

Facility Name: DeKalb Metal Fir	nishing		
Address: 625 West 15th Street	PO Box 70 Auburn, IN 4	16706	
Phone Number:	260-925-1820	Type(s) of Plating Processing at this	Facility:
Fax Number:	260-925-5258	Process Table A	
		Zinc	Yes
Number of Plating Employees a	t this Facility: 31	Zinc Alloy Plating	Yes
Captive Plater (Y/N):	No	Process Table B	
Commercial Plater (Y/N):	Yes	Surface Conditioning of Metals for Decorative Plating	No
Date of Assessment:	1-Jan-2010	Process Table C	<del></del>
	-	Surface Conditioning of ABS & PCABS Plastics for Decorative Plating	No
Date of Previous Assessment:	1-Jan-2009	Process Table D	
		Decorative Plating	No
		Process Table E	
		Mechanical Plating	No
		Process Table F	
		Equipment	Yes
		Process Equipment	Yes

Current Quality Certification(s): ISO/TS 16949:2002	
Date of Re-assessment (if necessary):	N/A

Name:	Title:	Phone:	Email;
Dave Houser	Plant Manager	260-925-1820 Ext.16	dhouser@dekalbmetal.com
Paul Fry	Lab Manager	260-925-1820 Ext.15	pfry@dekalbmetal.com
Matt Morris	Quality/Systems Manager	260-925-1820 Ext.14	mmorris@dekalbmetal.com

Name:	Company:	Phone:	Email:
Matt Morris	DeKalb Metal Finishing	260-925-1820 Ext.14	mmorris@dekalbmetal.com

Number of "Not Satisfactory" Findings:	
0	

Number of "Needs Immediate Action"	Findings:
0	

Number of "Fail" Findings in the Job Audit(s):	
0	



CQI-11
Special Process: Plating System Assessment
Version 1 Issued 807

1.2	7		Question Number		
Does the plater perform advanced quality planning?	Is there a dedicated and qualified plating person onsite?		Question		
The organization shall incorporate a documented advance quality planning procedure. A feasibility study shall be performed and internally approved for each part. Similar parts can be grouped into part families for this effort as defined by the organization. After the part approval process is approved by the customer, no process changes are allowed unless approved by the customer. The plater shall contact the customer when clarification of process changes is hard copy and electronic format be documented.	To ensure readily available expertise, there shall be a decicated and qualified plating person on the site. This individual shall be a full-time employee and the position shall be reflected in the organization chart. A DeKaib Metal Finishing's Lab Manager job description shall exist identifying the qualifications has more than 20 years of experience in for the position including chemical and plating and surface. The Job Description for the position of minimum of 5 years experience in plating and surface Lab Manager reflects this requirement. finishing or a combination of formal chemistry/chemical engineering education and plating experience totaling a minimum of 5 years.	Section 1 - Management Ro	Requirements and Guldance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facilit
DeKaib Metal Finishing uses the AIAG manual as a reference for conducting APQP's. In addition, we utilize Procedure 37 to further define our APQP policy. Feasibility studies are done for each part and are maintained both in shard copy and electronic format.	DeKalb Metal Finishing's Lab Manager has more than 20 years of experience in the plating/surface finishing industry. The Job Description for the position of Lab Manager reflects this requirement.	Section 1 - Management Responsibility and Quality Plan	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facility
		nning	N/A		y Ove
*	×		Satisfactory		ty Overview)
			Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
			Needs Immediate Action		



CQI-11
Special Process: Plating System Assessment
Version 1 Issued 8/07

1.4	မ	Question Number		
Are finish process control plans up to date and reflecting current processing?	Are plater FMEA's up to date and reflecting current processing?	Question	:	
The organization shall incorporate the use of a documented Control Plan procedure and ensure the Control Plans are updated to reflect current controls. The Control Plans shall be written for each part or part family or they may be process-specific and written for each process. In any case, they shall address all process steps from part receipt to part shipment and identify all equipment used and all key plating process parameters as defined by the organization. A cross-functional team, including a production operator, shall be used in the development of Control Plans, which shall be consistent with all associated documentation such as work instructions, shop travelers, and FMEAs. All special characteristics, as defined by the organization and its customers, shall be identified, defined, and addressed in the Control Plans. Sample sizes and Frequencies for evaluation of process and product characteristics shall also be addressed consistent with the minimum requirements listed in the Process Tables.	The organization shall incorporate the use of a documented Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) procedure and ensure the FMEAs are updated to reflect current part quality status. The FMEA shall be written for each part or part family or they may be process-specific and written for each process. In any case, they shall address all process steps from part receipt to part shipment and all key plating process parameters as defined by the organization. A cross-functional team shall be used in the development of the FMEA. All characteristics, as defined by the organization and its customers, shall be identified, defined, and addressed in the FMEA.	Requirements and Guidance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facility
Dekalb Metal Finishing uses the AIAG manual as a reference for conducting Control Plans. In addition, we utilize Procedure 35, to further define our Control Plan polloy. Control Plans are created electronically and are directly linked to our lab controls in order to ensure that changes to the control plan are immediatly communicated to all affected parties.	DeKalb Metal Finishing uses the AIAG manual as a reference for conducting FMEA's. In addition, we utilize Procedure 37 to further define our FMEA policy. FMEAs are process driven and have been created for each process line (i.e. line 1, line 2, etc.).	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facility
		N A		
×	×	Satisfactory		Overview)
		Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
		Needs immediate Action		



