DCMA NSEO QUALITY PROCESS SURVEILLANCE (QPS) CHECKLIST #36

MATERIAL CERTIFICATION DATA PACKAGE REVIEW

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SUPPLIER & CAGE:**  |  |
|  |  |
| **LOCATION:** |  |
|  |  |
| **PROCESS:** |  |

**Program Type:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Level I/SUSBAFE (LI/SS) |  | Navy Propulsion Program (NPP) |  | Deep Submergence Systems/Scope of Certification Program (DSS-SOC) |
|  | Nuclear Plant Material (NPM) |  | Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) |  | Aircraft Launch & Recovery Equipment (ALRE) |
|  | Fly By Wire Ships Control Systems (FBWSCS) |  | Ships Critical Safety Items (SCSIs) |  | Other: |

**Contractual Requirement(s) for this process:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Supplier Procedure Number(s), Title(s) & Revision Level(s)/Date(s):**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Surveillance Performed By:  |  |
|  |  |
| Date(s) of Surveillance: |  |
| Contract Number(s): |  |
|  |  |
| Part Number(s)/Serial number(s)/NSN: |  |
|  |  |
| Part Nomenclature(s): |  |
|  |  |
| Supplier Personnel Contacted and Titles: |  |
|  |  |
| Drawing Number & Revision: |  |

 |  |  |  |

**Process Concerns and Guidance:**

* Certification includes Certified Material Test Reports (CMTRs), Reports of Test and Inspection (ROTI), and Certificates of Compliance (COC).
* Supplier does not understand all certification requirements.
* All certification/OQE requirements were not identified and documented during contract review.
* Certifications provided stating that they meeting specification requirements when they do not
* Organizations not passing down material certification/OQE requirements to subcontractors
* Organizations not re-testing, re-certifying & re-identifying material after it has been subjected to a process which has altered its chemical or mechanical properties
* Organizations without a procedure for the review of approval of certification documentation packages which are a contract deliverable item
* Certification documentation must comply with the requirements of the material/product specification, **AND**, any and all additional requirements invoked by the contract, DIDs, etc. (e.g., If the specification requires grain size to be reported, it must be present on the certification, whether the customer has requested it or not.)
* Certifications for QQ-N-286G K-Monel have been accepted when they have not contained all required chemical analysis information, as a “value” for Cobalt was not present.
* Chemical analysis certifications from an accredited laboratory have been accepted when the certifications stated material is Grade 2H or 4, but the material was actually Grade 7. (Personnel performing may not have understood or been aware of the Common Requirements identified in both ASTM-A193 and A194, prohibiting this action.)
* All OQE reviews should be conducted going from the requirement document and validating the OQE meets the requirement.
* The traceability documented in the OQE, through all processing of the material, does not meet the requirements cited in the contract and DIDs for material requiring traceability.
* Material certifications and other OQE has been received which contains disclaimers.
* Certification packages have been questioned when the chronology of material, processing, and testing certification documents is not successive.
* Certification packages are submitted which do not contain all contract required documentation.
* Certifications submitted as DID compliant for material properties have stated given testing was performed by another entity.

QARs should use the “BASIS OF DETERMINATION” column to document the objective quality evidence and/or clarify the rationale used to support their decision. (eg. direct observation, documents verified etc.)

S = Satisfactory U = Unsatisfactory

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SURVEILLANCE QUESTIONS** | **S** | **U** | **BASIS OF DETERMINATION** |
| 1. Is there a documented procedure/process for conducting certification review?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Do records exist for the training of certification review personnel?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Have certification review personnel demonstrated their ability to properly perform the function?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Has a contract review, focused upon quality documentation requirements, been conducted and documented? (Note: The applicable requirements may be invoked by a contract modification, changing the Technical Data Package and quality documentation requirements.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Have quality assurance personnel been a part of the contract review or conducted their own independent review?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the documentation/certification requirements identified by the review clearly documented and understood by review personnel?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Have all materials/parts/components requiring chemical/mechanical analysis certifications been identified?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. For each item requiring chemical/mechanical analysis certifications, has the applicable material specification (including revision, amendment, etc.) been identified?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Has all additional testing and inspections requiring certification (NDT, hydrostatic pressure, etc.) been identified, both component and assembly (as applicable)?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. For each item/assembly requiring additional testing and inspection certifications, have the applicable specifications/drawings/standards (including revision, amendment, etc.) been identified?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the applicable governing DID for each required certification document been identified?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Have all additional certification requirements, generally located in Section E of the contract, been identified?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the DID and Section E requirements, and their applicability, completely understood by review personnel?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the certification package reviewed to validate that all required documentation is present?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the reviewer possess the contract required specifications/drawings/standards (including revisions, amendments, etc.) and DIDs?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the traceability of the chemical and mechanical analysis certification to the applicable component/part verified?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are chemical and mechanical analysis certifications verified for format and general content against the applicable DID, generally DI-MISC-81020?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are chemical and mechanical analysis certifications verified for validity of the data content against the applicable specification?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the data content verification conducted, going from the requirement/specification to the certification, as required, to assure all required data is documented?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. For Level I material certifications which support material altered during processing, have the traceability requirements of the contract and DID (generally DI-MISC-81020) been properly invoked, enforced and documented in the certifications?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are testing and inspection certifications verified for format and general content against the applicable DID, generally DI-MISC-80678?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are testing and inspection certifications verified for validity of the data content against the applicable specification/standard, drawing and/or contract requirement?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are test reports/records provided in support of testing and inspection certifications verified for validity of the data content against the applicable specification/standard/drawing or other applicable technical document? (as applicable or required)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are other quality documents required by the contract, such as Special Emphasis Material Certificates of Conformance (NSEP C of C) and QAR Welding Validation Letters, identified during the contract review?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the documentation requirements identified by the review for the other quality documents clearly documented and understood by review personnel?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the other quality documents, such as the NSEP C of C, verified for format and general content against the applicable DID, generally DI-MISC-80678, as applicable?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the other quality documents, such as the NSEP C of C, reviewed for compliance with contract requirements, including those generally identified in Section E of the contract?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are testing and inspection certifications and other quality documents required by the contract properly identified for traceability (as applicable), including Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) item number(s)?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is all documentation provided in the certification package reviewed for legibility and completeness?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are all certification documents reviewed to assure there are no disclaimers present (when prohibited by contract)?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the certification review, and the results, documented?
 |  |  |  |
| Other observations: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall MPS Results:** | **SATISFACTORY** |  | **UNSATISFACTORY** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Corrective Action Generated?** | **No** |  |  | **Yes** |  |  | **CAR#** |  |

**FOLLOW-UP ACTION REQUIRED?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**SUMMARY/NOTES/COMMENTS/CONCERNS**:

|  |
| --- |
|  |