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**Webinar 1 Summary:**
Corrective Action: Command Media Expectations

- **Corrective Action Requests (CARs):**
  - A vital part of continuous process improvement
  - Required by AS9100C in Aerospace QMS

- **Normative Documents**
  - AS9100C, ISO 9000, ISO 9001

- **QX:** Flows quality requirements down to supplier POs

- **Supplier Approval and Control** procedure authorizes and directs SQM to issue CARs for non-conformances
Webinar 2 Summary: CA Internal Procedures and Expectations

SQM Corrective Action Tools
- Corrective Action Requests
- Supplier Excellence Plans
- Oversight Assessment Tool Heads Up Display (OAT HUD)
- Supplier Disclosures
- Supplier Quality Ratings
- Supplier Performance Reports

LM Aero Procedures, Requirements & Standards
- Supplier Approval & Control
- Corrective Action Tasks For All Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Manufacturing Programs
- Supplier Disclosure Letter
- AS9100 Quality Management Systems - Requirements for Aviation, Space and Defense Organizations
- QX Appendix to purchase orders
Webinar 3 – CAR Levels & Criteria

Provide training in CAR requirements, levels, and relevant criteria, including:

1. What a Corrective Action Request (CAR) is and when it is used
2. What determines the CAR level
3. How to determine appropriate Supplier response times and delinquencies
4. CAR impacts to the Supplier’s Quality Rating
The Basics: What is a CAR?

A Corrective Action Request (CAR) is a formal notification from a Supplier Quality Management (SQM) source, requesting the cause of nonconformities of a product, process, or service be eliminated, with the objective of preventing recurrence.

A CAR is submitted to a Supplier when a significant* problem threatens our production schedule.

The nonconformity cause is suspected to be a Supplier problem or shared LM Aero/Supplier problem with product or workmanship.

*Significant is a term of importance to CAR criteria and is detailed in slide 24. To summarize, a significant problem may be a repetitive or recurring one, may affect health or safety, may have been requested by the customer or program, may impact form, fit or function. A CAR may also be submitted in response to a Supplier Disclosure or audit results.
The Basics: When is a CAR used?

LM Aero SQM initiates a CAR when:
- A Supplier-responsible issue affects Safety of Flight
- A Supplier non-conformance is repetitive, occurring more than once in a ninety day period
- A CAR request has been made by the Customer, LM Aero Engineering or SQM Management
- Supplier is determined responsible for Significant* issues
- Systemic Issues* exist
- Identified issues affect a Critical Program Impact*

Before a CAR is issued, there should be dialogue with Supplier regarding the issue and the CAR. The Supplier Quality Engineer should also talk with program integrator/internal QE regarding any other issues.

* Significant issues: Criteria for “significant” is summarized on slide 6 and detailed on slide 24
* Systemic Issue: A problem that goes beyond the scope of the actual non-conformance and if not corrected, will continue to recur at the same or varying degrees of severity.
* Critical Program Impact: Issues that appear to critically impact single or multiple programs with significant quality consequences or have the potential for impacting the quality of supplier product, manufacturing of LM products, or delivery of LM products to customers.
• AS9100C, Section 8.5.2, Corrective Action
• Supplier Approval and Control procedure
  – Issuing a CAR and criteria for determining CAR levels
  – Analyzing Supplier CAR responses
• Corrective Action Tasks For All LM Aeronautics Manufacturing Programs procedure
  – Authority, responsibility and tasks of the CA process
  – CA vocabulary
• QX Appendices
  – LM Aero Quality Requirements levied in Supplier POs
  – Designed to ensure effective Corrective and Preventive Actions
  – Section 2.2 addresses corrective actions reporting but additional sections target non-conformances, counterfeit parts and other pertinent text
Select CAR level based on guidelines provided in Supplier Approval and Control procedure.
Supplier Approval and Control procedure provides the guidelines for selecting a CAR level

A Level 1 CAR does not impact a Supplier’s Quality Rating!

