



Issue Highlights

From the Chair 1
 Nadcap Meeting Schedule 1
 NDT Newsletter –
 Want to be on circulation? 2
 Baseline – Handbooks and
 Supplements 2
 Radiographic Inspection –
 Filmless Method 2
 Honeywell Aerospace –
 SPOC Changes 3
 Nonconformance
 Classifications in NDT 4-5
 PT System Performance
 Check 5
 NDT Labs and Sequencing
 of Operations 6
 Can you answer YES to
 the question? 7
 Completing Supplier
 Feedback 7
 Every Vote Counts! 8
 NDT Handbooks 8
 Upcoming Nadcap Training 9
 Supplier Voting Member
 Representatives of the
 NDT Task Group 9
 Prime Representatives of
 the NDT Task Group 10-11
 PRI Staff NDT Transition –
 Fasteners 12
 Staff Engineer
 Contact Details 12

Editors

Phil Keown
 Mark D. Aubele
 James E. Bennett
 Louise Belak

From the Chair

I would like to begin this letter by thanking those who participated in the meeting in Istanbul. Although there were some concerns about having the meeting there, this venue was most enjoyable, and the meeting very productive. Those who attended were introduced to a great cultural experience, one that augmented the usual Nadcap experience.

This October meeting will be the final in the traditional 4 per year format. In 2008 we will be transitioning to 3 meetings per year. Since this is going to reduce the opportunities for attending a Nadcap meeting, it is going to increase the need for participation to ensure the program continues to move forward. The schedule for the upcoming meetings is posted on eAuditNet and I encourage you all to review this schedule and to make the necessary provisions to attend those meetings that geography and your company resources allow. Although the major work of developing the Baseline Checklists is completed, the ongoing task of keeping them current is ongoing. The role of the Newsletter in keeping everyone up to date with what is going on in the Nadcap realm is going to grow, please utilize this resource to address those issues that you feel need attention by either contacting a staff engineer or task group member, or submitting an article that you feel answers a need.

Finally, please join me in congratulating Staff Engineer extraordinaire, Jim Bennett, and his lovely wife, Berty, on the birth of their first child, Spencer James Bennett. Dealing with the NDT Task Group has given Jim some great training in how to deal with his upcoming challenges.

Look forward to seeing you in Pittsburgh,

Sincerely,
 Phil Keown – NDT Task Group Chair

Nadcap Meeting Schedule

Month	2008
February	Rome, Italy 25-29
July	Pittsburgh, USA 21-25
October	Yokohama, Japan 6-10

Baseline – Handbooks & Supplements

Since the baseline criteria audits began in December 2006, PRI Staff, User Primes and Supplier representatives have discussed in detail changes to the Handbooks and Supplements for additional clarification purposes. This should be of no surprise to anyone as these documents were always intended (especially the handbook) to be 'living documents' that were changed as and when necessary to reflect current or changing customer requirements, expectations and practice in the industry. During the writing of this article, there is a new revision of the handbook and supplements being released into the system. The handbooks will be implemented effective immediately while the supplemental criteria will be undergoing the 90 day implementation period.

In order to quickly identify the changes to the documents, you will find a vertical line on the left hand side of the paragraph number on the applicable page. Please make every effort to fully review the changes accordingly to determine if this affects your system or not.

James E. Bennett – NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

NDT Newsletter – Want to be on the Circulation?

The NDT newsletter is published prior to the Nadcap Task Group meetings. The newsletters are read by the subscribing Nadcap Users, Suppliers, Auditors and anybody that happens to click on the latest NDT newsletter on the PRI website (www.pri-network.org). The aim of the newsletter is to communicate information relating to NDT within the Nadcap program to improve our process and to promote the sharing of best practices at all levels.

Have you stumbled across the NDT Newsletter by chance? Want to receive it on a regular basis? Keep up-to-date and in the know with all of the latest Nadcap NDT information by getting added to our distribution list! If you wish to receive notification when a new edition has been published, please e-mail Kellie O'Connor at koconnor@sae.org with your name, company and email address. Don't delay—join our circulation list today!

*Kellie O'Connor – NDT Committee
Service Representative*

Radiographic Inspection – Filmless Methods

In July of 2007, the NDT Group issued a mass email to all supplier contacts in NDT from eAuditNet to clarify the intent of AC7114/4. As the title of the checklist reads 'AC7114/4 AUDIT CRITERIA FOR NONDESTRUCTIVE TESTING FACILITY FILM RADIOGRAPHY SURVEY'. Below is the text used for the mass e-mail and has been published to further emphasize the purpose and intent of AC7114/4 accreditation as required by the NDT Task Group.

This e-mail is issued to clarify the requirements as identified in AC7114/4 (Audit Criteria for Non-Destructive Testing Facility Film Radiography Survey) by the Nadcap NDT Task Group.

