

Date: October 27, 2003

Topic: Registration Landscape

How did you accomplish this topic during your implementation?

Dwarak was involved with the Lucent registration for a wireless product line. Initially there were already multiple registrations existing for some of the involved functions when the decision was made to apply for a HW/SW registration for the whole product line. The other complication was that the locations with the existing registrations were organizationally in different units. The need was to be able to keep the existing registrations in tact, but be able to register the full product line, to unify and to drive improvement and efficiency through consistency and integration of common practices and processes. The solution was to create an “umbrella” registration over the existing and new separate registrations that would cover the whole product line and designate those processes, policies and practices that would be common across all the subordinate registrations.

The “umbrella” concept does not carry with it the registrar audit sampling practice as the large multi-site registration, and thus does not result in reduced registrar audits and associated expenses. The umbrella system does, however, facilitate driving for common processes, consistency of policies and practices, while still allowing for local flexibility. The AMPS/PCS TL 9000 Core Team determined which processes needed to be common, e.g., management review, corrective action, etc, and which were more efficient and effective if common across the locations and functions. Beyond the common process requirements, the system is more concerned that something IS covered – not HOW it's covered. There's lots of flexibility for implementation of local processes as makes sense – but from policy perspective, the QMS is the same.

There is an umbrella AMPS/PCS 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) and the design of the processes that were deemed common, but the unit/local quality manuals describe “HOW” those requirements will be implemented in the unit. Second level documents reference the AMPS/PCS Quality Manual (which sections are being covered by which procedures)

With the umbrella system, minimal changes were made to local procedures that were not common and for metrics data gathering, documentations, etc. Thus allowing the existing registrations to be able to come under the “umbrella” with as minimal disruption as possible

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

This was the first Umbrella system that the registrar had been involved with. As a result the Core Team had a pre-audit done to get the registrar familiar with the concept and to get preliminary feedback.

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 umbrella Registration and QMS did provide significant help in integrating the different units and providing unity and consistency where it made sense for efficiency and effectiveness of the QMS. Drove a common language across these units.
- Since the units under the umbrella were on separate registrations, a significant non-compliance in one registration did not necessarily jeopardize the umbrella.
- What didn't work was that there are no reduction of registrar costs or sampling of external audits with the umbrella system
- The biggest challenges were centralizing both management review and metrics submittal. Since these were different units with different systems and leadership structures, it was difficult to cascade the reviews and objective cross-organizations and to deal with getting data centralized from disparate systems.

What recommendations do you have for others attempting to use your method?

- Be sure of the scope and boundaries of the umbrella—what to include and what not to include. It is harder to add locations/functions after the fact.
- Have lots of upfront planning to research the requirements and desires for common versus local practices and processes and get buy in early
- Work with the registrar with your proposal so there are no surprises
- Start working on any cross-organizational processes, management review and metrics submittal centralization early because these are very hard and take longer than you think.

How did you measure the effectiveness of this method?

Receipt of the registration.

Process for Responding to RFPs, RFIs, Contracts, etc. that contain Quality Requirements (and/or Performance Management questions)

