

Date: October 27, 2003

Topic: Registration Landscape

How did you accomplish this topic during your implementation?

Nortel currently has over 30 separate TL 9000 registrations covering hardware, software and services. This approach was due to easy transition from CSQP (Bell Core standards: ISO + GR standards) to TL. In the early days, Nortel implemented TL 9000 where they had CQSP. If a unit/product group was already committed to CSQP, the transition to TL9000 was easier (actually ended up with a net reduction in requirements).

Nortel took a fragmented approach in the early days: Other reasons for registration fragmentation were:

- The success of the “sale” to convince organizations to register. If a unit said yes to TL registration, they implemented quickly.
- There was also no requirement for registration from enterprise customers. As a result there was a view that registration was not necessary for these units.
- Customer requirements for TL registration.

Numerous registrations create some issues for Nortel, e.g., there are no economies of scale or audit sampling to reduce registrar costs. They are moving toward consolidation of registrations (taking a major portfolio approach). They are organized by:

- Enterprise business (multiple portfolios within)
- Optical business
- Wireless
- Wireline

The idea is to ultimately roll into 4 single global registrations matching the portfolios.(Nortel calls them Leadership Categories). The reasoning behind this strategy (as opposed to a single registration for the entire company) is:

- Driven by metrics (product categories)—their metrics are bucketed by the portfolios
- Taking an organizational approach to registration landscape (rather than a design, build, service, functional kind of model) because that is how they really do business and the ownership is really at the portfolio executives.

To do the consolidations, Nortel will need to:

- Determine the needs/requirements/desires for common processes (at first the bare minimum and then in the longer term, those processes that would add value if common)
- Integrate the processes within the portfolio organizations
- Eventually migrate to a common QMS from a process perspective

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

Economies of scale on resource requirements can be gained from consolidation of the registrations

Was there any benchmarking activity?

No

What lead you to use this method?

See the above answers

What worked and what didn't work?

- At first, the benefits of a fragmented approach were that Nortel got organizations to register. However, now they are moving to consolidated registrations to reduce overhead and to gain economies of scale. Through reduction of registrar audit days.
- With separate registrations, a significant non-compliance in one registration does not jeopardize the others
- With a fragmented approach to registrations, the registrar costs are higher than a single multi-location registration. With a multi-location registration there is a sampling system used to determine the number of places the registrar audits. The more locations the smaller the number visited. This can significantly reduce registrar costs.
- The big challenge to the consolidations is push back from groups that do not want to change their local processes to the common ones
- Looking back now, it was a mistake to go after multiple registrations. It is very awkward to manage. Even ASQ's database wasn't set up to handle this type of arrangement. For example, they had multiple registrations pointing to the same data, and had to submit same data twice. Administratively, it was a real burden to handle from early on.

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

- Consider the advantages of a large multi-site registration versus the fragmented approach from a cost/benefit perspective.
- If you chose multiple registrations, still have a single point for submitting metric data to UTD, and a single central internal website with all TL metrics data for stakeholders to view. This has been a very good benefit for Nortel and ensures the consistency of the data reported to UTD and on their internal website.

How did you measure the effectiveness of this method?

The approach is no longer effective—thus the move toward registration consolidation.