manager/OSIC does not issue the CAR to the AIT, the RMC QA department shall issue a CAR to the AIT Manager and provide a copy to NAVSEA 04XQ.

(13) Naval Base Paint Inspector (NBPI), National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE), or Society for Protective Coating (SSPC) qualified QA Representative shall accomplish periodic reviews of preservation records while in process and 100 percent final record review to support work certification at the end of the availability.

(14) Per reference (f), request and accomplish periodic in-process reviews of contractor’s Test and Inspection Plan to ensure compliance with NAVSEA Standard Item requirements.

(15) Review the listing of the reports and PCPs per reference (g).