The purpose of the current AC7114/4 checklist (revision 2006-08) is to assess facilities conducting film radiography and not filmless radiography (e.g. Digital Radiography). Facilities performing only filmless radiography cannot comply with the checklist requirements as defined, therefore accreditation to AC7114/4 cannot be granted.

The previous revision of the checklist did allow for filmless radiography (via answering the applicable checklist questions as N/A), however due to the lack of technical content in the checklist addressing such technology and the unique application approvals required by the Nadcap User Prime for filmless radiography the decision was made by the NDT Task Group to focus the Radiographic Accreditation for film methods only.

The NDT Task Group since 2005 has been looking into filmless methods. An Ad hoc Panel has been tasked by the NDT Task Group to look into this method with the possibility of creating a checklist specific to this method. Until such time, the current AC7114/4 checklist cannot be used for filmless radiography.

If you have any concerns regarding Nadcap User Prime mandates for Radiography, then contact shall be made with the applicable User Primes (for Nadcap NDT User Prime Task Group Representatives, refer to page 8 of the latest edition of the NDT Newsletter - <http://www.pri-network.org/resource/docs/658/070916NDTNewsletter.pdf>). Concerns associated with the administration of the NDT accreditation and checklist can be forwarded to the PRI NDT Staff Engineers:

Mark Aubele - maubele@sae.org

Phil Ford - phil.ford@pri-europe.org.uk

Jim Bennett - bennet@sae.org

Mike Gutridge - mikeg@sae.org

James E. Bennett - NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

Honeywell Aerospace – SPOC Changes

The NDT representatives from Honeywell Aerospace asked that an article be published in the newsletter following recent changes to the SPOC (Supplemental Purchase Order Conditions) manual. The following screen shot displays the notification of the SPOC manual change and notably the changes within the manual that are of particular interest to suppliers conducting NDT for Honeywell Aerospace.

For further information associated with the SPOC manual contact Honeywell Aerospace NDT Task Group Representatives:

D. Scott Sullivan –
dscott.sullivan@honeywell.com

Robert Hogan –
robert.hogan@honeywell.com

Pat Thompson – pat.
thompson2@honeywell.com

Nadcap

Significant SPOC Manual Changes Applicable NDT Suppliers:

1.2.1 Subcontracting Policy**

All Honeywell suppliers shall ensure flow down, and compliance with, all applicable Purchase Order requirements to all sub-tier suppliers, including approved Special Process providers.

Supplier/subcontractor Purchase Orders to special processing providers must contain the following as a minimum:

- Reference to the applicable Honeywell facility, including Cage Code, who issued the original Purchase Order.
- Honeywell Purchase Order and applicable SPOC number(s).
- Honeywell part number, serial number, lot or control number and nomenclature, of subject part.
- Special Process performed and the applicable specification(s) and change letter(s).
- Any special drawing instructions/notes, as applicable; e.g., approved MESAs, inspection class, inspection grade and inspection acceptance requirements, etc.

106.2 NDT Requirements**

- Near-Vision Eye Examination requirements for persons performing Nital / Temper Etch shall be Jaeger type 2 – 20/30 or equivalent.**
- For Inspectors certified to the requirements of NAS410 (NDT) or Mil-STD-867 (Nital / Temper Etch), and for personnel performing visual inspection of welds, suppliers may administer their own eye examinations per the standard.**

165.7 Source Certifying Agent (SCA) program

See Supplier Instruction 165.7 located on the Supplier Portal.** Go to www.SUPPLIER.HONEYWELL.COM AND then: Aerospace Supplier Portal → Documents → Quality → Controlled Processes → Certifying Agent.

300.2 Quality System Requirements

Current version of the following Industry Standards are Honeywell Aerospace Quality System requirements.

- **Manufacturing:** Quality Management Systems - Aerospace - Requirements of AS/EN/JISQ 9100
- **Distribution and Brokers:** Quality Management Systems - Aerospace Requirements for Stockist Distributors AS/EN/JISQ 9120, or AS/EN/JISQ 9100.*
- **Repair and Overhaul:** AS/EN/JISQ 9100, or Quality Management Systems - Aerospace Requirements for Maintenance Organizations AS/EN/JISQ 9110, and/or the applicable National Aviation Authority Repair Station Certificate (FAA, EASA, JAS or equivalent).*
- **Special Process Suppliers (non-manufacturing):** AS/EN/JISQ 9100, or meet the requirements of SAE AS9003. Compliance to AS9003 is demonstrated by satisfactory audit to National Aerospace and Defense Contractors Accreditation Program AC7004. Audit is to be performed by PRI or AECMA-EASE. **NDT and Materials Laboratories:** may meet Quality System requirements by being accredited to ISO17025. General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories.**

James E Bennett - NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

Nonconformance Classifications in NDT

The following are the current definitions of a major and a minor NCR as found in the PRI/Nadcap Quality Manual dated 26 March 2007.

