

011-00688_App_2 Fix Manufacturing or Repair Method

Guidance for completion of the Method Verification Approval (MVA) Form

Issue 2

[Part A.](#)

Part A provides a record of the proposal, its verification requirement and its disposition. Completion of part A1 & A2 is carried out by the supplier Manufacturing Engineering. It is required for all classified parts regardless where the part is being manufactured. Completion of part A3 is carried out by the Siemens Task Owner.

[Part B.](#)

Part B is completed for all classified parts and is completed according to Work Instruction 011-00688. It defines the required verification and the rationale for the requirements.

[Part C.](#)

Part C is completed for all classified parts and is completed according to Work Instruction 011-00688. It records the conclusions of the review of the verification results and the rationale for the conclusions.

[Revision History](#)

		Method Verification Approval		Siemens Document Reference <u>A1</u>	Rev <u>A2</u>
eQMS+ 011-00688 & EBQR (Rev 2) B1.19		Export Control Declaration <u>A3</u>		Vendors Document Reference <u>A4</u>	
Part A1: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING DATA					
Process for <u>A5</u>	Request for <u>A6</u>	Affecting <u>A7</u>	Siemens Task Owner <u>A8</u>		
Prime Supplier name <u>A9</u>	Vendor code <u>A10</u>	Part Classification <u>A11</u>			
Fixed Process reference <u>A12</u>	Revision <u>A13</u>	DAR/Concession/FCI reference <u>A14</u>			
Part number <u>A15</u>	Part name <u>A16</u>	Product/marque or model <u>A17</u>			
Repair schemes/Service bulletins <u>A18</u>	Maintenance plan <u>A19</u>	Engine Manual chapter/section/Figure item <u>A20</u>			
Details of the request: <u>A21</u>					
For change of source / method the PA form (eQMS+ 011-00689 / EBQR-B1.19) reference is: <u>A22</u>					
Similar or previous request references : <u>A24</u>					
Number of continuation sheets <u>A23</u>					
A2: Reason for the proposal and supporting data					
Comments <u>A25</u>					
Continued <u>A26</u>					
Date submitted <u>A27</u>	Implementation target date <u>A28</u>				
Initiator name <u>A29</u>	Telephone number <u>A30</u>	Email address for correspondence <u>A31</u>			
Part A3: RELEASE OF THE PRODUCTION METHOD / FIXED PROCESS					
The Production Method / Fixed Process is: <u>A32</u>					
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved. <input type="checkbox"/> Approved with limitations. <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected. <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn.					
Comments <u>A33</u>					
Task owner name and job title <u>A34</u>		Signature <u>A35</u>	Date <u>A36</u>		
Distribution <u>A37</u>					

Part A: Proposal

Part A provides a record of the proposal, its verification requirement and its disposition. Completion of part A1 & A2 is carried out by the supplier Manufacturing Engineering. It is required for all classified parts regardless where the part is being manufactured. Completion of part A3 is carried out by the Siemens Task Owner.

Annotation A1: Siemens Document reference

[Return](#)

This is the unique identifier used within Siemens manufacturing plants to identify the production method verification and Method Verification Approval request form. The Siemens Local Control Authority allocates this reference for requests originating in the external supply chain.

Annotation A2: Rev.

[Return](#)

In some circumstances requests are modified. In these circumstances use this box to add a revision reference.

Annotation A3: Export Control Declaration

[Return](#)

The initiator uses this box to declare if there is any Export Controlled data in the form or supporting documentation. Internal plants must follow their own local policy to determine the Export Control rating. If Export Controlled information or data is associated with the verification then the requirements of each sites local policy must be followed. If in doubt contact the local Export Control officer.

Annotation A4: Vendors document reference

[Return](#)

This is not used for Siemens domestic manufacture. This is the unique identifier used by an external Supplier to identify the method verification request.