For a CAR to be Level 1, it must meet the following criteria:

• No special or systemic correction is required
• The issue can be corrected in an expedited manner
• This is not an item of Critical Program Impact*
• This is not a Safety Of Flight issue
• The issue is not considered systemic, significant or recurring

*A Level 1 CAR does not affect the Supplier Quality Rating*

*Note: Terminology is defined on slides 6 & 24*
CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

Item Number: 19346-1 (Level 1 - Excluded from Rating)
Issue Date: 05/09/2013
Date Due: 12/02/2013 (Severity Level 3 - 15 Response Days)

Type of CA Request: Quality System Element
Program: F-22
Defect Code: Quality System Discrepancy
PSP: N/A
Initiating Site: Fort Worth
# of Findings: 1

Reference Document(s): QX Rev 3 through 7

Requirement:
QX Records Requirement Par: Seller shall maintain complete records of all manufacturing, inspection, test, CoF, shipping, & process capability. Seller shall make records available for at least three years after completion of the PO or for longer periods if specified elsewhere in the PO.

Finding(s):
LM Aero and SPO requested verification that CCA’s built for Lots 4 & 6 were ESS tested and records to prove it. Project requirement for retention of thermal chart recordings for CCA’s was not in place until June 2012.

Re-occurrence: No

Non-recurring is confirmed here

Supplier’s response

Corrective Action Acceptable: Yes
Cause Code: Test

Response Summary:
Retention of records for the CCA’s built for Lots 4 and 6 is consistent with the Qx documents, QMS and Records Management policies (Records Management Program) in place during the period of performance of the Lot 4 and 6 contract.

Containment Actions:
Systems delivered under the Lot 4 and 6 contract.

Root Cause Analysis: Not required
Level 1 CAR Example, Page 2 of 2

Supplier Corrective Action:
Retention of records for the CCA’s built for the Lots 4 and 6 contract is consistent with the Records Management policy in place during the period of performance of the contract.

Effective Date: 11/13/2013  Follow-up Due Date: 12/12/2013
Follow-up Acceptable: Yes  Follow-up Date: 12/12/2013
New Follow-up Date: 12/12/2013

IMPORTANT
A request for corrective action has been generated. Please respond to all of the Lockheed Martin Contacts and the initiator. Failure to respond by the due date may result in suspension of hardware deliveries and may cause for new Purchase Order Lockout. Extensions will only be granted for special circumstances and must be submitted and approved by the due date. Please complete a root cause and corrective action statement in the linked document for each of the discrepancies stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
<th>12/03/2013</th>
<th>Comment Type: Supplier Response</th>
<th>Created By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>CAR response reviewed with IPT’s on 12/3/13, agreement that data provided is the record of completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
<th>11/02/2013</th>
<th>Comment Type: Due Date Extension</th>
<th>Created By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Revised CAR response submitted to Program for review and concurrence. CAR due date extended to allow the program time to review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
<th>09/17/2013</th>
<th>Comment Type: Due Date Extension</th>
<th>Created By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
<th>08/16/2013</th>
<th>Comment Type: Supplier Response Rejected</th>
<th>Created By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Review of QX back to Rev 3 states Seller shall: a. maintain complete records of all manufacturing, inspection, test, CoC, and shipping; and process capability or tooling controlled per TMS-MC-015, if applicable; and b. make records available for at least three (3) years after completion of this PO or for longer periods if specified elsewhere in this PO. Objective evidence is required for all CCA’s in Lots 4 &amp; 6 to validate that CCA’s were tested in accordance with engineering requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
<th>07/17/2013</th>
<th>Comment Type: Due Date Extension</th>
<th>Created By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Due date extended to allow time to review archived charts found for Lots 4 &amp; 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
<th>05/09/2013</th>
<th>Comment Type: Request Modified</th>
<th>Created By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Added Program and changed affected site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSE FORM

Access the following website to document the corrective action response (Choose Corrective Action response form):
http://www.lockheedmartin.com/us/aeronautics/materialmanagement/scm-quality_forms.html
CAR Levels (con’t.)

A Level 2 CAR impacts a Supplier’s Quality Rating by -2 pts.

