QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MANUFACTURE OF F100 ENGINE PARTS

P/N: 4025445
NSN: 2840003350533

Rev: 5
01-Nov-02

I. HARDWARE DESCRIPTION

A. Nomenclature:
Coupling, Gearbox Drive

B. Function:
This part serves as direct link between the gearbox towershaft and the engine bevel gear.

C. Material Composition:
AMS 6265 Steel

D. Critical Life Characteristics:
This part contains no critical characteristics, however, dimensions of splines must be maintained to ensure proper operation and transfer of power from the engine to the gearbox.

II. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

LPF-QAR-004 General Quality Assurance Requirements for F100 Engine Components.

III. JUSTIFICATION FOR QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Ref.: FAR Subpart 9.2, AFMCFAR Subpart 5309.2

The following paragraphs provide the justification for qualification requirements for this part.

A. Criticality of Part:

This is a Critical Application Item (CAI) used on F-16 configured engines. A failure during flight can lead to the loss of the aircraft and possibly the loss of life.

B. Complexity of Part:

This part is not complex to manufacture, however, it is used in a critical location and must therefore require strict process control and quality standards.

C. Government Risk:

The following paragraphs document the reasons why the risk to the government of buying this part from an unqualified source is compound.

1. The probability of an unqualified source producing an unsatisfactory part is moderate.

2. The probability of an unqualified source failing to produce within schedule is moderate.

3. A high potential exists for an unqualified source to underestimate the manufacturing difficulty and miss critical delivery schedules.

4. Untimely delivery critically impacts end item overhaul/repair schedules. Failure to deliver on schedule may result in additional high cost emergency procurements.

5. An inferior part can result in a loss of engine power or inflight shutdown. This would lead to a mission abort and possibly the loss of the aircraft.

D. There are no costs incurred by an offeror for qualification testing and testing evaluation under the requirements of paragraphs VI.A or VI.B. However, the offeror's development of a Source Approval Request (SAR) package to be submitted for Government evaluation may cost as much as $2500. In addition, the cost incurred by offerors for Government evaluation of their SAR submitted under the requirements of paragraphs VI.A or VI.B may be as much as $1,200. This cost may be borne by the Government if it is in the best interest of the Government to qualify alternate sources.

IV. JUSTIFICATION FOR QUALIFICATION PRIOR TO CONTRACT AWARD
Ref.: AFMCFAR Subpart 5309.2

The following paragraphs provide the rationale for requiring a demonstration of the qualification requirements prior to contract award.

A. The risk of default by the contractor must be minimized as the shortest combined administrative and production lead-time is over 24 months.

B. The technical risk must also be minimized due to the criticality of the part (Reference the section "Criticality of Part" in paragraph III.A).

C. The manufacturing and processing techniques are critical to performance and reliability (Reference the section "Criticality of Part" in paragraph III.A).

D. The risk to the government in determining a potential vendor's capability without an actual demonstration of that capability must be minimized. The expertise that is required to manufacture this part is not commonly available or easily obtained and therefore must be demonstrated. (Reference the section "Complexity of Part" in paragraph III.B).

V. DATA AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

The following paragraphs document the data that must be submitted with a request for source approval. All documentation submitted shall be the latest revision published. Documentation shall be bound (preferably a three ring binder) with a table of contents and corresponding sections tabbed.

A. The potential Offeror must substantiate that they possess latest revision of the following data by providing a copy in the source approval package, or must provide DCAS or other government representative written verification that the potential vendor has the latest revision of the following data:

1. Drawing Number: 4025445 (Including all sub-assembly or detail drawings specified on this drawing number)

2. Quality Assurance Data (QAD): 4025445 As applicable, include the QAD for each sub-assembly or detail part listed on the above drawing.

3. All applicable specifications called out on the drawing, and/or assembly and detail drawings, and on the QAD (as applicable). These include:

   a) Process Specifications
   b) Inspection Processes
   c) Material Specifications

B. The potential Offeror's Quality Assurance System must meet or exceed the requirements described in the attached document LPF-QAR-004.