Part A1: Verification Requirements –Manufacturing Engineering assessment

Annotation A5: Process for

[Return](#)

Use the drop-down list to select the category of the process. The available categories are:-

- New manufacture. Select this if the process to be fixed is to create a part from raw materials.
- Repair – Select this if the method is any sort of repair, not just a repair that requires Engineering control in accordance with RRES90000 (i.e. Controlled Book Repairs, Overhaul Procedures, Critical Repairs).
- Overhaul and Test - activities performed associated with Overhaul and Testing of an engine.

Annotation A6: Request for

[Return](#)

Use the drop down list to indicate the nature of the proposal. The options are:

- Baseline (New method/Fixed process). A Baseline is a new production method against which subsequent changes will be evaluated for equivalence in result. For a new part number or a change of source to a new Direct Supplier (Siemens operations or a first tier supplier) select Baseline.
- Source change. Select this option if there is to be a source change with no intended change in method. (example machine A to machine B with all parameters remaining the same)
- Method change. Select this option for a method change with no change in location. (example change of machining or data card parameters, or change of sequence of operations)
- Source and method change. (combination of the two above)

Annotation A7: Affecting

[Return](#)

Use the drop-down list option of “Multiple applications” to indicate that the impact of the proposal is on a material (e.g. a billet) that could be used to produce as yet unidentified part numbers, or if the change is to a manufacturing process (e.g. a change to an Non Destructive Engineering (NDE) process) that would affect all parts produced at the source.

Select the option “Affecting Specific parts/repairs if the impact of the proposal is limited to a set of identifiable part numbers. For a “Baseline” proposal (i.e. new part) this may be left blank.

Annotation A8: Siemens Task Owner

[Return](#)

The Siemens Task Owner is the responsible PPQ Leader within Siemens. As such this will only be filled out by Siemens upon receipt of the MVA.

Annotation A9: Prime Supplier name

[Return](#)

This is the name of the Supplier with delivery responsibility for the component (referred to as the “Direct Supplier” in RRES90000) and is therefore documenting the Fixed Process. Enter the name (together with their product and process codes)

For Siemens domestic manufacture the plant name is sufficient.

For tiered supply chains the supplier whom the Siemens Purchase Order is against is accountable for initiating the proposal, that is, acts as the interface with the Control Authorities. No sub-tier should directly submit an MVA to Siemens.

Annotation A10: Vendor Code

[Return](#)

Enter the vendor code as listed on the Purchase Order.

Annotation A11: Part Classification

[Return](#)

Use the drop down list to select the correct classification from the options provided. The classification of the part will be found on the drawing.

For certain legacy parts no classification may have been defined. In this case use the “legacy” or “legacy rotating” classification or if in doubt leave blank.

Annotation A12: Fixed Process reference

[Return](#)

This is the unique identifier used for the Fixed Process Document (FPD) itself.

Annotation A13: Revision

[Return](#)

This is the revision number for the Fixed Process Document being submitted for approval. For new parts this will be “baseline”. Subsequent changes will index through 1, 2, 3... or A, B, C... etc.

For a new Fixed Process Document on an existing part (e.g. from a change of source) begin the index at 1 or A etc.

Annotation A14: DAR/Concession/RCI reference

[Return](#)

If the MVA is being raised as part of an investigation supporting alteration to a drawing or Engine Manual Instruction (e.g. to introduce an alternative manufacturing process) insert the tracking number of the Drawing Alteration Request; the tracking number is supplied by the DAR controller), Concession Request or Resolve Customer Issues (RCI) as applicable into this box.

The MVA is in effect a specialist signature supporting the DAR investigation (like, for example, a stress assessment) so providing the MVA has the tracking number from the DAR investigator as evidence of an authorised DAR investigation the MVA should be processed with the result fed back into the DAR process.

Annotation A15: Part Number

[Return](#)

Enter the finished part number and/or any semi-finished product (e.g. forging or casting) impacted by the change. Leave blank if the change is a generic material or process or source change, see annotation A7.