Level 2 Criteria:

- **Systemic issues*** exist, adversely affecting Seller’s quality performance and supporting processes
- Issue affects cost, schedule or performance
- Issues are **significant, repetitive or recurring** (e.g., consider existing QARs, SQARS)
- Issues involve **Critical Program Impact** item
- Issues involve Safety of Flight
- Issues involve critical safety items

* Note: Terminology is defined on slides 6 & 24
Level 2 CAR Example, Page 1 of 2

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

To: [Blank]

Item Number: (Level 2 - Included in Rating)
Issue Date: 03/22/2012
Date Due: 04/20/2012 (Severity Level 2 - 10 Response Days)
Part Number: [Blank]
Tool Number: [Blank]
Tool Code: [Blank]

Attn: [Blank]
CA Request: Supplier QA Contact
Hardware Discrepancy Program:
Defect Code: Hardware Discrepancy
PSP: N/A
Initiating Site: Georgia
# of Findings: 6

LM Contacts:
Reference Document(s): AS 9100 B

Requirement:
8.2.4 Monitoring and Measurement of Product: The organization shall monitor and measure the characteristics of the product to verify that product requirements have been met. This shall be carried out at appropriate stages of the product realization process in accordance with the planned arrangements.

Finding(s): THE [Blank] HAS SIX DELIVERED UNITS WHERE THE GUIDE PINS ARE MISALIGNED AND WILL NOT ALLOW THE CONTROLLER TO SEAT ONTO THE GUIDE PINS. REFERENCE QAR(s) [Blank] No Root Cause/Corrective Action has been provided.

Re-occurrence: No
LM Originator: [Blank]
E-mail Address: [Blank]
CAR Owner: [Blank]
Telephone: [Blank]
Level 2 CAR Example, Page 2 of 2

SUPPLIER RESPONSE

Corrective Action Acceptable: Yes
Cause Code: Dimensional Error

Response Summary:

Containment Actions:

Root Cause Analysis:
The set up was changed in the middle of a production run and was not verified by re-inspection because the routing did not explicitly call out the standard work requirement for setup re-verification after change.

Supplier Corrective Action:
100% inspection of inventory performed at the vendor and they properly disposed of any discrepant parts. Also, 100% inspection operation will be added to the Work Order of the -7 bracket for immediate control of nonconforming parts. Additional training will be done with operators to stress the importance of having parts re-inspected if any changes occur during production run as well as the importance of self-inspection. Statement added to all Work Orders "Any changes to tooling or set-up during production run requires first article re-inspection." Supplier is to create a go/no-go gauge to enable a quick verification of the suspected area upon receipt from the vendor. Estimated completion of this is by the end of May 2012.

Effective Date: 05/30/2012
Follow-up Due Date: 06/29/2012

Follow-up Acceptable: Yes
Follow-up Date: 06/29/2012

CA FOLLOW-UP

IMPORTANT

A request for corrective action has been generated. Please respond to all of the Lockheed Martin Contacts and the initiator. Failure to respond by the due date may result in suspension of hardware deliveries and may be cause for new Purchase Order Lockout. Extensions will only be granted for special circumstances and must be submitted and approved by the due date. Please complete a root cause and corrective action statement in the linked document for each of the discrepancies stated.

Date Created: 07/03/2012
Comment Type: Follow-up Notes
Comments:

Date Created: 04/23/2012
Comment Type: Supplier Response
Comments:

Access the following website to document the corrective action response (choose Corrective Action Response form): http://www.lockedomartin.com/us/aeronautics/materialmanagement/scm-quality/scm-quality_forms.html
A Level 3 CAR is initiated by SCM/SQM Senior Mgmt.

- Before a Level 3 CAR occurs, an elevation process begins with you and your lead and proceeds through your manager and senior manager, to the director.
- Elevation process includes discussion of Supplier performance record, including Letter(s) of Concern, Supplier Disclosures, Level 2 CARs, and poor or no Supplier responses.
- A Level 3 CAR is a written letter, detailing serious contractual non-compliances.
- Requires Supplier acknowledge receipt and understanding, with a due date.
- Requires Supplier Root Cause Analysis (RCA) and Corrective Action Plan (CAP), with due dates.
- Requires elevation of supplier’s oversight level to Focus.
- It may impact the Supplier Quality Rating → SQM Mgmt. decision.
- It may be coupled with contractual remedies.
  - For example, disapproval of Supplier’s quality system.
  - Determined at SCM/SQM Director’s level or above.
- The Signatories for a Level 3 CAR are at the Director Level or above.