	ž õ		
. <del>.</del> .	Question Number		
Are all plating related and referenced specifications current and available? For example: SAE, AIAG, ASTM, General Motors, Ford, and DaimlerChrysler.	Question		
To ensure all customer requirements are both understood and satisfied, the organization shall have all related plating and customer referenced standards and specifications available for use and a method to ensure that they are current. Such standards and specifications include, but are not limited to, those relevant documents published by SAE, AIAG, ASTM, General Motors, Ford, and DaimierChrysler. The organization shall have a process to ensure the timely review, distribution, and implementation of all customer and industry engineering standards and specifications and changes based on customer-required schedule. This process shall be executed as soon as possible and shall not exceed two weeks. The organization shall document this process of review and implementation, and it shall address how customer and industry documents are obtained, how they are maintained within the organization, how the current status is established, and how the relevant information is cascaded to the shop floor within the two-week period. The organization shall identify who is responsible for performing these tasks.	Requirements and Guldance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Faci
Yes, these documents are sent to us by our customers. Additionally, we subscribe to a service that notifies us when specifications are updated. All documents are controlled electronically in our document management software.	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facilit
	N/A	П	y Ov
×	Satisfactory		lity Overview)
	Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
	Needs immediate Action		



1.7	. <del>.</del> 6	Question Number		
Has a valid product capability study been performed initially and after process change?	ls there a written process specification for all active processes?	Question		
To demonstrate each process is capable of yielding acceptable product the organization shall perform product capability studies for the initial validation of each process, after relocation of any process equipment, and after a major rebuild of any equipment. The organization shall define what constitutes a major rebuild. Initial product capability studies shall be conducted for all plating processes per line as defined in scope of work and in accordance with customer requirements. Capability study techniques shall be appropriate for the plating product characteristics, e.g. plate thickness, corrosion resistance, etc Any specific customer requirements shall be met. In the absence of customer requirements, the organization shall establish acceptable ranges for measures of capability. An action plan shall exist to address the steps to be followed in case capability indices fall outside customer requirements or established ranges.	The plater shall have written process specifications for all active processes and identify all steps of the process including relevant operating parameters. Examples of operating parameters include process temperatures, cycle times, load rates, rectifier settings, etc. Such parameters shall not only be defined, they shall have operating tolerances as defined by the organization in order to maintain process control. All active processes should have a written process specification. These process specifications may take the form of work instructions, job card, computer-based recipes, or other similar documents.	Requirements and Guidance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facili
Product capability studies are performed annually by testing parts and panels against the most stringest specifications we are required to meet. Tested charactoristics include corrosion resistance and coating thickness. Where applicable, adhesion, nickel content and other customer specified requirements are also tested. Additionally, capability studies are performed after a major rebuild of the line (replacing the head).	Job Setup Instructions are in place for each part we produce. These instructions include recommended cycle times, recommended recitier settings, places per rack, racks per frame, required engineering specification, color, thickness requirements, racking requirements, packaging requirements, and other special requirements, as defined by each customer.	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facility
		N/A		Ove
×	×	Satisfactory		ty Overview)
		Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
		Needs Immediate Action		



Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facility Overview)

:						Assessment	
						Assessment	
Question Number	Question	Requirements and Guidance	Objective Evidence	N/A	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Needs Immediate Action
. <del>.</del> .	Does the plater collect and analyze data over time, and react to this data?	The analysis of products and processes over time can yield vital information for defect prevention efforts. The organization shall have a system to collect, analyze, and react to product or process data over time. Methods of analysis shall include ongoing trend or historical data analysis of special product or process parameters. The organization shall determine which parameters to include in such analysis.	DeKalb Metal Finishing uses and electronic system for gathering, storing, and analyzing most types of data. This data is analyzed on an ongoing basis to make decision on lab, production and quality management.		×		
1	Does management review and verify bake oven logs for parts requiring hydrogen embrittlement relief every 24 hours?	Management shall review the oven monitoring systems/logs at intervals not to exceed 24 hours or prior to parts being released for shipment. The plater shall have reaction plans for non-conformances to process requirements. This is to contain, at minimum, requirements for quarantining material and notifying customer.		×	:		
1.10	Are internal assessments being completed on an annual basis, at a minimum, incorporating AIAG PSA?	The organization shall conduct internal assessments on an annual basis, at a minimum, using the AIAG PSA. Concerns shall be addressed in a timely manner.			×		