Note Siemens mandates one part number for MVA form. For similar changes over multiple parts a suite of MVA's shall be submitted.

Annotation A16: Part Name

[Return](#)

Enter the name of the finished part or semi-finished product (e.g. forging or castings) impacted by the change. Leave blank if the change is a generic material or process change, see annotation A7.

Annotation A17: Product/marque or model

[Return](#)

Enter the Products(s) including variant that will be impacted by the change. This is used to identify the relevant Chief Engineer Product Change Board. It is acceptable for the supplier to leave this blank, however the Task Owner shall fill this out before the MVA is reviewed.

Annotation A18: Repair schemes/Service Bulletins

[Return](#)

Applicable to Repair processes only. For new product manufacture mark with N/A.

For Repair if implementation is associated with a specific Repair Scheme or Service Bulletin then insert the applicable number here to ensure traceability.

Annotation A19: Maintenance Plan

[Return](#)

A Maintenance Plan (also known as a Route card) is a document that travels with the product within a Repair & Overhaul facility.

Record the applicable Maintenance Plan Number associated with the requested change.

Annotation A20: Engine manual chapter/section/Fig item

[Return](#)

Record the associated Chapter/Section/Fig Item from the Engine Manual applicable to the component subject to the change i.e. 72-31-16-01210. It is acceptable for the supplier to leave this blank, however the Task Owner shall fill this out before the MVA is reviewed.

Annotation A21: Details of the request

[Return](#)

For new parts ("baseline" see annotation A6) this may be left blank.

For a source and/ or method change enter a summary, in plain English free of acronyms and jargon, of all the differences between the current and proposed production method. In particular

- For a source and/or method change, reference the associated eQMS+ 011-00609 Preliminary Assessment (PA) using the box at the bottom of the section (annotation A22).
- Cite changes to order of operations, machining techniques and process parameters. If the order of operations has changed provide an overview of operation sequence in the current and proposed manufacturing method.
- List any changes to Special Processes and their data cards, referencing their revisions and including copies.
- For stock materials (e.g. forging stock, casting stock, powder, bar, plate, rings) state the current and proposed forms.
- Declare that parts of the manufacturing method that are not cited will not change.

Annotation A22: For a change of source/ method the PA form reference is

[Return](#)

For a new part production method verification enter "Not Applicable".

For a change to method and/or production source enter the reference number for the Gate-0 Preliminary Assessment form (eQMS+ 011-00609 / EBQR A4.2). This may provide further background information that will influence verification, for instance non-conformance history or service issues.

Annotation A23: Number of continuation sheets

[Return](#)

Mark the continuation box if the continuation sheet is being used to record further detail. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation A24: Similar or previous request references

[Return](#)

If similar requests have been made in the past enter the reference number of previous requests (from annotation A1). These may be used to identify potential read-across data that could influence the verification requirements.

Part A2: Reason for the proposal and supporting data

Annotation A25: Comments

[Return](#)

List the reasons why the change is required.

- Quality improvements
- Greater operational flexibility
- Cost improvements, whether it be unit or operational cost

Annotation A26: Continued

[Return](#)

Mark the continuation box if the continuation sheet is being used to record further detail. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation A27: Date submitted

[Return](#)

Enter the date.

Annotation A28: Implementation target date

[Return](#)

Enter the date when it is planned to implement the production method should approval be given. Enter "no schedule" if there is currently no planned manufacture.

Annotation A29: Initiator name

[Return](#)

Enter the name of the person in the supplier that has initiated the proposal and could be contacted for discussions on business aspects of the request for production method verification.

Annotation A30: Telephone number

[Return](#)

Enter the telephone number for the Initiator of the verification request (annotation A29). Ensure that they are legible.

Annotation A31: Email address for correspondence

[Return](#)

Enter the e-mail contact details for the Initiator of the verification request (annotation A29). Ensure that they are legible.

Part A3: Release of the proposed Fixed Process/ Production Method

Section A3 confirms that all required verification actions have been completed the disposition of the production verification is properly made and releases the results of verification of the production method to eQMS+ 011-00688.

