Distinguish PPAP evidence from production authorization

Connect production evidence to the correct part and process revision, and distinguish submission, customer decision and continuing authorization conditions.

Submitted does not mean approved

Fictional case: supplier Meridian has assembled a production-evidence package for bracket M42 revision C. The actual run used process revision P7. Coordinator Ana finds an older approval for product revision B and a new submission receipt, but no applicable customer decision for C/P7. The core lesson's boundary remains: a collection of files is not production authorization.

Your role and the reference condition

Supplier quality coordinator with customer quality and engineering
Normal: Required evidence, submission conditions, product/process identity and the retained customer decision correspond to the intended production scope.
Gap: The shipping team sees a complete folder and treats the submission timestamp as approval. An old decision is reused because the part number looks similar.

Work within these conditions

1. The workflow is not a complete PPAP element list or a prescribed submission level.
2. Applicable customer requirements govern submission, change notification and authorization.

Fictional teaching case. Supplied observations support the exercise; proposed actions are not verified customer results.

See how the method works

PPAP concerns evidence that the production process can consistently meet the relevant design and specification requirements under actual production conditions. Determine the customer's submission and change requirements before assembling the package. Link the evidence to the correct part, revision, process and production conditions. Submission, review and authorization are distinct states; possessing records is not the same as having approval. Preserve the decision and any conditions so the shop floor cannot silently treat an unresolved status as permission to ship. The workflow shown here is an original overview, not a complete PPAP element list, a submission level or a substitute for customer-specific instructions.

01 Requirements

Confirm customer submission and change requirements.

02 Part + revision

Identify the correct part, process and revision.

03 Production evidence

Gather representative production evidence under actual conditions.

04 Submission + decision

Submit and track the applicable customer decision.

05 Retained status

Retain authorization status and conditions without assuming approval.

Read every connection

1. Step 1 > 2
Continue with the next action

2. Step 2 > 3
Continue with the next action

3. Step 3 > 4
Continue with the next action

4. Step 4 > 5
Continue with the next action

Method exhibit: Requirements, Part + revision, Production evidence, Submission + decision, Retained status.

Follow the evidence and decisions

Inspect the supplied case inputs

Record	Identity / status
Current product	M42 revision C
Production process	P7 under declared run conditions
Old customer decision	Revision B; applicability to C/P7 not established
New submission	Receipt confirmed
Current decision	Not present in supplied record

01 / Confirm the required submission scope

Ana checks the applicable customer requirements, part/revision and reason for submission or change. She identifies who can clarify the required evidence and submission level.

Why: A generic checklist cannot override customer-specific conditions. The first task is to know which approval question the package must answer.

Evidence / check: A scope record names customer, product revision and process conditions.

02 / Bind evidence to actual production conditions

She traces the representative run records to M42/C and P7, including the applicable equipment, material and production conditions. Any limitations remain explicit.

Why: Evidence from a prototype or different process condition may not support the intended production claim. A report title alone does not prove applicability.

Evidence / check: Each evidence item identifies its source run and revision.

03 / Reconcile the package before submission

Ana checks required evidence for completeness and internal consistency, resolving mismatched revisions rather than hiding them in appendices. She distinguishes submitted material from retained material required under the applicable process.

Why: A package can be extensive and still fail to answer the correct requirement. File count is not an evidence-quality measure.

Evidence / check: The review record identifies each requirement and its matching evidence or gap.

04 / Track the actual customer decision

The submission receipt is recorded as receipt only. Ana retrieves the applicable customer decision and any conditions through the authorized channel; absence of a decision is not interpreted as approval.

Why: Submission, review and authorization are different states. An older decision cannot silently extend to a changed product or process.

Evidence / check: Current status remains decision pending in this fictional record.

05 / Retain conditions and manage later changes

After an actual authorized decision, the team retains its identity, scope and conditions and monitors relevant changes through the customer requirements. Operational instructions reference the correct status.