		,		_		
1.14	1.13	1.12	1.11	Question Number		
Does the Quality Manager or designee authorize the disposition of material from quarantine status?	Is there a continual improvement plan applicable to each process defined in the scope of the assessment?	Does the Quality Department review, address, and document customer and internal concerns?	Is there a system in place to authorize reprocessing and is it documented?	Question	:	
The Quality Manager or designee is responsible for authorizing and documenting appropriate personnel to disposition quarantine material.	The plater shall define a process for continual improvement for each plating process identified in the scope of the PSA. The process shall be designed to bring about continual improvement in quality and productivity. Identified actions shall be prioritized and shall include timing (estimated completion dates). The organization shall show evidence of program effectiveness.	The quality management system shall include a process for documenting, reviewing, and addressing customer concerns and any other concerns internal to the organization. A disciplined problem-solving approach shall be used.	The quality management system shall include a documented process for reprocessing that shall include authorization from a designated individual. The reprocessing procedure shall describe product characteristics for which reprocessing is allowed as well as those characteristics for which reprocessing is not permissible. All reprocessing activity shall require a new processing control sheet issued by qualified technical personnel denoting the necessary plating modifications. Records shall clearly indicate when and how any material has been reprocessed. The Quality Manager or a designee shall authorize the release of reprocessed product.	Requirements and Guldance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facility
The plant manager, in conjunction with the quality manager will determine the disposition of quarantined material.	DeKalb Metal Finishing has a three tier (Red, Yeltow, Green) process management system for controlling the plating process and measuring process improvement. This systems is monitored as part of management review for effectiveness verification.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes and electronic system for recording and managing customer complaints, internal rejects, and external rejects.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes Procedure 40 to manage the reprocessing. Referenced documents include Procedure 29 and Job Setup instructions. Documentation is managed and stored electronically.	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facility
				NIA		O <sub>V</sub>
×	×	×	×	Satisfactory		/ Overview)
				Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
				Needs Immediate Action		



CQI-11
Special Process: Plating System Assessment
Version 1 Issued 807

		1 × 4 × 7 × 7 × 7 × 7			
1.17	1.16	1.15	Question Number		
Is there a responsibility matrix to ensure that all key management and supervisory functions are performed by qualified personnel?	ls management providing employee training for plating?	Are there procedures or work instructions available to plating personnel that define the plating process?	Question		
The organization shall maintain a responsibility matrix identifying all key management and supervisory functions and the qualified personnel who may perform such functions. It shall identify both primary and secondary (backup) personnel for the key functions (as defined by the organization). This matrix shall be readily available to management at all times.	The organization shall provide employee training for all plating operations. All employees, including backup and temporary employees, shall be trained. Documented evidence shall be maintained showing the employees trained and the evidence shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of the training. Management shall define the qualification requirements for each function, and ongoing or follow-up training shall also be addressed.	There shall be procedures and work instructions available to plating personnel covering the plating process. These procedures or work instructions shall include methods of addressing potential emergencies produce refailure), equipment start-up, equipment shut-down, product segregation (See 2.8), DMFWI071 (Line 1 Startup/Shutdown), procedures. These procedures or work instructions shall be accessible to shop floor personnel.  Procedures, work instructions are made available to all personnel through our electronic Document services personnel through our electronic Document should be recedure 10 (Inspection and Testing), DMFWI112 (Plant Startup/Shutdown), DMFWI073 (Line 2 Startup), procedures. These procedures or work instructions shall be accessible to shop floor personnel.	Requirements and Guldance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facility Overview)
DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes a Responsibility Matrix (DMF301) to ensure that rall key management and supervisory functions are performed by qualified personnel.	DeKalb Metal Finishing educates employees on plating operations utilizing Program 1000 and Program 2000. Documented evidence is maintained electronically in lour training software.	Procedures, work instructions and other documentation are made available to all personnel through our electronic Document Management software. Specific documents include Procedure 08 (Contingency Plans), Procedure 19 (Inspection and Testing), DMFWI072 (Line 1 Startup), DMFWI072 (Line 1 Shutdown), DMFWI073 (Line 2 Startup), DMFWI074 (Line 2 Shutdown), DMFWI076 (Line 3 Shutdown), DMFWI077 (Line 4 Startup), DMFWI078 (Line 3 Shutdown), DMFWI077 (Line 4 Startup), DMFWI078 (Line 4 Shutdown)	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facility
			N/A		ý
×	×	×	Satisfactory		erview)
			Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
			Needs Immediate Action		



. 1		1		<del></del> 1
1.18	1.18	Question Number		
Has the plater developed a critical spare part list and are the parts available to minimize production disruptions?	Is there a preventive maintenance program? Is maintenance data being utilized to form a predictive maintenance program?	Question		
The plater shall develop and maintain a critical spare parts list and shall ensure the availability of such parts to minimize production disruptions.	The organization shall have a documented preventive maintenance program for key process equipment (as identified by the organization). The program shall be a closed-loop process that tracks maintenance efforts from request to completion to assessment of effectiveness. Equipment operators shall have the opportunity to report problems, and problems shall also be handled in a closed-loop manner. Company data, e.g., downtime, quality rejects, first time-through capability, recurring maintenance work orders, and operator-reported problems, shall be used to improve the preventive maintenance program. Maintenance data shall be collected and analyzed as part of a predictive maintenance program.	Requirements and Guidance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Faci
The critical spare parts list is included this in the maintenance log (DMF261).	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes a spreedsheet based maintenance log to manage its preventive / predictive maintenance program (DMF261).	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facility
		N/A		Ove
×	×	Satisfactory		llity Overview)
		Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
		Needs Immediate Action		