The Siemens task owner completes Part A3 after the proposed production method has been sentenced by the provision of a completed verification report and completion of part C1 or C2. It is a notification to the Supplier of the sentencing of the MVA request. **This section cannot be completed until a Fixed Process has been sentenced by the relevant Control Authorities.**

Annotation A32: The Production Method/ Fixed Process is:

[Return](#)

The PPQ Leader should use the tick boxes to indicate the results of the review of verification evidence. This includes results from verification specified in Part B and the conclusions of specialists from part C if that was required. The options are:-

- **Approved:**
Indicates that the MVA form shows agreement from the Local Control Authority and/or Engineering Control Authority that the FPD gives satisfactory assurance that the design intent will be delivered by the defined manufacturing process and control plan.
- **Approved with limitations:**
Indicates that the Fixed Process has been approved by the relevant Control Authorities but limitations have been applied e.g. for a limited number of parts to be produced. The details of the limitation must accompany the MVA form back to the Supplier using the comment box, annotation A43.
- **Rejected :**
Indicates that the MVA form does **not** show agreement from the Local Control Authority and/or Engineering Control Authority that the FPD gives satisfactory assurance that the design intent will be delivered by the defined manufacturing process and control plan.
- **Withdrawn:**
Indicates that the Supplier has withdrawn the Fixed Process from consideration for approval. This may have happened for instance because of problems with yield or dimensional errors. Record the reason for withdrawal in the comment box, annotation A33.

Annotation A33: Comment

[Return](#)

Use this to convey any instructions for disposition of parts. For example a description of what has happened to any parts made for verification purposes. For instance, they may have had temporary part numbers to prevent their delivery to finished part stores but are now available for release, the Fixed Process having been approved, or are to be scrapped in the case of a Fixed Process not being approved.

When a Definition Alteration is required state here that the revised definition must be issued before the revised Fixed Process is implemented.

Annotation A34: Task owner name and job title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job title of the Siemens task owner. The Siemens task owner is an individual who has demonstrated the competence (behavioural, technical and process) and is authorised to approve documentation within the scope of their PPQ authorisation.

Annotation A35: Signature

[Return](#)

This is the signature of the person from annotation A32.

Annotation A36: Date


[Return](#)

Enter the date on which the Fixed Process Document was sentenced at part C1 or part C2 if applicable.

Annotation A37: Distribution

[Return](#)

Add a list of people that have been sent a copy of the Method Verification Approval form.

	Method Verification Approval	Siemens Document Reference: Rev <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> B1 B2 </div>	
Part B1: VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS - Local Control Authority assessment			
Assessment: <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 100px;"> B3 </div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 100px;"> B4 </div>			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Verify. B5 <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering Control Authority Approval Required Reject. </div>			
Verification requirements: (Limited production parts must not be released to stores) <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 100px;"> B6 </div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 100px;"> B7 </div>			
Local Control Authority member name and job title	Signature	Date	
B8	B9	B10	
Local Control Authority chair name and job title	Signature	Date	
B11	B12	B13	
Part B2: VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS - Engineering Control Authority assessment			
Assessment: <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 100px;"> B14 </div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 100px;"> B15 </div>			
Engineering Control Authority decision : <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Verify. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verify and delegate assessment of results to Local Control Authority B16 Reject. </div>			
Verification requirements: <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 100px;"> B17 </div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 100px;"> B18 </div>			
Engineering Control Authority member name and job title	Signature	Date	
B19	B20	B21	
Critical parts and lifting member name and job title	Signature	Date	
B22	B23	B24	
Engineering Control Authority chair name and job title	Signature	Date	
B25	B26	B27	

Part B: Risk Assessment and Verification Requirements.

Part B records the assessment of the risk that the proposed Fixed Process will not deliver the design intent together with the consequent work that will be needed to verify the proposed Fixed Process. Parts B1 and B2 are completed by the Local Control Authority (LCA) and the Engineering Control Authority (ECA) respectively for characteristics that cannot be verified by inspection during or after production.