C. The vendor shall supply a list of all manufacturing and inspection processes that will be performed, both in-house or by sub-vendors. The vendor shall substantiate that sources to be employed for any significant process, including themselves, with the exception of conventional metal removal processes, are currently approved by Pratt & Whitney (P&W) for the specific process required or another OEM for an equivalent process. The vendor must supply the name and address of each certified vendor to be used. In all cases where process approval is relative to an OEM process specification other than Pratt & Whitney, the vendor shall provide the complete specification and demonstrate the equivalence of the specifications.

VI. SUBSTANTIATION OF MANUFACTURING CAPABILITY

The following paragraphs document the methods to be used to substantiate a vendor's capability to manufacture this item.

A. A vendor who has manufactured the item for the prime contractor (P&W), another engine OEM, or for other United States Department of Defense users of the same item within the last five years may be approved as a source for the part provided the vendor was responsible for all material procurement, inspection, and finishing of the end item, i.e., the prime manufacturer, P&W, or other engine OEM did not add any value to the end item. The vendor must submit evidence of the scope of work for the part indicating that they had primary responsibility for all operations necessary for the completion of the part for delivery to the customer. This evidence shall include MANUFACTURING PROCESS SHEETS.

B. Other vendors will be considered for approval on the basis of their ability to manufacture a similar item for the prime contractor (P&W), another engine OEM, the United States Department of Defense, or a NATO country. The following conditions must be met for approval by similarity:

1. Submit evidence of the successful manufacture and sale of the similar item, to include purchase orders and shipping documents reflecting production quantities within the last five years. This evidence must document that the vendor had primary responsibility for all operations necessary to produce the similar item, and that the similar item was accepted by the customer. Also include a summary of quality deficiencies experienced within the last two years of production of the similar item(s) with coordination from the Q. A. manager. The vendor shall provide SPECIFIC similarities and differences between the subject part and the similar part.

2. The vendor shall substantiate that the similar component(s) submitted will satisfy the following criteria:

   a) Fabricated of the same alloy or an alloy from the same alloy family, e.g. Alpha Titanium's, Inconels, Austenitic Stainless Steels.

   b) Illustrates the ability of the vendor, in conjunction with their sub-vendors, to perform all significant processes to be employed and maintain requisite tolerances and surface finish requirements.

   c) The data must also show that the manufacturing and inspection/test processes for the similar part demonstrate the full range of difficulty required for the subject part. Included in this data shall be complete MANUFACTURING PROCESS SHEETS for the similar item.

3. A first article requirement may be included in any contract resulting from approval based upon similarity. The estimated cost of first article testing is $2,500.00. These tests may include material properties analysis, dimensional analysis, and possibly rig test. At least three first articles would be required with one first article requiring destructive testing.

VII. RESPONSIBLE ENGINEERING ORGANIZATION

The responsible organization for establishing these qualification requirements is the F100 Engine Engineering Branch, within the Fighter Propulsion Division of the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center, Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma.

1 APPLICATION

These requirements apply to all F100 engine parts.

2 PURPOSE

This document establishes the minimum technical requirements that prospective sources must satisfy to obtain engineering approval of their quality system. All documentation provided as evidence of compliance with requirements specified herein must be in English. Engineering source approval shall be valid for five years from the date of the OC-ALC letter notifying the contractor of engineering source approval.

3 REQUIREMENTS

3.1 The Offeror must provide a Quality Assurance Manual that accurately portrays their current quality assurance system. The Quality Assurance System must meet or exceed the requirements as described in this document. Additionally, the Quality Assurance System must satisfy one of the following:

3.1.1 Certified to ISO 9002 by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) or the International Standards Organization (ISO) in Geneva, Switzerland, or

3.1.2 Previously certified within the last three (3) years to MIL-I-45208A plus paragraphs 3.1 through 3.5, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, and 6.2 of MIL-Q-9858A by the DCMC or other appropriate government Quality Assurance Representative, or

3.1.3 Approved by the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM).

3.2 Proof of certification/approval must be provided and must be dated within the last three (3) years. The decision to approve or disapprove the Quality Assurance System shall only be made after a thorough review of the Offeror's Quality Assurance Manual by the cognizant engineering authority, OC-ALC/LPFR.

