Date: October 17, 2003

Topic: Registration Landscape

How did you accomplish this topic during your implementation?

Alcatel's US approach has been described as: one Company; one system; one registration:

- There is one TL9000 registration covering everything in the US and Mexico. The scope includes 4 locations, 10,000 employees and hardware, software and services for 18 product categories covering 76 products.
- Canada will be merging in soon making it a North American registration
- There's a Belgium TL registration.
- Currently there are many ISO registrations in Europe, most on a country basis. Interest is starting to become hotter for TL registration in Europe. They are currently working a plan to get European Units registered to TL as a single entity, and will not have country-specific registrations.
- TL 9000 registration was a follow-on from original ISO 9000 registrations for both Alcatel and Rockwell (later acquired by Alcatel). Alcatel used the single TL registration approach to facilitate the integration of these 2 widely desperate companies. It made sense economically (one set of audits, one common QMS to bring people together.)
- The single registration also provides economies of scale and the use of sampling for registrar audits which is far more cost effective than the multiple registration approach.

Alcatel's registration is more like an umbrella system.

- Each local unit is allowed flexibility. The system is more concerned that something IS covered – not HOW it's covered.
- There's lots of flexibility for implementation of the requirements – but from policy perspective, the QMS is the same.
- There is an Alcatel USA quality manual that describes "WHAT" each unit must do to satisfy the TL requirements (e.g., for management review—a list of minimum review content and minimum schedule), but the unit/local quality manuals describe "HOW" those requirements will be implemented in the unit.
- The detail of the Quality Manual is at the level that the standard requires for registration but does not get into the specific local practices that are used. Second level documents reference the Alcatel Quality Manual (which sections are being covered by which procedures)
- There are local entities, which have their own documentation and tools, but they must meet the minimum requirements identified in the Alcatel quality manual.
- They are moving to a single document numbering system but the local procedures will still be unique.
- Alcatel's TL 9000 QMS documentation, while local in nature for lower level procedures, is done using a centrally developed document control system.

What resources/tools/vendors were used to accomplish this task?

In addition to helping to integrate the processes from Alcatel and Rockwell, cost was a significant factor in going to a single US registration and in the registration consolidations going forward. Having a larger multi-site registration costs less from a registrar perspective because the registrar samples the locations visited on the audit. This saves money from both registrar and travel costs.

With multiple registrations, or single site registrations, the registrar visits more if not all locations covered by the registrations and this is usually a much higher number than if they were all consolidated—thus much higher registrar costs to maintain the registration.

Was there any benchmarking activity?
No

What lead you to use this method?
See the above answers

What worked and what didn't work?
- What worked: Having the single Registration and QMS did provide significant help in integrating the two companies
- Cost to maintain the registration is definitely lower
- The thing to be careful of with a larger registration is: a non-conformance in one or two areas could hold up a registration for the whole thing.

What recommendations do you have for others attempting to use your method?
Make sure your internal audits are really good to pick up any non-conformances that are not systemic.

How did you measure the effectiveness of this method?
Receipt of the registration.