Annotations B1 & B2: Siemens Document Reference

[Return](#)

See annotations A1 & A2 respectively.

Part B1: Risk Assessment and Verification Requirements – Local Control Authority Assessment:

Annotation B3: Assessment

[Return](#)

To be filled out by Siemens materials engineer and PPQ Leader.

For change proposals:

Describe the effect of the proposed Fixed Process on the component e.g. surface finish, dimension fit within acceptable band, run outs, cusps, effects on underlying material properties, likelihood and consequence of non-conformance to manufacturing output.

What is the assessment of the proposed manufacturing capability (new method and /or source)? State the reasoning behind this assessment e.g. demonstrated capability on new parts.

For forgings and castings what is the opinion of a specialist in these areas?

What technical risks are there associated with the Fixed Process and who was involved in assessing them?

State the rationale and evidence to justify the risk ranking decision and the Local Control Authority's sentencing decision.

If the people entering comments in B3 are not the same for B5 through B13, comments must be annotated with the name of who made the comments with their signature.

Annotation B4: Continued

[Return](#)

Mark the continuation box if the continuation sheet is being used to record further detail. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation B5: LCA Decision:

[Return](#)

Use the tick boxes to indicate the decision of the Local Control Authority. The available options are:-

- Verify
Select this option if the Local Control Authority considers that verification work is justified to evaluate the proposed Fixed Process. Verification work is justified if the risk that the proposed verification results would lead to the proposed method being rejected is low.
The technical risks associated with the change must present a low risk to component integrity, performance or reliability (**refer to the rules in step 1 and 3 of eQMS+ 011-00688 work instruction**).
The Local Control Authority may recommend that parts could be manufactured “at risk” ahead of the Fixed Process approval to provide items for a verification programme or in order to meet production schedules. This recommendation should be recorded here together with the rationale and any limitations to quantities.
Any such recommendation should consider the risk to delivery schedules. External suppliers must accept the risk that the parts may be scrapped and that they will not be paid for them unless explicitly agreed with Siemens via a Purchase Order. **The approval to manufacture parts “at risk” is taken as a project management decision as part of eQMS+ 011-00609**

gate 1 Parts must not be allowed to proceed to stores until the production method is approved so that effective systems must be in place to identify and segregate them.

- Engineering Control Authority Approval Required
Select this option if the Local Control Authority considers that the change presents more than a low risk to component integrity, performance or reliability but verification actions will probably establish that the hazard is not present and that therefore Engineering Control Authority input is required to evaluate the proposal.
- Reject.
Select this option if the Local Control Authority considers that the technical risks associated with the change **cannot** be effectively mitigated or the verification results are likely to lead to a rejection of the method. No further work will be carried out to evaluate the Fixed Process.

Annotation B6: Verification requirements

[Return](#)

List the actions the Local Control Authority considers necessary to verify that the proposal will satisfy the design intent for new parts or that the change to the Fixed Process will maintain equivalence of parts produced by the new FPD with those produced by the previous FPD.

State any actions to evaluate items currently being produced e.g. Last Article Inspection. All of the verification actions necessary to demonstrate a sufficiently low probability of the proposed Fixed Process producing an adverse impact on design intent must be capable of evaluation against objective pass-fail criteria e.g. comparison against a standard.

State any actions to demonstrate process capability.

Note: A PPQ should not be specified as a verification action here since this is specified in Part A3. The primary purpose of sections B & C (the MVA) is to consider risks to characteristics that cannot practically be verified by inspection e.g. material condition; the PPQ process considers conformance to all aspects of the component specification including dimensions. In practice both processes will operate in parallel so to avoid extra work the information requested for MVA approval should be in the format suitable for the PPQ pack.

Annotation B7: Continued

[Return](#)

Mark the continuation box if the continuation sheet is being used to record further detail. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation B8: LCA member Name and job title.