Major Nonconformance:

- a) The absence of, or systemic breakdown of, the Process Control and/or Quality Management system. OR
- b) Any non-conformance where the effect impacts or has the potential to impact the integrity of the product.

Minor Nonconformance:

Any single system failure or lapse in conformance with the applicable standard or audit criteria.

These are simplified definitions from the previous renditions - designed to be more "user friendly" and quite simply make it easier for an auditor to make a determination where an issue should reside. Alas nothing is perfect and we still find some issues are classified improperly. Part of the problem stems from each Task Group "reading" the definitions a little differently and part stems from each auditor being an "individual" with his or her own experiences and expectations. To add to these issues the Nadcap Management Council recently approved a change in policy that requires objective evidence to be submitted for all NCR's, major and minor (excluding NCR's accepted on site).

So, in an effort to help to clarify the classifications of nonconformance issues, at least in NDT, I present the following list of "potential issues" and how they should be rated. Some are not absolute but all are good general characterizations to keep in mind when classifying or receiving an NCR during your next Nadcap NDT Audit.

The first general case involves a procedure anomaly that does not impact product and does not affect the way that the process is performed and would be classified as minor.

- A personnel qualification procedure issue that does not affect a qualification examination, in other words, the procedure is incorrect but all examinations given are adequate and acceptable.
- A calibration procedure issue that does not effect a calibration, for instance, the procedure calls out an incorrect frequency but the device is calibrated at the correct frequency.
- An issue that affects a current calibration where the details of the calibration procedural requirements or flow down are inadequate or incorrect but the calibration itself appears adequate. This includes frequency, number of points, range, etc.

- A "typo" in a process control log indicating an incorrect parameter such as recording a "tick" instead of a number as long as it is demonstrated that the test is performed correctly.
- A "typo" in a traveler or technique that does not impact the test, such as an incorrect revision level as long as this issue is deemed isolated to a single case and other documentation correctly reflects the proper criteria. Systemic issues of this nature are not minor even if the auditor sees no impact.
- An isolated procedural issue regarding a requirement not met as located in the user supplemental checklist criteria.

The second set of examples involve issues where there is impact determined to be a possibility or where it is clearly indicated and all of these examples would be classified as major.

- Any hardware inspection to incorrect procedure, traveler or technique criteria. This is not a hands on issue; this refers to utilizing any incorrect criteria, i.e., outdated revisions to specifications, incorrect dwell times as listed, wrong or incomplete acceptance criteria, etc. Impact does not have to be clearly indicated and each one of these issues shall result in a "failed compliance". For an exception to this, please see earlier explanation when issue is determined to be an isolated "typo" issue.
- Any noncompliance during the processing of hardware such as incorrect dwell times, eye adaptation, improper swabbing, wrong transducer frequency, incorrect film use, outdated film, incorrect lighting issues, etc. Impact does not have to be clearly indicated and each one of these issues shall result in a "failed compliance".
- An issue resulting in a device being calibrated improperly. This includes a single point calibration being performed where multiple points is required. This would also include any out of tolerance condition identified in conjunction with a calibration.
- Any procedural or compliance issue that clearly impacts hardware or has a clear potential to impact hardware. Please note that even though there may be no impact to the part currently under test, the auditor is required to make a determination if the issue could affect other inspections previously performed.

- Any noncompliance determined to result from a non-sustaining corrective action.

The third and last set of examples is where impact is not determined or indicated but the issue would still be classified as major.

- Any issue regarding qualification/certification exams regardless of the procedure adequacy resulting in exams having to be retaken. This would include annual performance reviews not conducted.
- A multiple (systemic) procedural issue written against the same procedure.
- The number of issues required to be considered as systemic is a judgment call on the part of the auditor to be made at the time of the audit and should consider the seriousness of the individual issues. (As a guide, 3 or 4 may qualify)

- Any multifaceted issue written against existence and/or adequacy plus compliance. In other words the issue not only reflects that the procedure is missing or inadequate, but the actual effected process is not performed or performed incorrectly.
- Any NCR written against the corrective action system due to non-sustaining corrective action. In addition, all such NCR's shall be identified as potential for impact.

Please, remember that some of these examples are not absolute as in the case of the systemic issue, some judgment is required. On the other hand they can and should function as a guide in determining the classification of issues discovered in the Nadcap NDT Audit.