N	Ŋ	N	N	N		Que		
2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1		Question Number		
Is there a system to identify trap points in the entire plating process to reduce risk of mixed parts (inappropriate, unfinished, or improperly plated parts)?	Are procedures adequate to prevent movement of nonconforming product into the production system?	Is lot traceability and integrity maintained throughout all processes?	ls product clearly identified and staged throughout the plating process?	Does the facility ensure that the data entered in the receiving system matches the information on the customer's shipping documents?		Question		
The plater shall have documented procedures to identify and monitor trap points for each process/equipment. Monitoring of potential trap points shall occur for every part changeover.	The control of suspect or non-conforming product is necessary to prevent inadvertent shipment or contamination of other lots. Procedures shall be adequate to prevent movement of non-conforming product into the production system. Procedures shall exist addressing proper disposition, product identification and tracking of material flow in and out of hold area. Non-conforming hold area shall be clearly designated to maintain segregation of such material.	Out-going lot(s) shall be traceable to the incoming lot(s). The discipline of precisely identifying lots and linking all pertinent information to them enhances the ability to do root cause analysis and continual improvement.	Procedures for part and container identification help to avoid incorrect processing or mixing of lots. Appropriate location and staging within the facility also help to ensure that orders are not shipped until all required operations are performed. Customer product shall be clearly identified and staged throughout the plating process. Non-plated, inprocess, and finished product shall be properly segregated and identified. All material shall be staged in a dedicated and clearly defined area.	Documented processes and evidence of compliance shall exist, e.g., shop travelers, work orders, etc. The facility shall have a detailed process in place to resolve receiving discrepancies.	Section 2 - Floor and Ma	Requirements and Guidance		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facili
Dekalb Metal Finishing has identified trap points and posted these findings on signage located throughout the plant.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes Procedure 29 to manage the integrity of the non-conforming / hold area to unsure segregation of such material.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes DMF135, DMF250 and Trace Tags to maintain lot integrity throughout all processes.	Customer product is typically identified by the customer on the packaging. Additionally, DeKalb Metal Finishing labels the product during the receiving process. Once the plating process is completed, plated parts are moved to the warehouse where they are placed with "finished goods".	DeKalb Metal Finishings receiving document (DMF135 and DMF250) are checked against customers incoming paperwork.	Section 2 - Floor and Material Handling Responsibil	Objective Evidence		Assessment (General Facilit
					₹	N/A		y Ov
×	×	×	×	×		Satisfactory		ty Overview)
						Not Satisfactory	Assessment	
						Needs Immediate Action		



Assessment		Special Process: Plating Process Assessment (General Facility Overview)	

						Assessment	
Question	Question	Requirements and Guidance	Objective Evidence	N/A	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Needs Immediate
2.6	Are containers free of inappropriate material?	Containers handling customer product shall be free of inappropriate material. After emptying and before re-using containers, containers shall be inspected to ensure that all parts and inappropriate material have been removed. The source of inappropriate material shall be identified and addressed. This is to ensure that no nonconforming plating parts or inappropriate material contaminate the finished lot.	DeKalb Metal Finishing uses customer supplied containers.		×		
2.7	Is part loading specified, documented and controlled?	Loading parameters shall be specified, documented and controlled. Examples include parts per rack and load size.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes Job Setup Instructions (DMF147) to specify loading parameters. These documents are controlled electronially.		×		
2.8	Are operators trained in material handling, containment action and product segregation in the event of an equipment emergency including power failure?	Unplanned or emergency downtime greatly raises the risk of improper processing. Operators shall be trained in material handling, containment action, and product segregation in the event of an equipment emergency including power failure. Training shall be documented. Work instructions specifically addressing potential types of equipment emergencies and failures shall be accessible to and understood by equipment operators. These instructions shall address containment/reaction plans related to all elements of the process. Evidence shall exist showing disposition and traceability of affected product.	DeKalb Metal Finlsng trains operators on material handling, containment, and product segrigation. This training is verified through the use of our procedure quiz (DMF268).		×		
2.9	Is the handling, storage and packaging adequate to preserve product quality?	The plater's loading/unloading systems, in process handling and shipping process shall be assessed for risk of part damage or other quality concerns.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes Procedure 18 to ensure preservation of product.	·	×		
2.10	Are plant cleanliness, housekeeping and environmental and working conditions conducive to control and improved quality?	Plant cleanliness, housekeeping, environmental, and working conditions shall be conducive to controlling and improving quality. The plater should evaluate such conditions and their effect on quality. A housekeeping policy shall be clearly defined and executed. The facility shall be reviewed for the following items: loose parts on floor; spillage around tanks; overall plant lighting; furnes etc.	DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes Procedure 09, DMF194, and DMF253 to manage facility cleanliness. Procedure 09 and DMF194 manage general plant cleanliness while DMF253 relates to building maintenance.		×		