[Return](#)

Enter the name and title of any other person included in the Local Control Authority in addition to the Local Control Authority chair. If there is more than one person enter their details on the continuation sheet.

Annotation B9: Signature

[Return](#)

This is the signature of the person from annotation B8.

Annotation B10: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date of the signature made at annotation B9.

Annotation B11: LCA Chair Name and job Title

[Return](#)

Enter the name of the Local Control chair and their Job title and ensure that it is legible.

Annotation B12: Signature

[Return](#)

The Local Control Authority chair signs here as the accountable signatory for the Local Control Authority.

Annotation B13: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date when the signature at annotation B12 was made.

Part B2: Risk Assessment and Verification Requirements – Engineering Control Authority Assessment

This part records the Engineering Control Authority (ECA) assessment of the risk associated with the risk and the actions that will provide the evidence that the proposed Fixed Process will be satisfactory. **For new parts see rules for membership of the Engineering Control Authority at step 2 and 4 of eQMS+ 011-00688 work instruction.**

Annotation B14: Comments

[Return](#)

Use this section records any additional risks perceived by the ECA to those recorded by the LCA in part B1. For example, such risks may come from knowledge of performance in service or knowledge of similar parts at other suppliers.

Annotation B15: Continued

[Return](#)

Mark the continuation box if the continuation sheet is being used to record further detail. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation B16: ECA decision

[Return](#)

Use the drop-down list to indicate the decision of the Engineering Control Authority. The available options are:-

- **Verify**
Select this option to signify that the Engineering Control Authority agrees with the Local Control Authority decision that work is justified to evaluate the proposed Fixed Process.
The Engineering Control Authority may confirm the Local Control Authority assessment (annotation B5) that parts could be manufactured “at risk” ahead of the Fixed Process approval to provide items for a verification programme or in order to meet production schedules. This confirmation should be recorded here.
The approval to manufacture parts “at risk” is taken as a project management decision as part of eQMS+ 011-00609 gate 1 Parts must not be allowed to proceed to stores until the production method is approved so that effective systems must be in place to identify and segregate them.
- **Verify and delegate assessment of results to LCA**
For new parts leave blank since the review of verification evidence cannot be delegated to the Local Control Authority.
For change proposals select this option if the Engineering Control Authority is content that the Local Control Authority can review any verification evidence and sentence the change. **See rules at step 4 of eQMS+ 011-00688 work instruction for restrictions on Local Control Authority to sentence change.**
- **Reject**
Select this option to reject the proposal to adopt the new Fixed Process if the Engineering Control Authority considers that the technical risks associated with the proposal **cannot** be effectively mitigated. No further work will be carried out to evaluate the Fixed Process.

Annotation B17: Verification actions

[Return](#)

A verification programme is always required for new parts.

For change proposals:

- If the Engineering Control Authority considers that there additional or different verification requirements to those proposed by the Local Control Authority use this box to detail these additional requirements. Record why evidence from the verification actions or evidence read across from previous changes will be satisfactory to demonstrate mitigation of risk.
- Write “None” in this box if the verification proposals of the Local Control Authority are considered adequate to demonstrate that parts will remain equivalent after the change.

Note: A PPQ should not be specified as a verification action since the PPQ cannot be completed until the Fixed Process is approved so a circular logic is introduced. Instead think about what

information/requirement of interest would be evaluated in the process of putting together the PPQ and directly ask for that information/evaluation to be supplied as evidence.

Annotation B18: Continued

[Return](#)

Mark the continuation box if the continuation sheet is being used to record further detail. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation B19: ECA member Name and Job Title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job titles of the persons that have been involved in the review. Ensure that they are legible. The Chief Engineers and other specialists sign here if they have been involved in the review. Select the yes option in the continued box (Annotation B 18) and use the continuation sheet to record extra names if there are more names than provision is made for here.

