MFC - SCAR Guide for Response and Review

Purpose**:**This is a reference only resource for SCAR Coordinators and Suppliers - to communicate and align supplier responses and use to evaluate SCAR responses.

Supplier's SCAR Response Team:Should be a cross functional team led by quality to promote multi-disciplinary review of issue, analysis and measures taken to correct and prevent deficiency.

Containment Efforts: (Delivered units, work in progress (WIP), material in stock, any sub-tier items)

* Containment must take place *immediately (Best Practice:* Should be entered into the P2P portal within 24 hours).
* This may include containing all suspect or unknown product, additional inspection or testing of product, or other actions determined to be short term in nature.
* Containment efforts should not be limited to one part number. All LM parts/orders having the requirement cited/violated in the SCAR should be validated for compliance.

Root Cause of Non-Conformances:

* This should include investigation tools employed by supplier.
* Consider the following (depending on complexity): Is/Is Not, Fishbone, Fault Tree, FMEA, 5 Why.
	+ Target is to perform analysis not specific to immediate facts (i.e. operator error, training, etc.) as one root cause w/ multiple contributing causes may exist.
* This is the identification and verification of the existing or potential problem. The true root cause of the non-conformance i.e. The reason that caused the defect and if eliminated would preclude another occurrence. Should include sub-tier supplier and or raw material findings if necessary.

Tip: Human error occurs due to "latent organization weakness" that may exist in procedure development and review, engineering design and approval, procurement and product receipt inspection, training and qualification system(s), and so on. Human error reveals "Active Failure."

Corrective/Preventive Actions:

**NOTE:** "Told the operator to be more careful" does not satisfy corrective action. This statement is not effective and does not document effective corrective action.

LM MFC definitions:

Corrective Action - Action taken to eliminate the cause of a detected nonconformity or other undesirable situation to prevent recurrence

Preventive Action - Action to eliminate the cause of a potential nonconformity or other undesirable potential situation

* Determination of corrective actions in relation to "Root cause of non-conformance(s) identified”
* If implementation is planned at a future date, a firm expected completion date must be identified with responsible parties
* Implementation of Corrective Action will include responsible, what, when, expected results and success monitoring actions
* Prevention (Preventative Actions)
	+ What will be done or has been done to ensure the solution is totally integrated in the processes within the supplier (similar production lines, other LM programs, etc.)?
	+ What has been done to share this information internally and/or to supplier's sub-tiers?
	+ How the solution will be utilized to prevent issues of this sort in the future?

Key question to ask: "*If these actions are executed, is it reasonably certain the issue will not repeat?"*

**Tip**: Actual action taken to address the finding is sometimes limited to “we retrained the operator”. Retraining is seldom accepted by LM as a valid singular corrective action response. Focus on process improvements. Corrective action / preventative action is not limited to ONE action.

Effectivity of Corrective/Preventive Actions:

* How will it be measured?
* What is being measured?
* Who will measure it?
* Where will it be measured?
* When will it be measured?

This step could require the corrective action to mature for effects to be measured effectively.

Effectivity of preventive action i.e. Date, lot, serial number etc...

Also, how will the effectiveness of the corrective action be verified.

 Tip: Effectivity is a two-fold question. When were the corrective actions effective or "put in place", AND how will the supplier verify their corrective actions are effective? Effectivity should be accomplished through independent verification efforts. Preferably, utilize personnel / processes that are separate from the corrective / preventive actions. Those directly involved in the corrective action will want to see its success only, not its potential flaws and drawbacks. NOTE: Lack of future defect notifications from LM is not an acceptable plan for measuring effectivity.

# Objective Evidence:

* Include factual evidence in the form of data or records
* Utilization of Supplier Quality Field Representative (SQFR) to perform first-hand observations will be utilized as much as possible.
	+ The exact amount of evidence depends on the magnitude of the Corrective Action plan

Supplier to provide proof of corrective actions taken (i.e. Revised procedures/work instructions/travelers/work orders/drawings/engineering changes and training records), and evidence of verification of effectiveness (audit results of revised process).

 Tip: If you have been able to measure the effectiveness of the corrective actions, then show results as part of objective evidence. If training is part of corrective action, provide a signed, dated training log including the names of the participants, the instructor and the content of the training.

# SCAR "PENV" Processing : Pending Verification of Corrective Action:

Once an acceptable SCAR response has been received, LM may follow up to verify the effectiveness of the corrective action. In this case, the SCAR will be left open in the "SRES PENV" state. The action resides with the LM SCAR Coordinator. Once the CA is verified, the "PENV" status will be removed, and the SCAR will be completed (put in SCCA). All actions associated with the P2P SCAR for this process reside with LM, unless the CA breaks down and the SCAR is re-issued.