Requirements and Guidance  Requirements and Guidance  Requirements shall be monitored per frequencies specified in Process Tables. Computer monitoring equipment with alarms and alarm logs satisfy the verification requirement. A designated floor person shall verify the process parameters, e.g., by initialing a strip chart or data log.  Are there documented reaction plans to both out of control and out of tolerance process parameters? Is there documented evidence that reaction plans are followed?  Are there to process / Final Test Frequencies shall be performed as specified in Process Tables. Refer to Process Tables.  Test equipment shall be verified/calibrated per applicable customer specific standard or per an applicable consensus standard, e.g., ASTM, SAE, ISO, NIST, etc. Verification/calibration results shall be internally reviewed, approved and documented.  Refer to Process Tables for frequency of checks.	ls product test equipment verified?	Are in-Process / Final Test 2.13 Frequencies performed as specified in Process Tables?	Are out of control/specification 2.12 parameters reviewed and reacted to?	Are process control parameters monitored per frequencies specified in Process Tables?	Question Question		
Objective Evidence  Objective Evidence  Objective Evidence  N/A Satisfactory  Process parameters are created, monitored, and logged electronically and are directly linked to the control plans. This ensures that changes made to the control plans. This ensures that changes made to the control plan are communicated to all affected parties in the control plan are communicated to all affected parties in the control point stalls outside the specified range, affected parties are electronically notified and action is taken to ensure the control point is restored to appropriate levels.  The process and/or final testing is done in accordance with the process tables.  The resulting data is stored electronically.  In-process and/or final testing is done in accordance with the process tables.  The resulting data is stored electronically.  DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes gage calibrations and MSA studies. The frequency of such testing is set per gage and is derived from past calibration history, frequency of use, and specified requirements (i.e. customer, CQI-11).					Requirements and Guidance		Special Process: Plating Proce
tory	· =	In-process and/or final testing is done accordance with the process tables.  The resulting data is stored electronically.	S	er er	Objective Evidence		ss Assessment (General Facility
	×	×	×	×			/ Overview)
						Assessment	

Version 1 Issued 8/07



## Question Number 3.6 ω 5 3.4 $\omega_{\omega}$ 3.2 <u>ω</u> equipment calibrations and/or verification certified, posted, thermocouples checked and/or and current? process control equipment? Are rectifiers maintained? Are barrels, racks, and baskets maintained? replaced quarterly? relief ovens, are For hydrogen embrittlement uniformity surveys performed relief ovens, are temperature For hydrogen embrittlement Are process and testing Does plating line have proper Question system that is documented and implemented Requirements and Guidance Supplier shall have preventative maintenance up to temperature within one hour of entering oven both empty and with a dense load. Parts must come system that is documented and implemented Supplier shall have preventative maintenance system that is documented and implemented Supplier shall have preventative maintenance ISO, NIST, etc. Verification/calibration results shall be internally reviewed, approved and documented. standard or consensus standard, e.g., ASTM, SAE, callbration dates of equipment. This system will typically be a computerized tracking system or other requirements. Refer to Process Table F for equipment and meet temperature tolerance specified by Uniformity survey must show that ovens were tested verified/calibrated per applicable customer specific notification system. Test equipment shall be A system shall be used by the plating facility to track Section 3 - Zinc/ Zinc Alloy Plating Equipment requirements (i.e. customer, CQI-11). calibration software to log and monitor calibrations and MSA studies. The Rectifiers are serviced every 6 months as part of our preventive maintenance DeKalb Metal Finishing utilizes gage system (DMF253) maintenance system (DMF253) basis as part of our preventive history, frequency of use, and specified and is derived from past calibration frequency of such testing is set per gage Tooling is maintained on an on-going Objective Evidence Z × × Satisfactory × × × × Not Satisfactory Assessment Needs Immediate



## CQI-11 Special Process: Plating System Assessment Version 1 Issued 8/07

		Section 4 - Decorative (Cu, Ni, Cr) Plating		Equipment	ent		
Question Number	Question	Requirements and Guidance	Objective Evidence	N/A	Satisfactory	Assessment Not Satisfactory	Needs Immediate Action
4.1	Does plating line have proper process control equipment?	Refer to Process Table F for equipment requirements.		×			
.4. i2	ੇ ਹ	A system shall be used by the plating facility to track calibration dates of equipment. This system will typically be a computerized tracking system or other notification system. Test equipment shall be verified/calibrated per applicable customer specific standard or consensus standard, e.g., ASTM, SAE, ISO, NIST, etc.  Verification/calibration results shall be internally reviewed, approved and documented. Refer to Process Table F, for equipment certification time table		×			
4.3	Are racks maintained?	Supplier shall have preventative maintenance system that is documented and implemented.		×			
4.4	Are rectifiers maintained?	Supplier shall have preventative maintenance system that is documented and implemented.		×			
4.5	Are filters maintained?	Supplier shall have preventative maintenance system that is documented and implemented.		×			
4.6	Is all other applicable equipment maintained?	Supplier shall have preventative maintenance system that is documented and implemented.		×			:
4.7	d?	Supplier shall have preventative maintenance system that is documented and implemented.		×			
4.8	Are the process and equipment alarm checks being tested?	Checks shall be documented. Each alarm shall be reviewed independently for functionality if applicable. Plater shall have a list of alarms relevant to process.		×			