Annotation B20: Signature

[Return](#)

Enter the signature of the person from annotation B19. Select the yes option in the continued box (Annotation B 18) and use the continuation sheet to record extra signatures if there are more signatures than provision is made for here.

Annotation B21: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date the signature at annotation B20 was made.

Annotation B22: Critical parts and lifing member name and job title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job title of the critical parts and lifing member. Ensure that it is legible.

Annotation B23: Signature

[Return](#)

Enter the signature of the person identified at annotation B22.

Annotation B24: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date the signature at annotation B23 was made.

Annotation B25: ECA chair name and title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job title of the Engineering Control Authority Chair. Ensure that it is legible.

Annotation B26: Signature

[Return](#)

Enter the signature of the person identified at annotation B25.

Annotation B27: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date the signature at annotation B26 was made.

Part C:

Part C of the form is used to record the evaluation of evidence from any actions proposed in part B.

Annotation C1 & C2: Siemens reference for this request & Rev

[Return](#)

See annotations A1 & A2 respectively.

Part C1: Review of verification evidence –Local Control Authority

Annotation C3: LCA Assessment comments:

[Return](#)

For change proposals use this box to record the rationale for reaching the decision made. Reference any supporting documents or reports and ensure that any such material will be retrievable as a category A record.

Annotation C4: Continued

[Return](#)

If the continuation sheet is being used to record further information use the drop-down list to indicate yes or select no if this is not the case. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation C5: LCA Decision

[Return](#)

Use the tick boxes to indicate the decision of the Local Control Authority. The available options are:-

- **Approved**
For change proposals select this option if the Local Control Authority considers that the verification evidence meets the requirements defined in part B.
See rules at step 4 of eQMS+ 011-00688 work instruction for restrictions on Local Control Authority to sentence change.
Approval by the Local Control Authority is permissible only if: -
 - Assessment is against defined pass/fail criteria such as microstructural standards
 - There are no safety policy or other restrictions (e.g. from Engineering Standards) that require approval from other signatories.
 - No test programme or parts were required,
 - There is no need to change to a drawing

Note: Changes to unit cost or changes to recurring and non-recurring costs (e.g. tooling and gauging) will need approval of the commercial risks associated with source and method change by operating eQMS+ 01100609 Control Production system change.
- **Approved with limitations**
Select this option if the decision is to approve the proposed FPD for a defined quantity, batch or time period only. The serial numbers, batch numbers, or time period (respectively) must be clearly defined in part A3 of the form. The Fix Manufacturing or repair method Work Instruction prohibits the use of a Limited Approval MVA in place of a Concession application. This option can be used under a variety of situations such as: -
 - A Supplier may decide not to pursue a requested change because the process did not deliver the expected business benefit and the sample parts conform to drawing and equivalence requirements. The FPD must be retained on file and no drawing changes are permissible.
 - Acceptable hardware is available and is required prior to having a final detail (editorial) in the FPD completed. The parts may conform to the drawing via an approved Concession Application, but additional work is required and proven before final acceptance. Once all required data is obtained the Limited Approval can be revised to a full approval by submission of a change proposal in the normal way.
- **Engineering Control Authority Approval Required**
Select this option to signify that ECA input is needed to sentence the change. This may be because:
 - The proposal has the potential to effect the equivalence of fit, form or function and so was forwarded to the Engineering Control Authority in part B (see annotation B5).
 - The verification evidence does not have an objective pass/fail criterion.
 - The verification evidence does not meet the defined criteria (i.e. reject decision) but the LCA considers that the ECA may nevertheless assess the Fixed Process as being satisfactory.

- Rejected
Select this option if the Local Control Authority considers that verification evidence cannot meet the requirements defined in part B. Improvement activities may be appropriate followed by resubmission of verification evidence for the revised Fixed Process.

Annotation C6: LCA member name and Title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and title of any other person included in the LCA in addition to the LCA chair. If there is more than one person enter their details on the continuation sheet section. Ensure that these details are legible.

