RENAULT GROUPE “Customer-Specific Requirements for use with IATF 16949 1st Edition – version 2016

Content

Customer-Specific Requirements
For Use With IATF 16949 1st Edition – version 2016
July 2017

Foreword: Part quality development is based on ANPQP which is formally conforming to expectations as mentioned in IATF 16 949 standard.

1. Scope

a) IATF 16949 and this document define the fundamental quality system requirements for organizations supplying production
and/or service parts to Renault. In addition to previous document, supplementary requirements mentioned in this document include the following:

- As a key-reminder : The supplier shall inform and get feedback from Renault (RNPO and Plant SQA) about any Change in its Product or Process or Controls means prior to start change implementation. Tier-1 supplier shall apply this requirement to Tier-2.
- The supplier shall review FMEA by using Reverse FMEA (R-FMEA) tool and make this tool deployed over its Tier-2.
- Supplier shall demonstrate exhaustively and at any request that its entire production is conforming to Safety and Regulatory Characteristics in vigor for commercialization countries.
- As systematic preventive action, the supplier shall not employ temporary workers on workstations producing Safety and/or Regulatory characteristics and on Final Control stations.
- At last, Renault Group requests Supplier to deliver ZERO NC parts in its plants. Supplier shall define and implement continuous scheduled action plans- heading to Zero NC- in order to meet this objective and to make it reliable over the time.

2. References

Information regarding the technical documents that are to be used when working with Renault Group will be listed in the RFQ and/or will be available through the supplier portal.

3. Definitions

Where inconsistent terminology exists between IATF 16949 and Renault Group contractual documents / Alliance Supplier Guide
(ASG) website, the latter shall take precedence. In all other cases, the definitions used in IATF 16949 shall apply to this document.

Certification Body : A firm recognized by the IATF to conduct audits to IATF 16949 and issue certificates to clients. As an IATF OEM member, Renault only recognizes certificates issued by recognized Certification Bodies carrying the IATF logo and specific IATF number.

4. Requirements

Renault specific requirements are expressed partly below, partly in technical information gathered in the RFQ.

a) The supplier is expected to provide products that meet or exceed Renault Group Quality & Customer Satisfaction, Cost and Delivery targets.

4.1 Leadership and commitment

Renault requests that suppliers delivering to Renault consider and implement good practice regarding sustainable development / social responsibility, especially in the following areas: No child labor / no forced work / Working conditions / Health and Safety / Environmental protection. Applicable evidence may include:
- having access to the Renault CSR guidelines, and having access to the organizations' signed commitment to DDSF (Déclaration des Droits Sociaux Fondamentaux)
- 2nd party evaluation (for example, customer evaluation)
- 3rd party evaluation, such as ISO 26000 evaluation, OHSAS 18001 / ISO14000 certification,

Any other system demonstrating that sustainable development / social responsibility concerns are taken seriously by the organization will be accepted.

4.2 Customer focus

Confirmation of the implementation of the supplier's quality management system and its ability to meet Renault Group requirements will be carried out by Renault Group using the Alliance audit tools (such as ASES, PESES or SHC).

The supplier shall achieve a minimum level of C rank after ASES evaluation.

In some cases, the supplier may be requested to achieve a minimum ASES level of B rank. If the supplier is evaluated at an ASES level of D rank, they will either receive no business or will be obliged to commit at top management level to
provide the necessary resources and action plan to achieve the required Quality level.

Adherence to this commitment should be considered as a Customer Requirement, as defined in IATF 16949 clause 5.2: "Top management shall ensure that customer requirements are determined and are met with the aim of enhancing customer satisfaction". Major disruption will result in notification to the IATF and may lead to suspension of certification.

4.3 Resources

The supplier must have a Supplier ANPQP Representative (SAR) responsible for ANPQP deployment within their organization.
The SAR can be at plant or at group level, as long as the following tasks are ensured at certified organization level :
- staying up to date with latest ANPQP changes
- making sure that point 3) below is followed

4.4 Skills and Training

4. The supplier staff in contact with Renault during the quotation phase, project development phase and mass production phase must have been trained in ANPQP.
Evidence for 4.3 may include, but are not limited to training records, explanation of ANPQP and demonstration on how to access to ANPQP requirements and templates, ANPQP portal.

4.5 Changes to requirements for products and services

The supplier shall inform and get feedback from Renault about any Change in its Product or its Process or its Control means prior to start change implementation. The Supplier shall inform the relevant SAM in RNPO and the relevant CSDL in DQSC-F about change proposal with its risks analysis and necessary countermeasures to be taken. Then, in case of common approval, Change management will be performed accordingly to ANPQP chap. 9 during project phases or adapted procedure during serial life. As mentioned in ANPQP, change of or at Tier-2 is included in this requirement.