Mark D Aubele – NDT Senior Staff Engineer (Lead)

PT System Performance Check

This subject has to be one of the most discussed items since the inception of the baseline and continues to be a hot topic at the Task Group meetings. Following the July meeting in Istanbul, the Task Group agreed to change the verbiage used to describe the system performance check for PT when using known defect standards (excludes NiCr panels). At the time of writing this article, the proposed changes are currently undergoing ballot with the Nadcap Management Council (NMC). To help clear some of the confusion with the expectation of the system performance check:

1. A baseline is required for known defect standards and material in use.
2. The baseline is to be recorded by utilizing a color photograph, with a 1:1 representation.
3. Measurement of the indications on the known defect standard shall be recorded for the annual degradation check.

4. System performance check is to be performed at least daily or prior to use, including materials that are 'sprayed to waste'. The check is not required if all materials utilized for the process are from sealed aerosol cans.
5. The system performance check requires the known defect standard to be processed and compared to the photograph taken of the baseline. The size and appearance of the indications shall be the same. If differences are noted then further action is required.
6. Other methods of system performance checks not specified in the checklist / handbook are not authorized by the NDT Task Group for use, e.g. comparison using replica spray.

If consideration is being made to use an alternate method, then it is recommended to contact a member of PRI staff for clarification. This will help in preventing unnecessary NCR's being issued.

James E Bennett - NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

NDT Labs and Sequencing of Operations

In the checklist AC7114 paragraph 4.1 it states:

4.1 Customer Requirements

4.1.1 Responsibility

Has a Level 3 been given responsibility for identifying and assuring implementation of customer NDT requirements for the following?

- Review of NDT requirements
- Sequence of NDT operations
- NDT procedure development and approval
- NDT technique development/review and approval

- Training of NDT personnel
- Examination of NDT personnel

HB7114 paragraph 4.1 it clarifies the statement with:

4.1 Customer Requirements

4.1.1 The supplier shall identify those responsible for identification and implementation of customer NDT requirements. The Level 3 in the method shall review NDT requirements and assure the proper sequence for NDT operations is achieved as specified by the appropriate process standard and/or drawing. Verification of proper sequencing may be accomplished by one of the examples noted below, but is not limited to these options:

- 1) The Level 3 signature on the routing and/or checklist, approving the sequence.
- 2) Use of a sequence template for specific product, or family of product, which has been approved by the Level 3.
- 3) Approval of part drawings which include the sequence of operations by the Level 3.

The Level 3 shall be responsible for NDT procedure and/or technique development, review and subsequent approval. The Level 3 shall ensure that NDT personnel are properly trained and examined in accordance with the appropriate standard.

However this does not clearly define the role of the Responsible Level 3 for an Independent NDT Test House/

Laboratory where the Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory is provided with a purchase order, which may just state "carry out NDT to a specific customer specification". In several cases the Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory will also be provided with the customer's route card/traveler and they will be required to stamp off the relevant operation. If the Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory does nothing other than NDT what is the NDT Task Groups expectation of the Responsible Level 3 when dealing with the "Sequence of NDT operations"?

Where an Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory does nothing more than NDT then the Responsible Level 3 is required to ensure that the NDT conducted is carried out in accordance with the customers requirements as defined by the purchase order and specifications flowed down to them. Although the sequence of NDT with regards to the manufacturing sequence is not being reviewed the Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory shall still procedurally define what method they use to show that the Level 3 has carried out a review of the purchase order / customer flow down to ensure that what the Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory carries out on the part is what the customer has requested. This procedure shall clearly define how this review, by the Level 3, is to be carried out and how the Level 3 will document that this review has been completed satisfactorily.

Where an Independent NDT Test House/Laboratory does other processes such as a chemical process, plating, coating etc then the Responsible Level 3 is required to ensure that the NDT conducted is carried out in accordance with the customer's requirements as defined by the order and specifications flowed down. Also they are required to verify that the proper sequencing of the NDT operations, within their own processing operations sequence. This means that they have to comply directly with the requirements of AC7114 paragraph 4.1.1.

Phil Ford – NDT Senior Staff Engineer

Can you answer YES to the question?

Have you performed a review of the checklists prior to your audit? Do you have a question on the checklist that you feel should be answered N/A but there is not an option to answer N/A, only YES or NO? Then this article may be of some use to you.

There have been a few situations that have occurred this year that have prompted this article. If you have a situation where you feel the more pertinent answer to a checklist question is N/A, but do not have that option as an answer, call PRI or a member of the Task Group to clarify the situation. PLEASE DO NOT IGNORE THIS! Remember that the intent of the checklist questions is that if an answer is NO, then it is an NCR. If it is an N/A, it is because you do not use the method e.g. post emulsified penetrants, use of NDT level 1 personnel, etc.

Here are a couple of examples:

Example 1: AC7114/2 para 5.1 & 5.2

Requires suspension and contamination checks for magnetic particle suspension to be performed. The answer to the checklist questions is either YES or NO. There is not an N/A option. No matter which method of application is being used, the checks must be performed. A company was recently written up with an NCR for not performing these checks as they were using aerosol spray cans. While it may appear to make sense that the check is not required in this situation, the checklist does not allow any deviation.