A SCM/SQM Senior Management Level 3 CAR is the result of an elevation process that determined the Supplier’s contractual non-compliances warrant a letter to the Supplier President and General Manager, requiring immediate acknowledgement, RCA & CA.
July 26, 2013

Leonard’s Farm & Ranch
65 Main Street USA
Podunk, STATE 030606909

Attention: John Smith, Vice President Performance Excellence, Electronic Systems


To ensure complete and dependable Mission Success for our Customers, Lockheed Martin Aeronautics (LM Aero) Company and our suppliers must commit to and maintain a high standard of excellence in the areas of quality, delivery, and affordability.

Several recent and significant quality issues have impacted Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Quality and Delivery. These quality problems indicate your quality systems and processes are inadequate to ensure fully conforming your products are available to support the build and delivery of the F-16, F-35, F-22 and F-2 Programs.

Recent evidence of your quality shortfalls:
- Over the past year there have been 14 Systemic CARs issued for hardware issues, missed deliveries, Functional Failure, DCMA CAR, and Control of Sub-tiers. These issues disclose a lack of system control and discipline.
Failed to notify Lockheed Martin within 10 days of Government CARs issued as required by Appendix QX 1.1 (Revision 7).

9 Supplier Disclosure Letters (SDLs) and 23 Quality Assurance Reports (QARs) indicate escapes which should have been found at your facility. These SDLs and QARs require LM Aero Resources to initiate, process and perform the work. In addition, they show your reliance on LM Aero MRB to build and ship product.

In addition to LM Aero findings, the DCMA has found and documented multiple CARs for systemic issues this year.

LM Aero SQM expects your acknowledgement of this CAR within 5 days and respond within 30 days. Response to this CAR shall, as a minimum, include:

- Actions taken or planned to prevent recurrence of further quality escapes that impact Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Programs
- Root Cause identification of the quality performance problems
- Corrective Action plan to correct the causes
- Improvement expected as a result of planned actions
- Target dates for implementation of planned actions
- Responsible persons to complete the planned actions
- Schedule to provide update to LM Aero on completion of the planned actions and their outcome.

The Root Cause and Corrective Action will be verified and validated for sustained performance as part of closing this Level III CAR.
Failure by you to respond with and execute a comprehensive Corrective Action Plan that improves quality performance may result in contractual action by Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company that may include cost impact recovery and or termination.

Nothing in this CAR should be construed as a contractual change to any existing contract.

Should you have any question, please contact your LM Aero Supplier Quality Engineer or Procurement Representative:

William Willco                      Robin Peter                     Pay N. Paule
Procurement Representative          Procurement Representative   Supplier Quality Engineer

Regards,

Sheelby Spendin                   Makina Purchase                 Gunna Doright
Vice President                    Director                        Director
F-35 Supply Chain Management      Supply Chain Management, IFG   Supplier Quality Management
Supplier Acknowledgement – LM Aero Level III CAR LMQA-2014-01

Dated: 26 July 2013

Leonard’s Farm & Ranch
65 Main Street USA
Podunk, STATE  030606909

Attention: John Smith, Vice President, Performance Excellence, Electronic Systems


________________________________________________________________________

Name (Printed)

________________________________________________________________________

Title and Date (Printed)

________________________________________________________________________

Signature
February 22, 2014

Leonard’s Farm
65 Spitting Creek Rd
Podunk, OH 030606909

Attention: John Smith, Vice President Performance Excellence, Electronic Systems

Subject: Letter of Concern Regarding Unacceptable Performance on Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Contracts

Leonard’s Farm’s quality performance noted herein is not meeting the Quality Excellence standards. Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company has committed to maintaining in the products that we procure and deliver to our customers. Simply stated, the expectation is "Right the First Time and All the Time Quality". Supplied products must meet the "Right the First Time and All the Time Quality" expectation, must be manufactured without supplier MRB processing, must install and operate on our aircraft without rejection throughout the production process, and must meet established life and performance requirements.

LM Aeronautics has identified the below quality concerns related to Leonard’s Farm’s quality management system:

7.2.2 Review of Requirements Related to the Product - The organization shall review the requirements related to the product. This review shall be conducted prior to the organization’s commitment to supply a product to the customer. . . .