Annotation C7: Signature

[Return](#)

This is the signature of the person from annotation C6.

Annotation C8: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date of the signature at annotation C7.

Annotation C9: LCA Chair Name and Title

[Return](#)

Enter the name of the Local Control Authority chair and their Job title. Ensure that these are legible.

Annotation C10: Signature

[Return](#)

This is the signature of the person in Annotation C7.

Annotation C11: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date of the signature at annotation C10.

Part C2: Review of verification evidence – Engineering Control Authority

This part is used to record the ECA evaluation of evidence from any actions proposed in part B.

Annotation C12: ECA Assessment comments

[Return](#)

Use this box to record the rationale for reaching the decision on how to sentence the proposed Fixed Process.

Annotation C13: Continued

[Return](#)

If the continuation sheet is being used to record further information use the drop-down list to indicate yes or select no if this is not the case. If the continuation sheet is used be sure to use headings in the continuation sheet to indicate what section of the MVA the information refers to.

Annotation C14: ECA decision:

[Return](#)

See the rules at step 4 of eQMS+ 011-00688 work instruction for restrictions on Engineering Control Authority to sentence change.

Use the tick boxes to indicate the decision of the Engineering Control Authority. The available options are:-

- **Approved**
For a new part enter a mark in this box if, after reviewing the verification evidence from part B, it is considered that the proposed Fixed Process **will** deliver the design intent.
For change request enter a mark in this box if, after reviewing the verification evidence from part B, it is considered that the proposed change **will** maintain the equivalence of the part.
- **Approved with limitations**
Select this option if the decision is to approve the proposed FPD for a defined quantity, batch or time period only. The serial numbers, batch numbers, or time period (respectively) must be clearly defined in part A3 of the form. The Fix Manufacturing or repair method Work Instruction prohibits the use of a Limited Approval MVA in place of a Concession application. This option can be used under a variety of situations such as: -
 - A Supplier may decide not to pursue a requested change because the process did not deliver the expected business benefit and the sample parts conform to drawing and equivalence requirements. The FPD must be retained on file and no drawing changes are permissible.
 - Acceptable hardware is available and is required prior to having a final detail (editorial) in the FPD completed. The parts may conform to the drawing via an approved Concession Application, but additional work is required and proven before final acceptance. Once all required data is obtained the Limited Approval can be revised to a full approval by submission of a change proposal in the normal way.
- **Rejected**
Select this option for a new part if, after reviewing the verification evidence, it is considered that the proposed Fixed Process **will not** deliver the design intent.
Select this option for a change request if, after reviewing the verification evidence, it is considered that the proposed change **will not** maintain the equivalence of the part to the original approved (e.g. certified) definition.

Annotation C15: ECA member name and Job title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job titles of the persons that have been involved in the review. The Chief Engineers and other specialists sign here if they have been involved in the review. Ensure that details are legible.

Select yes in the drop-down list in the continuation box (annotation C13) and use the continuation sheet to record extra signatures if there are more signatures than provision is made for here.

Annotation C16: Signature

[Return](#)

Enter the signature of the person identified in box C15.

Annotation C17: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date the signature at annotation C16 was made.

Annotation C18: Critical parts and lifing member name and job title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job title of the critical parts and lifing member. Ensure that it is legible.

Annotation C19: Signature

[Return](#)

Enter the signature of the person identified at annotation C18.

Annotation C20: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date the signature at annotation C19 was made.

Annotation C21: ECA chair name and job title

[Return](#)

Enter the name and job title of the Engineering Control Authority Chair. Ensure that this is legible.

Annotation C22: Signature

[Return](#)

This is the signature of the person from annotation C21.

Annotation C23: Date

[Return](#)

Enter the date at which the signature at annotation C22 was made.

Revision History

[Return](#)

Issue	Date	Reason for issue
1	06Jan2017	First Issue as part of the Siemens electronic Quality Management System
2	27Nov2020	Minor changes incorporated FPA to MVA and PPQ Leaders