The issue was taken to the NDT Task Group Committee to discuss. The resolution being that the checklist should be changed to include an N/A solely for Aerosol Spray Can application. This has been included in the current ballot. This did affect the process time of the audit report package.

Example 2: AC7114/4 para 4.3.17, 4.3.20, 4.3.28, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.6, 6.6, etc.

Contains checks and requirements associated with the use of film for radiographic inspection. The answer to the checklist questions is either YES or NO. There is not an N/A option. A company was found to be using filmless techniques for radiographic inspection. The vast majority of questions on the checklist would be answered as NO, therefore resulting in numerous NCR issuances.

The resolution was straightforward – the checklist clearly states in the title that the accreditation applies to Film Radiography. The audit was stopped and accreditation was not granted. The NDT Task Group reiterated that a separate accreditation is required to address filmless techniques.

If you are a supplier that has been accredited for a number of years, do not assume that because it was acceptable at the pre-baseline audit, that it is acceptable today with the new checklist. Ask questions beforehand rather than finding out during the audit or ignoring the issue during your pre-audit. It could cost an NCR or at worst cost an audit that was not necessary.

James E. Bennett - NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

Completing Supplier Feedback

By now, everyone should be familiar with the supplier feedback process.....

Following an audit and submission of the audit report package onto eAuditNet by the auditor, suppliers are required to provide PRI with feedback on the performance of the auditor during the audit, by asking a selection of questions. Although this article does not intend to replace the instructions and explanations associated with the Supplier Feedback system (available via www.eauditnet.com and selecting **Public Documents**), it is important to reaffirm the steps to be taken by the supplier to ensure unnecessary response cycles are not recorded.

Every so often a supplier will click on 'send for staff engineer review' upon completion of supplier feedback, but not answer the NCR's that were issued during the audit. The result being that the staff engineer is not in a position to review the NCR's. Staff notes that the supplier feedback was completed and then sends the audit report back to the supplier to address the NCR's, with a note indicating that the supplier is required to respond to the NCR's before sending

to staff engineer for review. This results in ONE CYCLE RESPONSE, which cannot be removed from the system. When the supplier is contacted by telephone about this, the common response is that 'the instruction book told me to do this'. The instruction book actually states that you cannot 'send to staff engineer for review' until you have completed the supplier feedback.

Steps to follow:

1. Select the supplier feedback screen and select the appropriate answers as required. This should be completed within three days of the audit report submitted by the auditor to eAuditNet.
2. When completed, click the SAVE button at the bottom of the screen. The supplier feedback form is complete at this point, no further action is required.
3. If NCR's are issued, then respond accordingly. (If zero NCR's or only minor NCR's accepted on site are recorded, no action is necessary, go to step 4).
4. Click 'send to staff engineer for review'.

James E. Bennett - NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

Every Vote Counts!

The Supplier Support Committee (SSC) has been tracking Supplier Voting Member's (SVM) voting percentage. The SSC tracks all voting for each Task Group. Overall, the voting rate has been 54% (as reported by the SSC in July 07). The NDT Supplier Voting Members vote at a 35% rate. SVM's are leaving 65% of the votes on the table! More than half the time we are not being heard. SVM's need to exercise their right to vote on ballots to make a difference. I encourage all SVM's to vote when ballots are presented for a vote from the Task Group. There is an opportunity to have a voice in the Nadcap process and we need to maximize that voice. As Supplier Voting Members in the NDT Task Group, there is an expectation to represent the best interest of all suppliers within the NDT community.

Gary White – Orbit Industries, Inc, Supplier Voting Member – NDT Task Group

NDT Handbooks

In preparation for a Nadcap audit, when using the AC checklists, it would be well advised to also have the corresponding Handbook (HB) available for reference. There are many cases where the information contained therein elaborates on the brief question shown on the checklist or perhaps suggests standard methods of compliance. In such cases hopefully the problems will go away and the company will be better equipped to meet the forthcoming audit.

If, however, when consulting the written information the answer to the question cannot be found, then maybe the handbook would benefit from further amendment so that both suppliers and auditors better understand the exact Task Group agreed baseline requirement.

The Handbooks are now being maintained on a more pro-active basis and accordingly feedback from all interested parties will be beneficial to their development. So instead of complaining behind closed doors help us to help you!

Please, take action and **be objective**. Discuss any issues locally and further with other individuals familiar with the process to ensure you have not missed something and if the requirement is still not crystal clear after due deliberation and discussion then it is suggested a format similar to that shown below is used to make comments to Task Group. This may be sent directly to the Staff Engineers or can be fed into the Task Group through any User Prime or Supplier Voting Member. Remember, however, the system that currently operates requires comment to be received in writing at least 14 days prior to a Task Group meeting for discussion at that meeting.

