

Section4.txt

During the audit of DFR Ltd in July, the auditor discovers that an audit programme has not been established for the current year. Audits had taken place in two business processes during June and a small number of opportunities for improvement had been identified and appropriate corrective action had been taken.

<End>

When auditing in Process Line 3 in a clothing manufacture, the auditor notices that a metal detector is located above the conveyor belt just before the clothing is packed for despatch to customers. This is to prevent staples, needles or any other metallic item being packed with the clothes. The auditor asks how this device is calibrated and is told that a test piece is put through on the conveyor each morning before production starts. A check of the current production record appears to confirm this since the box titled "MD check" is signed and marked with today's date. The Production Manager confirms that the signature belongs to the production supervisor. The auditor asks to see the test piece used to calibrate the device and is shown the top of a tin can. The top is about 100mm in diameter and marked "MD Test Item 4". The production manager confirms that the detector had not found any metal contaminants as far as he knew.

<End>

In the call center, the auditor notes that the staff are taking orders from customers over the telephone and entering details directly into the organization's computerized order processing system. The auditor is told that there is no need for a review of individual orders, because the call center staff are fully trained and the database blocks any issue relating to the credit rating of customers.

<End>

In the traffic office of a road haulage company, the auditor asks the Traffic Manager about the actions taken when faults on vehicles are notified by drivers. The Traffic Manager states that all faults are reported immediately to Engineering and the noted in the log which goes to the owner of the company. The auditor then asks what the Traffic office does with this information. The Traffic Manager says that while the faults are undesirable, they are a normal part of the process which are reported and recorded. He adds that no further action is taken and that the organization's procedures require nothing further more than dealing with the cause of vehicle faults.

<End>

During an audit of management review process, the auditor notices from the records of the management review meetings that the meetings are not attended by any of the top management team. When the auditor queries this, the management representative explains that management review has evolved into a two tier process, as it was proving so difficult for all of the departmental and top managers to be available at the same time. The process is now that departmental managers meet and conduct the first tier of management review. The management representative prepared a summary report including actions and recommendations. This is passed circulated to each of the top management team for comment, and the Managing Director finally agrees the action plan.

<End>

During a review of internal audits, the auditor is shown internal audit report from the last audit. These include a nonconformity report stating that three people in the purchasing department had not been trained in the use of the approved supplier list. The corrective action taken was to train the three members of staff. The audit report has been closed. The management representative tells you that no further investigation was made as the corrective actions were obvious. The internal auditor had checked the training records of the staff concerned before closing the reports.

Section4.txt

<End>

In the purchasing department, the auditor asks how the new supplier for TMX101 items was selected. The purchasing clerk explains that the regular supplier could not meet the delivery date and the order was placed with a supplier that they had never used before, because the price quoted was extremely low. The clerk states that no other evaluation was carried out.

<End>

During an audit of a hotel kitchen, the auditor notices that there is a UV (ultra violet) insect trap mounted on the wall above one of the tables that is being used to fill sandwiches. A visual inspection indicated that there are some insects trapped on the HV (High Voltage) wires and quite a number of dead insects are lying on the trap's bottom tray; some have fallen onto the table. The auditor is aware of at least one flying insect in the kitchen. The area supervisor advises that this insect trap was installed about 12 months ago and had brought about a welcome reduction in the amount of insects in the area. She did not know how often the trap is cleaned.

<End>

During an audit of a national retail store, the auditor asks to see training records for three people who work in the Customer Service area receiving returned items from customers. The auditor observes from the training records that each had attended a course on customer care. The auditor asks the Personnel Manager how she knew that the training had been effective. The Personnel Manager replies, "Well, I spoke to several people in the Customer service area after they had attended the course. They said that the training had been enjoyable and useful".

<End>

During an interview with a software engineer in a software development company, the engineer explains his work on a project (PRO 123/11) developing software for a client. The auditor questions the authorisation for the use of software tools and the information provided by the client for use on the project. During the development of the project, on two occasions, the project containing information from the customer has been sent to sub-contractors. It is established that it is common practice for the Departmental Manager to send projects to various independent sub-contractors to assist in the resolution of problems associated with the development. Customers are not aware that this is normal practice. On some occasions, the sub-contractors do not respond and records of such transactions are deleted after time.

<End>

During a surveillance audit of an organization that manufactures furniture, the auditor notices the quality policy displayed in reception. Upon close examination, the auditor sees that it is signed by Mr. Julian Mayall, CEO. Since Mr. Mayall had retired from the organization five months previously, the auditor raised the matter with the Quality Manager. "Oh do not worry about that, we have had a lot on, with the new range of dining suites to deal with. Nothing has changed with the policy though, that is the same as before". The Management Review minutes contained references to corrective action made in response to a number of issues and noted the departure of Mr. Mayall.

<End>

During the audit of a large training organization, the auditor asks the CEO if the management team were provided with a summary of the outcome of analysis of student feedback regarding course delivery, tutor performance and facilities. The CEO replied that she left this to the departmental managers to deal with; if there was

Section4.txt

anything that she should know about they would bring it up management meetings. The auditor asked to see minutes of the last management review of the QMS and noted there was no mention of delegate feedback and, possibly as a consequence, any reference to improvement recommendations.