Evidence:
- a. CAR 19960 for Inadequate Specification/Contract Review for heat treat aging requirements

8.2.1 Customer Satisfaction - As one of the measurements of the performance of the quality management system, the organization shall monitor information relating to customer perception as to whether the organization has met customer requirements. . . .

Evidence:
- a. Requested monthly metrics have not been provided and/or do not exist for tracking of LM non-conformances and/or corrective actions taken
- b. No buy-in to supplier excellence plan for issues/concerns identified by LM Supplier Quality Engineer
- c. Delivery performance suffered due to product being pulled late from stock and presented for source acceptance (Delivery rating: Dec’13: 79.25%; Jan’14: 90.91%)
- d. Quality rating decline of 15% in 2013
Evidence:
   a. 8.5% rejection rate during LM product acceptance since August 1, 2013
      NOTE: This number does not include multiple documentation errors and/or omissions in
      product data packages presented to LM SQE during source acceptance
   b. FAI rejected for incorrect tolerances & engineering revisions
   c. Product with wrong material and wrong finish

8.4 Analysis of Data - The organization shall determine, collect and analyze appropriate data to
demonstrate the suitability and effectiveness of the quality management system...

Evidence:
   a. See a – c in 8.2.1 Customer Satisfaction above

8.5.2 Corrective Action - The organization shall take action to eliminate the causes of nonconformities
in order to prevent recurrence....

Evidence:
   a. Twice failed to respond to CAR 20310 NOTE: CAR response is still delinquent
   b. CAR 20172 for six (6) source rejections for same discrepancy (part marking and pkg)

Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Supplier Quality Engineer, Lloyd Ligature, will be contacting
your company to set up a time to review and analyze the data supporting the identified concerns and
ensure a common understanding of these same concerns. Within 30 days of this meeting the
development of a comprehensive Corrective Action Plan (CAP) will be required of Leonard’s Farm, L.
P. The CAP should include, as a minimum, the following:

1. Details of quality issues/concerns/non-compliances/previous requests
2. Details/findings of Root Cause Analysis
3. How Leonard’s will address each system nonconformance and any issues which allowed the
   nonconformance to exist
4. Short term corrective actions/interim plans until long term preventive actions are in place to
   prevent recurrence of further quality escapes impacting affected Program(s)
5. Long term corrective actions and preventive actions
6. Containment plans
7. Improvement expected as a result of planned actions
8. Target dates for implementation of planned actions
9. Responsible parties and contact information
10. Completion date of plan (date after Leonard’s completes their internal validation of effectiveness
    of plan)
11. Schedule of planned reviews to ensure plan is being implemented as scheduled (i.e., monthly
    reviews, weekly reviews, etc.)- Periodic reviews should include, as a minimum:
    - Progress made to the plan
    - Outcome/effectivity of completed actions
    - Metrics that track performance and effectiveness of the plan

Failure to identify and implement preventative and sustainable actions may result in suspension or
disapproval of your quality management system. As a result of the above quality performance
concerns, Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company will increase our level of oversight at
Leonard’s Farm, L.P. until such time as the milestones identified in the Corrective Action Plan are attained and improved performance is sustained.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter by completing and signing the last page of this letter and returning it to your Supplier Quality Engineer within 7 days of its receipt. If you have any questions regarding the above quality concerns, please contact your Lockheed Martin Supplier Quality Engineer or for other related contractual issues contact your Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Buyer.

Supplier Quality Engineer: Lloyd Ligature (817) 777-7777
Buyer: Luis Ligadura (817) 777-5555

Regards,

Makina Purchase
Director, Supply Chain Management

Gunna Doright
Director, Supplier Quality Management

Supplier Acknowledgement
2/27/2014

Leonard’s Farm
65 Spitting Creek Rd
Podunk, OH 30606909

Attention: John Smith, Vice President Performance Excellence, Electronic Systems

D&B Number: 008033169

Subject: Letter of Concern Regarding Unacceptable Performance on Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Contracts

NOTE: This acknowledgement must be signed by person indicated on the Attention line.