Suggested format for comment:

HB Ref	Para	Issue	Problem	Proposal
HB 7114/4 Rev 2006/04	5.6.11	The procedure for storage of exposed film requires that environmental conditions such as humidity are addressed.	We use a low cost hygrometer to monitor humidity and replace it at intervals not to exceed 24 months. This is documented in our procedure. There is no calibration certification for this instrument.	Add sentence: Traceable certification may not be required for instrumentation provided it can be demonstrated that the documented system is adequate to control and monitor the environmental conditions.

Andy Bakewell – Supplier Voting Member, EM Inspection Company, UK

Upcoming Nadcap Training

Internal Auditing: How to Plan & Perform Internal Audits – a new 2-day course that teaches participants how to develop and implement an internal audit program and how to perform successful audits of all types. Internal Auditing is a key component of any quality management program and PRI's course will ensure that your internal audits will become an effective continual improvement tool.

Upcoming dates:

22-23 October 2007.. Pittsburgh, PA, US

12-14 November Beijing, China

29-31 October Nagoya, Japan

What participants are saying:

"The information presented and the skills taught are so important that seminar attendance should be required of all suppliers."

- Johanna Lisa
Continental Heat Treating &
Quality Heat Treating

Root Cause & Corrective Action - this 7-hour training course shows participants how to conduct a thorough root cause analysis and implement preventive action to effectively eliminate the sources of non-conformances and ensure continual improvement in your operations.

Upcoming dates:

15 October 3007 Birmingham, UK

24 October 2007 Pittsburgh, PA, US

7 November 2007..... Dallas, TX, US

What participants are saying:

"The instructors, seminar material, and the experience and knowledge I gained were excellent."

- Dieter Frentzen
Goodrich Control Systems,
GmbH

▶ Each of these courses are offered at locations throughout the world and can also be scheduled at your facility and/or customized to your company's needs. For more information and to register, please go to www.pri-network.org/Nadcap/supplier/suppliertraining. To schedule a program for your company, contact Jennifer Gallagher at jgall@sae.org or +1 724 772 8693.

Supplier Voting Member Representatives of the NDT Task Group

Suppliers	Representative	Status	E-mail contact
AAA Plating & Inspection Inc. Compton, CA	Robert Custer	Supplier Voting Member	bob@aaaplating.com
NEX-TECH Processing Wichita, KS	Grant Reynolds	Supplier Voting Member	grant.reynolds@nex-techaerospace.com
Bodycote Testing (MTET) Europe United Kingdom	Alan W. Parsons	Supplier Voting Member	parsons.a@bodycote-mt.com
Carpenter Technology Corp. Reading, PA	Edward Macejak	Supplier Voting Member	emacejak@cartech.com
E. M. Inspection Leicester, United Kingdom	Andy Bakewell	Supplier Voting Member	andy.bakewell@emcol.co.uk
GKN Aerospace Services East Coves, United Kingdom	Michael Watts	Supplier Voting Member	michaelwatts@gknaerospace.com
Hitco Carbon Composites Gardena, CA	D.E. "Skip" McDougall	Supplier Voting Member	mcdougall.skip@hitco.com
Howmet Research Ctr Whitehall, MI	Ryan Soule	Supplier Voting Member	rsoule@howmet.com
Mitchell Labs Pico Rivera, CA	David Mitchell	Supplier Voting Member	david.mitchell@mitchell-labs.com
NDT Inspection & Testing Ltd Worcester, United Kingdom	Paul Evans	Supplier Voting Member	paul.evans@ndt-inspection.co.uk
New Hampshire Ball Bearings, Inc. Peterborough, NH	Richard King	Supplier Voting Member	rking@nhbb.com
Orbit Industries Inc. Middleburg Heights, OH	Gary White	Supplier Voting Member	gwhite@orbitndt.com
Praxair Surface Technologies Weston-Super-Mare, United Kingdom	Bob Gifford	Supplier Voting Member	robert_gifford@praxair.com
Team Industrial Services TCM Division Cincinnati, OH	Cindy Roth	Supplier Voting Member	croth@teamindustrialservices.com
West Penn Non-Destructive Testing Inc. New Kensington, PA	N. David Campbell	Supplier Voting Member	ndcampbell@westpenntesting.com
West Penn Non-Destructive Testing Inc. New Kensington, PA	Mark Pompe	Alternate / Supplier Voting Member	mpompe@westpenntesting.com
X-R-I Testing Cleveland, OH	William B. Evridge	Supplier Voting Member	bille@xritesting.com