4.6 Control of nonconforming output

The supplier shall review FMEA by using Reverse FMEA (R-FMEA) tool. In order to switch from Corrective to preventive actions, the supplier shall check at shop floor level their Existing FMEA and provide necessary activities to avoid occurrence or at minimum to improve detection of Non conformity.

4.7 Review of the requirements for products and services

Supplier shall demonstrate exhaustively that its entire production is conforming to Safety and Regulatory Characteristics. Safety and Regulatory characteristics as mentioned on the part drawing must be taken into account in successive Control Plan applied during production and Conformity Of Production Trials must be performed respectfully with defined methods and frequency. Supplier shall be compliant to updated Regulations in the country of commercialization. Evidence of tests with results and synthesis reports must be provided on customer's request. Such evidences shall be kept available accordingly to defined storage period.

4.8 Product audit

As systematic preventive action against Non Conformity occurrence that could lead to major issue, the supplier shall reserve workstations and final control with Safety or/and Regulatory marks to workers with dully controlled experience and practice.
Regular observation reports can be requested during different audits at shop floor level.

4.9 Nonconformity and corrective action

Supplier shall define, implement and review necessary continuous and scheduled action plan in order to insure ZERO NON CONFORMING PART delivered in Renault Group plants. This road map heading to zero default shall be monthly recorded and be available during audits or Performance Reviews.

b) The certification body quality follow up

The certification body shall include in their report detailed feedback of their checks of the items listed as key items in paragraph 5 / "focus on key items".
In case of nonconformity during the IATF 16949 audit, the supplier and the certification body must manage IATF nonconformities in a robust way. The table below lists the respective "shalls"

Step	Requirement for the supplier	Requirement for the certification body (CB)
Finding description	Findings shall be formally acknowledged by plant manager AND quality manager. (signature).	The CB shall state several examples or preferably the extent of failure of the system. (number of cases out of number of

	Supplier should reserve 0,5 to 1 day right after the audit to start asap the corrective process, starting with the root cause analysis, should there be any NC.	examples picked / ratio of Not OK with respect to scope of system, continuously low performance). The CB should describe the risk associated to this finding (for its customer, the OEM, the final customer)
Definition of effectiveness *(What will be the evidence of effectiveness of corrective actions : Define target and how to measure it (what, when))*	It shall be formally defined, preferably with quantified figures or as a binary result, such as proof or eradication of the systemic root causes. This effectiveness definition shall be formalized and communicated to CB jointly with the root cause analysis and prior to the action plan.	Relevance of effectiveness definition shall be validated. Corresponding documents shall be saved as part of the file.
Root cause analysis	It shall be documented with a deep analysis for occurrence, non detection and systemic cause of non-conformity. Each type of cause shall be studied down to the root cause thanks to quality tools such as combined Ishikawa and 5 why. Causes should be at organization / management level and not related to individuals. The first 3 steps should be conducted within 21 days. They shall be formally approved by plant manager AND quality manager	Note : ability to conduct root cause analysis has been validated by CB by item 8.5.2.1. There is no excuse to accept a lame analysis at the same time. Detailed analysis shall be saved as part of the file.
Define SYSTEMIC corrective actions linked to previous analysis :	Action plan shall address root causes and shall ensure that there will not be recurrence of the non conformity where it was found as well as in similar areas where countermeasures shall reasonably be applied. Action plan shall be formally validated by plant manager AND quality manager (signature, paper or electronic). This step should be conducted within 35 days max.	The CB shall validate the relevance of the action plan and the link to the root cause analysis. CB should give feedback before 45th day
Completion, effectiveness and maintenance of effectiveness for each action	It shall be submitted as part of the file, separately for each action previously mentioned in the action plan	All requested evidence shall be validated, then saved as part of the file (as requested by IATF rules).
Global effectiveness	It shall be formally assessed with respect to the effectiveness criteria as defined in corresponding step	
100% solved		The 100% solved status was originally created to address the rare cases where

		the actions could not possibly be completed within 90 days. If some non-conformities are solved using this status, explain why and define current status of action plan completion and new date to send / collect further evidence of achievement and effectiveness as soon as possible.
Change of status following a Non Conformity or a complaint.	If nonconformity is not solved according to IATF rules and leads to change of certificate status, supplier shall notify Renault of their change of status. (mail to qualite.achats@renault.com and usual Purchasing and Quality & Customer Satisfaction Department contacts.	