Why: Approval is meaningful only for its defined scope. Subsequent changes may require notification or resubmission; the teaching example does not decide those obligations.

Evidence / check: The status record preserves the decision and identifies the change-review owner.

Completed submission-to-decision record

Question	Evidence available	Current conclusion
Correct part/process?	M42/C, P7 records	Identity documented
Package submitted?	Submission receipt	Yes, receipt only
Applicable decision?	Only old revision B decision	Current authorization not established
Next action	Customer-quality owner retrieves decision/requirements	Do not infer approval from folder completeness

A conditional decision arrives

The customer issues a decision with explicitly limited scope or conditions.

Decision

Retain the exact applicable conditions, make them visible to the receiving operation and follow the required process for closure or further authorization.

Reasoning

A conditional decision must not be relabelled unconditional approval for convenience. The actual authorized wording and scope govern.

What would change the decision?

The internal status links to the retained decision and its unresolved conditions.

Practise with a changed case

A changed tool after an earlier decision

New fictional part K16 revision D has a retained customer decision for tool T1. The supplier moves production to T2, completes internal checks and uploads a new folder; no customer change decision is supplied.

Item	State
Existing decision	K16/D using T1
Change	Production moved to T2
Internal checks	Completed
Customer change requirements/decision	Must be established

Your task

1. Identify why the old decision may not cover the new scope.
2. List the evidence and authority to retrieve before claiming authorization.
3. Write a truthful status statement.

Use the next page to record your reasoning before reading the answer.

Your practice worksheet

A changed tool after an earlier decision

Part/process identity

Change description

Applicable requirement

Evidence gap

Current decision status

Complete your reasoning before turning to the answer. Use the separate learner workbook for group practice.

Check your reasoning and transfer it

1. The product revision is unchanged, but the process/tool scope changed. Determine the applicable customer notification/submission requirements and retain the relevant decision for T2.

2. A truthful statement is: internal checks complete; applicability of customer authorization to T2 not established from supplied evidence. The lesson does not determine whether a particular submission is mandatory without those requirements.

Suggested completed record

State	What is known	What is not established
Old decision	T1 scope	Automatic extension to T2
Internal checks	Completed	Customer authorization
Next step	Review applicable change requirements	Invented submission level

Plausible wrong turns

1. A submission receipt is not approval.

2. An unchanged part number does not prove unchanged process scope.

Evidence of a sound answer

1. Keep evidence tied to actual conditions.

2. Distinguish statuses accurately.

3. Name the authorized source of the decision.

Take the learning back to work

Commitment	Agreed follow-through
Owner	Supplier quality and authorized customer interface
Record	Requirement-to-evidence map and retained decision/conditions
Review	At submissions, decisions and relevant changes
Verification evidence	Correct revision/production scope and explicit authorization status
If unresolved	Resolve scope or evidence gaps through the customer process before representing a submission as approved.

Help someone else apply the method

Prepare

1. Revision and decision cards
2. Blank status record
3. Customer-requirement placeholder clearly marked missing

Minutes	Activity and coaching prompt
5	Separate the states What does receipt prove?
8	Trace the evidence scope Which run supports which revision?
10	Review the tool change What must be checked before extending approval?
5	Debrief conditions Who must see a limited decision?

Debrief

1. Do not ask learners to invent a PPAP level.
2. Challenge file-count or silence-as-approval reasoning.

Individual or remote practice

Write a status line that would remain truthful if read by shipping, engineering and customer quality.

Connect the method and check its boundaries

Before application

1. Applicable customer submission requirements
2. Correct product/process revision identity

Outside this lesson

1. A complete PPAP element list
2. A guessed customer submission level

AIAG: PPAP4

AIAG: PPAP4

PPAP concerns evidence that production processes can consistently meet engineering and specification requirements at production conditions/rates.

Submission level, required evidence, authorization and change notification must follow applicable customer requirements.

Open this lesson and its visual aids