Prime Representatives of the NDT Task Group

Prime	Representative	Status	E-mail contact
Airbus Toulouse Cedex, France	Yves Esquerre	User / Voting Member	yves.esquerre@airbus.com
Airbus Filton Bristol, UK	Trevor Hiscox	User / Voting Member	trevor.hiscox@airbus.com
Alenia Aeronautica Naples, Italy	Davide Salerno	User / Voting Member	dsalerno@aeronautica.alenia.it
Avio Torino, Italy	Massimo Colombo	Member	massimo.colombo@aviogroup.com
BAE Systems (Air Systems)	Chris Dootson	User / Voting Member	chris.dootson@baesystems.com
BAE Systems (Air Systems)	Chris Young	Alternate / User / Voting Member	chris.young@baesystems.com
Bell Helicopter Textron Ft. Worth, TX	Jim Cullum	Alternate / User / Voting Member	jcullum@bellhelicopter.textron.com
Bell Helicopter Textron Ft. Worth, TX	Ed Hohman	Alternate / User / Voting Member	ehohman@bellhelicopter.textron.com
Bell Helicopter Textron Ft. Worth, TX	Tyler Ribera	User / Voting Member	tribera@bellhelicopter.textron.com
The Boeing Company Mesa, AZ	Bob Reynolds	Alternate / User / Voting Member	bob.s.reynolds@boeing.com
The Boeing Company Seattle, WA	Peter Torelli	User / Voting Member	peter.p.torelli@boeing.com
The Boeing Company St. Louis, MO	Douglas Ladd	Alternate / User / Voting Member	douglas.l.ladd@boeing.com
Bombardier Belfast, UK	Bobby Scott	User / Voting Member	bobby.scott@aero.bombardier.com
Bombardier Belfast, UK	Eric McIlroy	Alternate / User / Voting Member	eric.mcilroy@aero.bombardier.com
Cessna Aircraft Company Wichita, KS	Greg Hall	User / Voting Member	ghall2@cessna.textron.com
Eaton Aerospace Jackson, MS	Steven Garner	User / Voting Member	stevewgarner@eaton.com
Eaton Aerospace North Charleston, NC	Greg Robinson	Alternate / User / Voting Member	gregoryprobinson@eaton.com
Eurocopter, France Marignane Cedex	Thierry Jacques	User / Voting Member	thierry.jacques@eurocopter.com
GE Aviation Lynn, MA	Phil Keown	Chairman / Alternate / User / Voting Member	philip.keown@ae.ge.com
GE Aviation Cincinnati, OH	Ron Rodgers	User / Voting Member	ron.rodgers@ae.ge.com
Goodrich Aerostructures Chula Vista, CA	Richard Costantino	User / Voting Member	richard.costantino@goodrich.com
Goodrich Landing Gear Cleveland, OH	Robert Rainone	Alternate / User / Voting Member	bob.rainone@goodrich.com
Hamilton Sundstrand Windsor Locks, CT	Michael Mitchell	User / Voting Member	mike.mitchell@hs.utc.com
Hamilton Sundstrand Rockford, IL	Roger Eckart	Alternate / User / Voting Member	roger.eckart@hs.utc.com
Hèroux Devtek, Inc. (Landing Gear Div) Longueuil, Quebec	Kirk Whalen	User / Voting Member	kwhalen@herouxdevtek.com

Prime Representatives of the NDT Task Group (continued)