5. Additional Information regarding Renault position vs IATF 16949 version 2016

Focus on key items

Renault has limited its number of specific requirements because the IATF 16949 standard itself is comprehensible.
For Renault, the key concepts of the IATF 16949 are customer satisfaction as well as self-improvement through efficient problem solving and continuous improvement. All tasks achieved / documents used within this frame should serve these goals:
Acceptance of a document by an OEM is not a waiver.
A study of past quality problems and 2nd party system audits has led Renault to highlight some areas requested by the IATF 16949 standard, for which confirmation of the existence of documented evidence is highly recommended. These are:

Item		
7.1.4 Change control	Whole paragraph, including the note, starting with 'The organization shall have a process to control and react to changes that impact product realization. The effects of any change, including those changes caused by any supplier, shall be assessed, and verification and validation activities shall be defined, to ensure compliance with customer requirements. Changes shall be validated by the Customer before implementation.(…)	Evidence of risk analysis should be documented
7.3.4 Design and development review	At suitable stages, systematic reviews of design and development shall be performed (…). Records of the results of the reviews and any necessary actions shall be maintained.	
7.5.1.3 Verification of job set-ups	Job set-ups shall be verified whenever performed, such as an initial run of a job, material changeover or job change.	Evidence of verification should be accessible
8.3 Control of nonconforming product	The organization shall ensure that product which does not conform to product requirements is identified and controlled to prevent its unintended use or delivery	The ergonomics and the robustness of the method used have to be considered when evaluating conformance to clause 8.3
8.3 Control of nonconforming product 8.3.2 Control of reworked product	(..)When nonconforming product is corrected it shall be subject to re-verification to demonstrate conformity to the requirements. Instructions for rework, including re-inspection requirements, shall be accessible to and utilized by the appropriate Personnel	
8.5.2.1 Problem solving	The organization shall have a defined process for problem solving leading to root cause identification and elimination.	Problem solving must be thorough enough to solve the problems. Acceptance of a problem solving file by a customer is no waiver for a poor analysis, as the ultimate goal of the analysis should be for the organization itself to solve its problem

8.5.2.3 Corrective action impact	The organization shall apply to other similar processes and products the final corrective action, and controls implemented, to eliminate the cause of a nonconformity.	Documented evidence is necessary
7.3.6.3 Product approval process	The organization shall conform to a product and manufacturing process approval procedure recognized by the customer. NOTE Product approval should be subsequent to the verification of the manufacturing process.[…]	Note that it is the organization responsibility to ensure the verification of its process, regardless of the customer approval.

Renault and the core tools

FMEA	The use of FMEA (according to AIAG Manual, latest version) is widely accepted. The use of Renault AMDEC is recommended in accordance with standard 01-33-200. (accessible through Renault supplier portal – GD norms); The Supplier's own standard is accepted. Whenever requested by Renault, a Product, Process or Means FMEA / AMDEC shall be submitted for verification and validation. FMEA should be a living document, used to evaluate risks and therefore updated regularly along with the latest changes (7.1.4) Reverse FMEA (R-FMEA) tool must be applied to review FMEA. Evidence of R-FMEA deployment and use shall be requested by Renault Quality Representative. Tier-1 supplier is requested to deploy R-FMEA use at its Tier-2.
MSA	The use of MSA is accepted. However the use of the CNOMO standard or Renault specific methods are recommended.
APQP	As part of purchasing contracts, Renault requests the use of ANPQP . ". The supplier is required to rigorously apply ANPQP to identify all reasonably foreseeable potential safety issues and to take preventative actions to ensure that such safety issues do not occur during the use of the product". The structure of ANPQP is similar to the structure of the AIAG APQP document. This has been done to facilitate the understanding of ANPQP Note : Though not forbidden, a detailed check of an ANPQP file is not requested from the certification bodies
PPAP	The equivalent for Renault of the "Production Part Approval Process" is the ANPQP ("Alliance New Product Quality Procedure"). The equivalent for Renault of the "PPAP submission" or "PPAP package" is the PSW (Part Submission Warrant). This link between PPAP and ANPQP / PSW is for explanation purpose only. Nota : For all reference part, the supplier shall implement necessary actions to make PSW rated K0 at latest for SOP.
SPC	Capabilities: Renault accepts the use of capabilities according to AIAG manual, but recommends the use of Renault internal methods and targets. Control charts : Renault accepts the use of control charts and rules for reaction as defined in the AIAG manual. The basic principles of control charts should be considered, including - control limits are not tolerance ranges, and should be calculated according to usual SPC rules - In case a need for reaction is identified, according to chosen SPC common sense rule, the reaction should be conducted, recorded, and its result confirmed with documented evidence.

Notification to certification bodies

Status	Notification to CB
In addition to PPM Alerts, RANKING of Supplier became a Key Quality indicator : high ranking lead the supplier to be enlisted in Red/Yellow list	Renault will notify the Certification Body, according to IATF rules, after detecting a serious quality problem such as repetitive car blockages, recall campaigns, recurrence of Quality alarms (Ranking, PPM), weak ASES results or insufficient involvement in Rank Up activities. These situations may also lead to a Business Hold through the Red/Yellow list procedure in use within Renault Group.
Blockages: Recall Campaigns, Warranty incidents, …	
ASES D rank active supplier with no commitment for Rank up to ASES C or B rank.	
ASES D rank for an organization seeking certification to IATF 16949	