## **Audit Criterion Requirements**

	Audit Data	1			
ID code:	Title:				
PA000008	Product Audit 8				
Audit Category:			Audit t	ype:	
JA - Product Audits	S		1st Par	ty	
Audit Purpose:			Scope	Period:	
Internal Surveilland	ce - Internal Surveillance			-	
Audited Company	<i>y</i> :				
Audit Company:		Lead Auditor:			
DEKALB METAL	FINISHING	Morris, Matt - mmorr	is		
	Audit Criterion	Data			
ID code:	Name:		Type:		
JA-11	Job Audit (Plating Lines)		QA - C	Quality	
<b>Evaluation Criter</b>	ia:	Revision:		ation Type	e:
JA - Job Audit		0	Qualit	ative	
Conformity Leve	<b>:</b>	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
	Audit Questi	ons			
ID code:	Name:			٧	Veight:
CQI 5.0	Job Audit - Finished Product Review			1	
Conformity Leve	l:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
CQI 5.01	Quality Documents		_	1	
Description:					
Are Contract Revi	ews, APQP's, FMEA's, Control Plans, etc. per	formed by qualified inc	lividuals?		
Audit Evidence:		· ·			
All documentation	listed is created and maintained by Top Mana	gement.			
Conformity Leve	1:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
CQI 5.02	Engineering Documents	_		1	<u></u>
Description:					
Does the plater ha	ave the proper customer specifications for the	part?	<u> </u>		
Audit Evidence:					
	- DBL8451.15 was listed on the Job Setup Ins	struction and was avail	lable in ISC	OSystem D	ocument.
Wolverine does no	ot have any custoemr specific requirements.				<del></del>

	Audit	Questions			
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:	**************************************		V	Veight:
CQI 5.03	Travelers			1	
Description:					
Is a shop trave	eler created to meet customer requiremen	ts?			
Audit Evidend	Ce:				
DMF250 and I	DMF trace tag had been created, and wer	e attached to the box.			
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:		·	٧	Veight:
CQI 5.04	Tracability			1	
Description:		M			
-	ntification (part numbers, lot numbers, cor	ntract numbers. etc.) maintai	ined througho	out the plat	ing
process?	Tallocation (part name of the manual of the				
Audit Eviden					
DMF250 and I	DMF trace tag had been created, and wer	e used for identification thro	ughout the co	pating proc	ess.
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
CQI 5.05	Receiving			1	
Description:					
Is there docum	nented evidence of Receiving Inspection?				
Audit Eviden	ce:				
The receiving	section of DMF250 was completed and si	igned by Chris Davis			
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
CQI 5.06	Part Setup			1	
Description:		·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
=	ng / Racking requirements identified?				
Audit Eviden	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				<u>-</u> -
	king requirements were properly identified	on the parts Job Setup Inst	ruction. Too	lina to be i	used is B
_	per bar and 3 bars per frame.				
Conformity L	•	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:		<del></del>		Veight:
CQI 5.07	Process Monitoring			1	I
Description:					
	procedure or process specification used?		specific para	ameters. L	ist
	at were verified in this audit in the spaces	provided below.			
Audit Eviden		adiaa amata allamata P. 19	m /7 hive 0 ***	\ O=	
Daviers -	eraters hourly line checks and found no re	adıng odiside allowable ilmli	s (7 plue 3 gl	een). Ch	ecks wer
-	Dory Cotrell				
Reviewed open performed by Conformity L	···	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR

Description: What are the product inspection requirements? Audit Evidence: Name are to recieve 3 point thickness and visual inspection. All required inspections were performed by Ramona Didion. Point A = 2-17um (actual 3.84) Point B and C = 7-22um (Actual 9.74 and 10.0) Value: % C : AVLR: % CLF P - Pass N/A	D code.	Audit Que	estions			. <u>-</u>
Description:  Mat are the product inspection requirements?  Audit Evidence:  Mat are the product inspection requirements?  Audit Evidence:  Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF  P- Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A  Dode: Name:  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF  P- Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A  Dode: Name:  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF  P- Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A  N/A N/A N/A N/A  Dode: Name:  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF  P- Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A  N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	ib cout.	Name:			V	Veight:
Audit are the product inspection requirements?  Audit Evidence:  Name:  Observiption:  Weight:  Col 5.09 Process Signoff  Discription:  Were appropriate are process steps signed off?  Audit Evidence:  Name:  NiA	CQI 5.08	Part Inspection			1	
Audit Evidence: These parts are to recieve 3 point thickness and visual inspection. All required inspections were performed by Ramona Diction. Point A = 2-17µm (actual 3.84) Point B and C = 7-22µm (Actual 9.74 and 10.0)  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF N/A	Description:			·· <del>···</del>		
These parts are to recieve 3 point thickness and visual inspection. All required inspections were performed by Ramona Didion. Point A = 2-17um (actual 3.34) Point B and C = 7-22um (Actual 9.74 and 10.00 Male: % C: AVIR: % CLF N/A	What are the p	roduct inspection requirements?				
Ramona Didion	Audit Evidenc	e:		·		<del>.</del>
Value					performed	by
P - Pass   N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   D   Code:   Name:   Welght:   Col. 5.09   Process Signoff   1					A)// D-	0/ OLD
ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.09 Process Signoff 1  Description: Were appropriate are process steps signed off? Audit Evidence: DMF250 was signed by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at each individuals appropriate stages of processing.  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF N/A	<del>-</del>	vel:			AVLK:	
CQI 5.09 Process Signoff  Description: Were appropriate are process steps signed off?  Audit Evidence: DMF250 was signed by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at each individuals appropriate stages of processing.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A  Dode: Name: Weight: CQI 5.10 Part Inspection  Description: Were all inspection steps, as documented in the control plan, performed?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: Value: Value: Value: Value: Value: Value: Value: Value: Value: Veresteps/operations performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: Yes  Conformity Level: Value: Valu	P - Pass		N/A	N/A		
Description: Were appropriate are process steps signed off?  Audit Evidence: DMF250 was signed by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at each individuals appropriate stages of processing.  Conformity Level: P- Pass N/A	ID code:					_
Were appropriate are process steps signed off?  Audit Evidence:  DMF250 was signed by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at each individuals appropriate stages of processing.  Conformity Level:	CQI 5.09	Process Signoff			1	
Audit Evidence: DMF250 was signed by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at each individuals appropriate stages of processing.  Conformity Level: P- Pass N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/	Description:					
DMF250 was signed by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at each individuals appropriate stages of processing.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	Were appropria	ate are process steps signed off?				
Conformity Level: Value: % C : AVLR: % CLF P - Pass N/A	Audit Evidenc	e:	**************************************	<u></u>		_
P. Pass Name: Weight: CQI 5.10 Part Inspection 1  Description: Were all inspection steps, as documented in the control plan, performed?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF P. Pass N/A	DMF250 was s	igned by Ramonda Didion and Dory Cotrell at	t each individuals appro	opriate stages	of process	sing.
P - Pass Name: Weight: CQI 5.10 Part Inspection 1  Description: Were all inspections performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: COI 5.11 Process Steps 1  Description: Were steps/operations performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF N/A	Conformity Le	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR
CQI 5.10 Part Inspection  Description: Were all inspection steps, as documented in the control plan, performed?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
CQI 5.10 Part Inspection  Description: Were all inspection steps, as documented in the control plan, performed?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
Description: Were all inspection steps, as documented in the control plan, performed?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A						<del>-</del>
Were all inspection steps, as documented in the control plan, performed?  Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	<b></b>	- art mepeetien		<del>- '</del>		
Audit Evidence: Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	•	ction stone as documented in the control plan	narformed?			
Reviewed Job Setup Instruction and Final Audit Log. All inspections were completed as documented.  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF P - Pass N/A	<u> </u>	•	, periorifica :			
Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF				d aa daayma	ntod	
P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A  ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.11 Process Steps 1  Description: Were steps/operations performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: Yes  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLF N/A		<u> </u>				
ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.11 Process Steps 1  Description: Were steps/operations performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: Yes  Conformity Level: Value: % C : AVLR: % CLF N/A	=	vel:			AVLR:	
CQI 5.11   Process Steps   1	P - Pass		N/A	N/A		
Description: Were steps/operations performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: Yes  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A  Description: If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	ID code:	********			V	_
Were steps/operations performed that were not documented in the control plan?  Audit Evidence: Yes  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/	COLE 11					•
Audit Evidence: Yes  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A	UQI D. H	Process Steps			1	
Yes  Conformity Level: Value: % C : AVLR: % CLI P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A  ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.12 Additional Process Steps 1  Description: If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: Value: % C : AVLR: % CLI P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A  ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications 1		Process Steps			1	i 
Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A  ID code: Name: CQI 5.12 Additional Process Steps 1  Description: If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A  ID code: Name: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications  Value: % C: AVLR: % CLI % CL	Description:	•	I in the control plan?		1	
P - Pass N/A	<b>Description:</b> Were steps/ope	erations performed that were not documented	l in the control plan?		1	
P - Pass N/A	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence	erations performed that were not documented	l in the control plan?			
ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.12 Additional Process Steps 1  Description: If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLI P - Pass N/A	Description: Were steps/op Audit Evidenc Yes	erations performed that were not documented		% C :		
CQI 5.12 Additional Process Steps 1  Description: If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: Value: % C: AVLR: % CLI P - Pass N/A	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le	erations performed that were not documented	Value:			% CLR
Description:  If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence:  There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level:  P - Pass  N/A  N/A  N/A  Weight:  CQI 5.13  Lot Certifications	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass	erations performed that were not documented ee: evel:	Value:		AVLR:	% CLR N/A
If additional steps not in the control plan were performed, were they authorized?  Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A Weight: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass	erations performed that were not documented ee: evel: Name:	Value:		AVLR:	% CLR N/A Weight:
Audit Evidence: There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Weight: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12	erations performed that were not documented ee: evel: Name:	Value:		AVLR:	% CLR N/A Weight:
There was no evidence of additional steps.  Conformity Level: P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Weight: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description:	erations performed that were not documented ee: evel: Name: Additional Process Steps	Value: N/A		AVLR:	% CLR N/A Weight:
Conformity Level:         Value:         % C :         AVLR:         % CLI           P - Pass         N/A         N/A         N/A         N/A           ID code:         Name:         Weight:           CQI 5.13         Lot Certifications         1	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional ste	erations performed that were not documented ee:  evel:  Name:  Additional Process Steps eps not in the control plan were performed, we	Value: N/A		AVLR:	% CLR N/A Weight:
P - Pass N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications 1	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional ste	erations performed that were not documented  ee:  Name: Additional Process Steps  eps not in the control plan were performed, we	Value: N/A		AVLR:	% CLR N/A Weight:
ID code: Name: Weight: CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications 1	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional stee Audit Evidence There was no e	erations performed that were not documented ee:  Name: Additional Process Steps eps not in the control plan were performed, were: evidence of additional steps.	Value: N/A N/A ere they authorized?	N/A	AVLR:	% CLR N/A Veight:
CQI 5.13 Lot Certifications 1	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional ste Audit Evidence There was no e	erations performed that were not documented ee:  Name: Additional Process Steps eps not in the control plan were performed, were: evidence of additional steps.	Value: N/A ere they authorized? Value:	N/A % C :	AVLR:	% CLR N/A <b>V</b> eight:
	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional stee Audit Evidence There was no e	erations performed that were not documented ee:  Name: Additional Process Steps eps not in the control plan were performed, were: evidence of additional steps.	Value: N/A ere they authorized? Value:	N/A % C :	AVLR:	% CLR N/A <b>V</b> eight:
Description:	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional ste Audit Evidence There was no e Conformity Le	erations performed that were not documented  ee:  Name: Additional Process Steps  eps not in the control plan were performed, were: evidence of additional steps.	Value: N/A ere they authorized? Value:	N/A % C :	AVLR:	% CLR N/A Weight:
	Description: Were steps/ope Audit Evidence Yes Conformity Le P - Pass ID code: CQI 5.12 Description: If additional stee Audit Evidence There was no e Conformity Le P - Pass	erations performed that were not documented  ee:  Name: Additional Process Steps  eps not in the control plan were performed, we  ee: evidence of additional steps.  evel:  Name:	Value: N/A ere they authorized? Value:	N/A % C :	AVLR:	% CLR N/A Veight:

	Audit G	uestions			_
Audit Evidend	e:	<u> </u>			
Yes, cert was	accurate vs inspection data.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
CQI 5.14	Lot Certifications			1	
Description:		**************************************			
	cation signed by an authorized individual?				
Audit Eviden	ce:	<u>.</u>			-
Cert signed by	Toni Smith				
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			V	Veight:
CQI 5.15	Mixed Parts			1	
Description:			·		
-	and containers free of foreign objects or con	tamination?			
Audit Eviden	<del></del>	<u> </u>			
	tainers (cardboard boxes) were dirty as ship	ped to us. We cleaned ou	ut the old brow	vn paper a	and
replaced with	new.		<u></u>		
Conformity L	evei:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A	<u> </u>	N/A
ID code:	Name:				Veight:
CQI 5.16	Packaging	·			·· <del>-</del>
Description:					
Are packaging	requirements identified?				
Audit Eviden					
Reviewed Job	Setup Instructions. Parts were bulk packet	d in layers per requiremen	<u> </u>		
Conformity L	evel:	Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:				Neight:
CQI 5.17	Prevention of Mixed Parts			•	1
Description:					
Are parts paci	kaged to minimize mixed parts (parts packe	d over height of container)	?		
Audit Eviden	ce:				
Reviewed Job	Setup Instructions. Parts were packaged	as specified by the custom	er and in a m	anner to r	ninimize th
risk of mixed		Value	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR
Conformity L	.evel:	<b>Value:</b> N/A	% C : N/A	AVLK;	N/A
P - Pass		IN/A	INIA		
ID code:	Name:				Weight: 1
CQI 5.18	Shipping Identification	<u> </u>			ı
Description:					
	s properly identified (for shipping)?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	*****		
Audit Eviden					
A DMF trace	tag was used to identifty the parts.				

	Audit Que	stions	-		
Conformity Level:		Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A
ID code:	Name:			Weight:	
CQI 5.19	Shipping Labels			1	
Description:	***************************************				
Were the con	tainers properly labeled (for shipping)?				
Audit Evider	ice:				
A DMF trace	tag was used to identifty the container.				
Conformity Level:		Value:	% C :	AVLR:	% CLR:
P - Pass		N/A	N/A		N/A

Legend				
% C :	Percentage Conformity			
AVLR:	Average Value of Lower Level Requirements			
% CLR:	Percentage of Conformity to Lower Level Requirements			
AVLR:	Average Value of High Level Requirements			
% CHR:	Percentage of Conformity to High Level Requirements			
N/A:	Not Applicable			

FOODSOTTERSHIP ROUTE BROKE SAME OF A BROWN BROKE ARMAINONN