3.3 Copies of the latest document(s) which describe and govern the quality assurance system in effect at the Offeror's facility(ies). If provided within the last year and no significant changes have been incorporated this requirement may be waived. However, OC-ALC/LPFR as the cognizant engineering activity for the F100 engine reserves the right to request an additional copy in the event the previous submittal cannot be located.

3.4 P&W documentation identifying the specific conditions/restrictions (i.e., specific P/Ns, components, processes, or material this status applies to, production testing required for material release, testing the LCS supplier is authorized to perform, etc.) imposed by P&W with regard to Laboratory Control at Source (LCS) Supplier status if Offeror is a P&W-approved LCS Supplier. The fact that a sub-vendor is a P&W LCS Supplier shall not relieve the Supplier of the responsibility of conducting follow-on quality assurance surveillance to ensure that sub-vendors are providing conforming material.

3.5 Evidence that the emphasis in quality assurance planning is placed upon controlling processes to preclude generation of non-conformance's and is supplemented by sufficient inspections or tests to assure effective process control.

3.6 Offeror procedures/specifications governing the control of significant processes proposed for use in the fabrication of the approval item for assuring that:

3.6.1 Only Purchaser approved sources are used for raw material, significant processes, and major sub-components and adequate consideration is given to a source's capability and performance prior to placing an order.

3.6.2 The quality acceptance standards imposed in routine production acceptance both in-house and by sub-vendors are complete and approved by P&W and the test methods employed in routine production acceptance are sufficient to verify compliance with these standards.

3.6.3 Fabrication performed in-house and by sub-vendors is accomplished in accordance with work instructions specified in manufacturing process sheets, schedules, and/or technical control plans which define the exact sequence of all production operations and all process variables and all critical parameters of manufacturing operations which may directly affect material structure, mechanical properties, surface finish and/or direction or lay of the cutting action. The procedure shall also assure that work instructions have been approved by the customer.

3.6.4 All inspection of characteristics, which serves as the basis for final acceptance of a characteristic, including in-process inspections, are performed in accordance with work instructions specified in inspection method sheets which define all characteristics specified on the applicable P&W drawings and Quality Assurance Documents (QAD's), the classification of each characteristic, the Acceptable Quality Level (AQL) for each classification of characteristic, sample size, frequency of inspection, the specific inspection methodology to be utilized, and the required instrumentation. The procedure(s) shall also assure that all inspection method sheets have been approved by the customer.

3.6.5 Specific Offeror audit procedures/guidelines which pertain to process and product audits performed both in-house and at sub-vendor facilities. These procedures shall, as a minimum assure:

3.6.5.1 Strict adherence to the sequence, parameters, and all other significant process variables of manufacturing operations defined on manufacturing process sheets approved by the customer is maintained both in-house and at sub-vendors' facilities. Specific procedures for auditing and/or controlling requisite significant processes must be provided.

3.6.5.2 Dedicated equipment is properly maintained and calibrated and is capable of adequately performing its intended application.

3.6.5.3 General housekeeping and manufacturing practices employed do not adversely affect the quality of the end product.

3.6.5.4 Established process controls and production acceptance plans are providing products which conform to the Purchaser requirements.

3.6.6 Specific Offeror procedures for assuring that certificates of test or conformance provided by sub-vendors of raw material and significant processes are complete and supported by process data and numerical test results from an OEM-approved laboratory for the requisite testing, are representative of material received, and the material is in conformance with Purchaser requirements.

3.6.7 Adequate records are retained for documenting sub-vendor lists, sub-vendor quality ratings, layout inspection reports, all Purchaser and OEM approvals, component traceability, and objective evidence of conformance to product, process, and quality acceptance requirements; and are available to the Purchaser upon request.

3.6.8 Evidence of a system for controlling non-conforming material to ensure:

3.6.8.1 The classification of all non-conforming characteristics in terms of critical, major, and minor is approved by the Purchaser.

3.6.8.2 Final disposition of all non-conforming critical and major characteristics including rework and repair is approved by the Purchaser prior to implementation.

3.6.8.3 Effective control of non-conforming material at sub-vendor facilities.

---------- **END OF DOCUMENT** ----------