

**PENNDOT – Engineering District 10-0
ISO 9001 Internal Audit Report
(01/13)**

Department	Audit Process	Date & Time of Audit
Materials	8.5.1	November 7, 2018 10:00a.m

Auditor(s)	Audit Objectives:
1. Kirby Starr 2. Dave Romanie	Review of Warranty Process and Compliance

Name of Auditee(s)	Auditee(s) job Function
1. Rich Polenik	1. District 10 Material Unit Manager

Item(s) or areas audited
Warranty

Auditee Comments:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Process ownership is listed as Construction services engineer in the ISO 9001 manual & Process Risk assessment manual

<u>Plan approved by: (Management Representative)</u>
Tab Boyer

PENNDOT – Engineering District 10-0

ISO 9001 Internal Audit Report

Audit Criteria

External requirements (questions)

1. What makes a project qualify for a warranty?
2. Explain how a warranty works.
3. Can the Department ask for a warranty prior to start of a project?
4. Do warranties increase the project's overall cost?

External requirements (answers)

1. Not sure, Pub 242 may have information, Pub 408 section 496 covers asphalt warranty
2. Warranty incorporated into project during design, yearly reviews conducted, Repairs as needed for the term of warranty
3. Yes, in design
4. No cost increase noticed when compared to non-warranty work by same contractor

Internal requirements (questions)

1. Is there a District team who decides which District Projects will have a warranty?
2. Does the District have a process chart in place for warranty projects?
3. Is there a process to keep track of any repairs made under the warranty?

Internal requirements (answers)

1. Pavement engineer, no specific team
2. Pub 408 section 496 table A, no process chart at district level
3. Possibly pavement Engineer

PENNDOT – Engineering District 10-0 ISO 9001 Internal Audit Report

Overall Statement of Effectiveness of the Quality Management System

Areas of strength regarding ability to meet requirements- including observed **BEST Practices**

1. Knowledgeable but unsure of process ownership

Areas to consider for improvement:

1. The process of keeping track of warranty should not be the responsibility of construction (notably materials) since it never was in the past

Specific observed nonconformities (Findings): If Applicable, Follow-up Scheduled:

1. This process has not been followed on past warranty projects.
2. There are no warranty projects ongoing to monitor conformity / nonconformity

Observations and auditor comments:

1. Construction Services Engineer is listed as owner of process in both the ISO Manual & Process Risk Manual

Statement of overall effectiveness of the system:

- Cannot be determined at this time. Remove process – give to maintenance

Distribution of Audit Report:

- Manager of area audited
- A.D.E. Construction
- ISO Management Representative

Unit Manager Comments Including Follow-Up Action: (if any)

➤ **No Comments**

8.5.1 – M7 Warranty Review

Process Owner: Construction Services Engineer

Purpose:

The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that all projects that included a warranty are reviewed as per the warranty special provision timeframe.

Scope:

The scope includes all projects that have warranties regardless of item or timeframe.

Reference Documents:

Project special provision located in ECMS
Manufacturer specifications

Procedure:

- Assistant Construction Engineer / Manager have the responsibility to review projects to see if warranties are incorporated.
- Ensure that the warranty toggle located in the detail screen in ECMS is checked "Yes". As per special provisions and/or work orders.
- Notify appropriate Unit for warranty review (or combination of below)
 - Roadway
 - Pavement Manager
 - Material Manager
 - Structure
 - Structure Control Engineer
 - Bridge Unit
 - New Product
 - Design Unit
 - Material Manager
 - CE Council
- Finalization checklist
 - Warranty date is when the warranty expires.
 - Add a miscellaneous detail for warranty information and reviews.
 - Conduct warranty reviews as required by warranty. Place reviews as conducted in miscellaneous detail.
- After each and final review, a letter is drafted and sent to the Contractor informing Contractor of the findings and status of the warranty.

District 10-0 Process Risk Assessment

Date: 3/1/18

Process Number
8.5.1 M7

Process Name
Warranty Review

Process Owner
Construction Services Engineer

Likelihood = Unlikely

Consequence = 10

Organizational Risk: Which occurs at the entity and activity levels

Comments: Technology risk for using new products, or products in an unusual situation.

Strategic Risk: Which happens when an organizations strategy or business plan is inadequate.

Comments: Contractor to take advantage of adequate resources for innovation and improvement.

Compliance Risk: Which involves failures to comply with legal and regulatory requirements

Comments: This process is a way for the department to try new products with minimal risk.

Operation Risk: Which includes subcategories related to procedures and actions

Comments: The department must follow through with warranty reviews and specifications to ensure product effectiveness.