Prime	Representative	Status	E-mail contact
Hèroux Devtek, Inc. (Landing Gear Div) Longueuil, Quebec	Serge Labbè	Alternate / User / Voting Member	slabbe@herouxdevtek.com
Honeywell Aerospace Phoenix / Tempe, AZ	D. Scott Sullivan	User / Alternate / Voting Member	dscott.sullivan@honeywell.com
Honeywell Aerospace Phoenix, AZ	Robert Hogan	User / Voting Member	robert.hogan@honeywell.com
Honeywell Aerospace Phoenix, AZ	Pat Thompson	User / Alternate / Voting Member	pat.thompson2@honeywell.com
Lockheed Martin Corp, Bethesda, MD	Ron Levi	User / Voting Member	ron.levi@lmco.com
Lockheed Martin Corp. Marietta, GA	R.J. (Jerry) Smith	User / Alternate Voting Member	r.j.smith@lmco.com
MTU Munich, Germany	Manfred Podlech	User / Voting Member	manfred.podlech@muc.mtu.de
MTU Munich, Germany	Juergen Burchards	Alternate / User / Voting Member	juergen.burchards@muc.mtu.de
Northrop Grumman Corporation Little Rock, CA	Stephen Bauer	User / Voting Member	stephen.bauer@ngc.com
Parker Aerospace Fort Worth, TX	Dale Norwood	User / Alternate / Voting Member	dnorwood@parker.com
Parker Aerospace Irvine, CA	Gary Gathman	User / Voting Member	ggathman@parker.com
Parker Aerospace Moncks Corner, SC	Gary O'Neill	User / Alternate / Voting Member	goneill@parker.com
Pratt & Whitney UTC East Hartford, CT	David Royce	Secretary / User / Voting Member	david.royce@pw.utc.com
Pratt & Whitney UTC East Hartford, CT	Jim Fowler	User / Alternate / Voting Member	james.fowler@pw.utc.com
Rolls-Royce Corporation Indianapolis, IN	Andrea Steen	User / Voting Member	andrea.m.steen@rolls-royce.com
Rolls-Royce PLC Derby, UK	Andy Statham	Vice Chair / User / Voting Member	andy.statham@rolls-royce.com
Rolls-Royce PLC Derby, UK	Chris Stevenson	User / Alternate / Voting Member	christopher.stevenson@rolls-royce.com
SAFRAN Group France	Alain Bouchet	User / Voting Member	alain.bouchet@sneema.fr
Sikorsky Aircraft Stratford, CT	Mike Clark	User	mclark@sikorsky.com
Spirit AeroSystems Wichita, KS	David H. Vaughn	User / Voting Member	david.h.vaughn@spiraero.com
Textron Systems Wilmington, MA	Carl Roche	User / Voting Member	croche@systems.textron.com
United Space Alliance Cape Canaveral, FL	Leo Going	User / Voting Member	claudio.l.going@usa-spaceops.com
Vought Aircraft Industries, Inc. Dallas, TX	Greg Rust	User / Voting Member	rustgr@voughtaircraft.com
Vought Aircraft Industries, Inc. Dallas, TX	Mike Shiplett	User / Alternate / Voting Member	shiplmi@voughtaircraft.com

PRI Staff NDT Transition – Fasteners

As part of the ongoing multitasking activities within PRI, I was recently appointed Staff Engineer for Fasteners. Before you get excited at the thought of Jim Bennett no longer looking at your Non-Conformance responses, this is in addition to the responsibilities already required in regard to the NDT commodity, SORRY!. Based on previous experience with Fasteners and the link between Special Processes and Fasteners (NDT being one of those), the choice was an obvious one.

Administratively at PRI, Fasteners is part of the NDT group under the leadership of Mark Aubele. In regard to the Fasteners Commodity as a Nadcap group, there are no changes. Fasteners and NDT are separate to each other.

The Fastener Task Group comprises of User Prime representatives from Hawker Beechcraft (John Sattler – Chair), The Boeing Company (Scott Frazier – Vice Chair), Honeywell Aerospace (Jim Traverso - Secretary), Cessna Aircraft, GE Aviation, Pratt & Whitney, Rockwell Collins, Rolls-Royce Corporation and Rolls-Royce Plc. Supplier Voting representation comprises of Lisi Aerospace, Heartland Fasteners, The Young Engineers, Bristol Industries, PCC/SPS Technologies, Click Bond, Alcoa Fastening Systems, Linread Northbridge & Monogram Aerospace.

The checklists and handbooks associated with Fasteners has been released (AC7113 series) and are available on eAuditNet for viewing. For further details on the Fasteners Program, feel free to contact the author.

Last, but not least, I wish to welcome Mary Conglose to the Fasteners Group. Mary is the CSR who keeps her finger on the pulse with all the administrative aspects of the Fastener commodity. She has already become a valuable resource to the group. Thanks Mary!

James E. Bennett - NDT & Fasteners Senior Staff Engineer

Phone: + 1 724 772 1616 ext 8651 • Fax: + 1 724 776 7121 • E-Mail: bennet@sae.org

Staff Engineer Contact Details - NDT Task Group

Name	Position	Location	e-mail Contact	Telephone
Mark Aubele	Senior Staff Engineer (Lead)	Warrendale, PA, USA	maubele@sae.org	+1 (724) 772-1616 ext 8654
Louise Belak	Committee Service Representative	Warrendale, PA, USA	belak@sae.org	+1 (724) 772-1616 ext 8644
Jim Bennett	Senior Staff Engineer	Warrendale, PA, USA	bennet@sae.org	+1 (724) 772-1616 ext 8651
Phil Ford	Senior Staff Engineer	Wales, UK	phil.ford@pri-europe.org.uk	+44 (0) 870 350 5011
Mike Gutridge	Senior Staff Engineer	Granville, OH, USA	mikeg@sae.org	+1 (740) 587 9841
Kellie O'Connor	Committee Service Representative	Warrendale, PA, USA	koconnor@sae.org	+1 (724) 772-1616 ext 8676
Mercedes Rodriguez	Committee Service Representative	London, UK	Mercedes.Rodriguez@pri-europe.org.uk	+44 (0) 870 350 5011