Name (Printed)

Title and Date (Printed)

Signature
The following are identified as Significant Issues:

- Recurrence of the same type of discrepancy (regardless of part number) within a 3 month period
- A discrepancy that could lead to an accident or serious loss of functionality, integrity, or safety margins
- Results of material surveys, one-time inspections
- Supplier Disclosures
- Government/DCMA Customer-identified non-conformance that could result in cost, schedule or other major contract impacts
- Request of Program / Integrated Product Team
- Repetitive rejections due to the lack of sub-tier control
- Installation or fit problem with excessive rework, repair time and/or cost

A Significant Issue is a threat to our production schedule.
CAR Criteria: Supplier Response

Response Time

• The Supplier has a predetermined number of days to provide a CAR response, depending on the severity level selected by the CAR originator when the CAR was initiated.

• The time constraint should not be viewed an inflexible. Select an appropriate time; extend as needed for RCA/CA requirements. Make sure you have containment & the right level of oversight for the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Calendar Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I = Urgent</td>
<td>5 days (LM Aero line impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II = Priority</td>
<td>10 days (Potential of non-conforming material at supplier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III = Routine</td>
<td>18 days (Audit findings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note this is calendar days, not business days.

The CAR system is coded so that a response is not delinquent until two days after it is due to LM Aero, in order to allow CAR response review time by the SQE.
CAR Criteria: Supplier Response (con’t.)

Select a response time based on the urgency of the CAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SQM Web Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQE iDash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA - Inbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate New CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Existing CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Excellence Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQM Metrics Dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAT HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Order Override</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQM Assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Supplier Quality Management Web Applications |
| Hide/Show Menu |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAR Discrepancy Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAR Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 - Included in Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Corrective Action Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Response Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Response Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Response Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Response Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Affected Site |
| Choose a Site |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement Document:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500 characters still available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4000 characters still available |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Customer Concur Required (Y/N): |
| No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Is this a re-occurrence? |
| No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Attachment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browse...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27
CAR Criteria: Supplier Response (con’t.)

• Upon submittal, the CAR is auto-emailed to Supplier and LM Aero key personnel identified in PQN & SQMS, to include:
  – *Supplier Contracts Manager/Lead, Quality Mgmt & Engineering, and Company Senior Manager*
  – *LM Aero Program QE, SQE, SCM, Surveyor/Auditor & Buyer*
  – *Contact info is only useful if current; updates are needed from QEs, SCM & Engineering*

• The required LM Aero CAR Response Form accompanies the CAR sent to the Supplier
  – *Also accessible via the SCM External website*
  – *The Supplier is required to return Response Form within the defined Response Time with the following information:*
    o Identification of deficiency Root Cause
    o Corrective Action Plan to improve process & prevent recurrence
CAR Criteria: Supplier Response Form, Page 1

Lockheed Martin’s expectation is “Right the First Time and All the Time Quality”.

In support of Lockheed Martin’s Quality performance expectation we are requesting your management review this form and assure its total completion and accuracy before presenting your response to our representatives for acceptance. All portions of this form must be completed before returning it to ensure sustained improvement and the elimination of redundant discrepancies of our supplier’s products and processes.

Please e-mail the completed form to those persons listed on the distribution of the original CAR. If e-mail is not available at your facility, FAX to your Supplier Quality Representative that initiated the CAR. You may copy or reproduce this form electronically for transmittal or expansion of answer areas. If transmitting electronically, please send in MSWord format. You may use attachments as well to provide detailed definition; however, this form must be completed in summary format as a minimum. Please contact the initiator for specific instructions if you do not understand any portion of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related to LM Aero CAR number:</th>
<th>Date of CAR Initiation:</th>
<th>Date CAR is due:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted by (Company Name):</td>
<td></td>
<td>LM Supplier ID Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Submitter:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date Your Response Transmitted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N or Service Affected:</td>
<td></td>
<td>LM Aero Program Affected:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Supplier Representative Approving this Response:  
Title:  
Date:  

“Supplier Representative” is an officer or manager in the Supplier company with authority to approve the response content, not a LM Aero employee.

Supplier provides root cause and corrective action information, using appropriate tools.

Note: It is required that at least one industry-recognized tool is used in the identification of a root cause that will help eliminate future occurrences. The following templates are attached as potential Root Cause Analysis tools. Other tools may be used as appropriate.

1. 5-Why Template  
2. Ishikawa Cause and Effect / Fishbone Diagram Template  
3. Cause Map Template

5 Why Template.doc  Cause and Effect Diagram.xlsx  Cause Map Template.xlsx
Note that, much like your school math tests, suppliers are required to “show your work”. This gives evidentiary support to a claim that RCA has been performed.
CAR Criteria: Delinquencies

- If received within the required response time, the next step in the CAR process is to accept or reject a Supplier’s response
  - The decision should have serious deliberation
  - Involve your peers and your lead in the decision-making, if guidance is needed

- A Response becomes delinquent when the ECD is exceeded by one calendar day, per corrective action tasks procedure
  - A delinquent Level 1 CAR has no impact on the Quality Rating
  - A delinquent Level 2 CAR results in a twenty point deduction from the Quality Rating
  - Reminder: The due date provides two additional days for the SQE review of supplier response
CAR Criteria: Delinquencies (con’t.)

• A CAR Response Delinquency May Be Avoided by Extending the Due Date
  – Supplier is justifiably unable to meet due date
  – Additional time is required for root cause investigation
  – Process changes are not yet completed
  – Unacceptable responses and failures to respond are not reasons for an extension

• CAR accept and reject criteria is further explored in Webinar 9.

A Supplier should not be penalized for our failure to take action on time. Move the due date out!
CAR Criteria: Delinquencies (con’t.)

• For an unacceptable response
  – Document the rejection in the SQM Web Apps under the Q&MS CAR menu
  – The CAR database appends a dash number to the CAR, i.e., -1, indicating it has been rejected
  – Establish a new due date
  – Return the CAR to the supplier
  – If rejected a second time, i.e., -2, this is typically where you elevate from a level 1 to a level 2 CAR

• For a Supplier non-response
  – Document the rejection as a failure to respond
  – Establish a new due date and return the CAR to the Supplier
  – The CAR database will have appended a dash number to the CAR, indicating a rejection
  – If Supplier again fails to respond, consider elevating a Level 1 CAR to a Level 2 or submitting an additional Level 2 CAR for failure to respond
Supplier Quality Rating

Quality Rating = 100 – (P₁ + P₂ + P₃ + P₄ + P₅)

- P₁ = Pre-Install Defects
- P₂ = Line Rejections
- P₃ = CAR Quantity
- P₄ = CAR Responsiveness
- P₅ = Customer Escapes due to Supplier

Max Deductions for Quality Rating Elements:
- P₁ = 30 pts
- P₂ = 40 pts
- P₃ = 10 pts
- P₄ = 20 pts
- P₅ = 25 pts per Esc.

- Rolling 12 month performance period
- 12 month Aging Factor for P₁, P₂ and P₃ to reduce penalties via sliding scale
- For P₁: 30 pt. maximum for yield of pieces rejected vs. pieces received – weighted monthly according to age of rejection
- For P₂: 5 pt. deduction per part number per month maximum
- For P₃: 2 pt. deduction for each CAR
- For P₄: 20 point deduction for 1 Overdue CAR
- P₅ applied as surtax
  - If score < 0; score is reset to 0

Deductions are made as the result of received defective components, line rejections, overdue CARs, Supplier caused escapes to the customer. Impacts show in the next rating update, reflecting a rolling twelve month period.
Summary

• A CAR is a document to formally request corrective action of significant findings by the responsible supplier/special process source, as defined by Supplier Approval & Control procedure.

• The Supplier Quality Management (SQM) Web Applications database is used to initiate and document a CAR.
Summary (con’t.)

• A finding is significant when the discrepancy/condition is:
  – Repetitive
  – Indicates a continuing negative trend
  – Affects Safety of Flight
  – Contributes to production line impacts
  – Customer directed
  – A Teaming effort
  – Systemic in nature
  – A produceability issue
  – A supplier First Article Inspection (FAI) escape or failure to notify SQM prior to commencing FAI
Summary (con’t.)

• If the Supplier CAR Response is unacceptable, document the rejection in the SQM Web Applications database and return it to the supplier for rework

• The supplier is typically given two (2) opportunities to work out a satisfactory corrective action with the CAR initiator