-

RESEARCH DESIGNS& STANDARDS ORGANIZATION

Manaknagar,Lucknow– 226011

QO-D-8.1-6

Vendor Application Processing

1.0 Amendment History:

S. No.	Amendment Date	Version	Reasons for Amendment
1.	12.09.2018	1.0	First issue under ISO 9001:2015. Approved by DG/RDSO on NP-1 to NP-3 of MR/ISO9001/App/QMS/Doc/2018 on date 07.09.2018.No change in content from previous document no.QO-D-7.1-6 Ver. 14.3 of 9001:2008 QMS.
2.	25.01.2019	1.1	Changes in Clause 4.4 (New para added in last) based on recommendation of "Standing Committee on Vendor Development and Approval Issues " at NP-17 to NP-19 of Computer Wing's file No. Comp/1.55.07.01 (Pt-I) Vol-III, which is approved by DG/RDSO on date 21.01.2019. Copy is placed at SN-13 of ISO Cell File no. "MR/ISO 9001/App/Vendor Interface Vol-III"
3.	08.05.2019	1.2	Changes in Clause 4.7 (first para second sentence modified) & in para 4.8 (first para first sentence modified), then in para 4.8 (after the last sentence of first para new sentence inserted) based on recommendation of "Standing Committee on Vendor Development and Approval Issues " at NP-26 to NP-28 of Computer Wing's file No. Comp/1.55.07.01 (Pt-I) Vol-III, which is approved by DG/RDSO on date 29.04.2019. Copy is placed at SN-23 of ISO Cell File no. "MR/ISO 9001/App/Vendor Interface Vol-III"
4.	19.06.2020	1.3	Special DG VD (Vender Development) has joined RDSO and looking after vendor development work. All proposal for ISO procedure related to vendor development , where it was earlier required to get the approval of DG/RDSO, now to be put up to Spl.DG/VD who is now designated as final authority in vendor development matters. DG's note no. DG/Misc. dated 15.Jun.2020 and 16 June 2020 to ED /VDG RDSO/LKO
5.	02.07.2020	2.0	Modified Clause 4.3 para 1 & 2, Clause 4.6 para1 , Clause 4.7 para 1, clause 4.8 para 2, clause 4.11 para 1, clause 4.12 & clause 4.14 para 1 based on recommendations of Standing committee duly approved by Spl DG/VD on 26.06 2020 in E Office file no. RDSO-QA/MOHQ(MISC)/21/2020-ED/QAM/RDSO/HQ at NP-30 .
6.	15.07.2020	3.0	Changes made In Para 4.11,1 based on recommendations of Standing committee duly approved by Spl. DG/VD on 10.07.2020 at Note#12 in E- Office file no. RDSO-MR0ISO(VD-M)/1/2020.

S. No.	Amendment Date	Version	Reasons for Amendment
7.	19.08.2020	3.1	New para added in clause 4.6 (after first para), 4.8 (after existing last para) & 4.13 (after first para) and in clause 4.6 last para & clause 4.8 existing third para word 'three' replaced with word 'five', based on recommendation of standing committee duly approved by Spl. DG/VD at Note # 51 on 18.08.2020 in the e-office file no.RDSO-QA/M0HQ(ISO)/2/2020. Recommendations are placed at SN 402-405 on above e- office file .
8.	17.09.2020	3.2	Existing para 4.10 split in two new paras 4.10 (a) and 4.10 (b) based on recommendation of standing committee duly approved by Spl. DG/VD at Note # 11 on 14.09.2020 in the e-office file no.RDSO-MR0ISO(VRQ)/1/2020-O/oMR/ISO/RDSO-Part(2) . Recommendations are placed at SN 17 on above e- office file .
9.	24.09.2021	3.3	Para 4.9, modified, based on recommendation of standing committee duly approved by Spl. DG/VD at Note # 103 on 07.09.2021 in the e-office file no. SO-MR0ISO(VRQ)/1/2020-O/oMR/ISO/RDSO-Part(1) . Recommendations are placed at SN 81-88 in above e- office file.
10.	12.10.2021	4.0	Modification done in various paras in reference to PED/QAM letter no. QAM/Vendor Approval Policy Date: 07.09.2021. These changes are based on recommendation of standing committee duly approved by Spl. DG/VD at Note # 10 on 04.10.2021 in the e-office file no. SO-MR0ISO(VD-M)/1/2020-O/oMR/ISO/RDSO-Part(2) . Recommendations are placed at SN 37-41 in above e-office file.
11.	30.12.2021	5.0	Modification in para 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 & para 4.13 based on recommendations of Standing committee duly approved by Spl DG/VD on 22.12.2021 in E Office file no. RDSO/35/2021-ED/QAM/RDSO/HQ at NP-44. Recommendations placed at SN 120-126 in the above file.
12.	24.06.2022	5.1	Added new point 4 in para 4.8. This modification is based on recommendations of Standing committee duly approved by Spl DG/VD vide letter no.ST/SP-4/RB & CRIS/1 Dated 10.05.2022 placed at SN 250 in this file as mentioned at Note#111 of this in E Office file no. MR0ISO(VD-M)/1/2020-O/oMR/ISO/RDSO (Comp. No. 18438). Recommendations placed at SN 264-265 in the above file.

S. No.	Amendment Date	Version	Reasons for Amendment
13.	28.07.2022	5.2	Replaced word 'Dirtectorate Head, or Head of Directorate' with 'ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level)' and Responsible authority for 'Requirement of deviation from directive' under the sub head 'Responsibility and Authority' in existing ISO documents with "PED of the concerned Vertical". These changes are based on recommendation of Standing Committee and duly approved by Spl. DG/VD on date 19.07.2022 at Note#14 in e-office file no. RDSO-MR0ISO(VD-C)/1/2020-O/o ED/Res/RDSO-Part(2) (Comp. No 123324). Recommendations of Standing Committee is placed at Note#11 in the above e-office file. Para 4.2 (b), 4.9 heading, 4.10 heading has been changed and word "Samples" has been replaced with "Samples/ Prototype" as per recommendation of Standing Committee duly approved by Spl. DG/VD on date 21.07.2022 at Note#38 in e-office file no. RDSO-QA/M0HQ(ISO)/2/2021-ED/QAM/RDSO/HQ (Comp. No 193080). Recommendations of Standing Committee is placed at SN 89-94 of this file.

2.0 Purpose

This document contains directives for vendor approval/vendor registration (multi-sourcing) of items allotted to RDSO by Railway Board/ D.G., RDSO.

This document contains directives specific to scrutiny of submitted applications at RDSO.

A set of related documents create the full set of directives for vendor registration process at RDSO. These are listed under para 5.0.

3.0 Scope of Application

This directive is applicable to all units covered by the quality management system of RDSO without any exception.

4.0 Details

4.1 Ensuring safekeeping of documents with IPR's

After receipt of complete application forms on line for vendor registration, the form shall be down loaded by the concerned personnel of the directorate

Hard copies of these documents can be kept in separate files by the respective Directorate.

4.2 Changes in the applicant entity while processing

No changes are normally to be permitted in the applicant entity during the processing of the application. However, wherever unavoidable the following shall be ensured:

a) The applicant shall inform the concerned directorate of RDSO regarding the changes. The directorate shall examine the same.

b) In case of change of Ownership with name/without name, Merger, Take Over, Acquisition, Major Changes in Share Holding/ Directors of company, change in type of firm from Proprietorship/Partnership/Pvt. Limited etc. the same application can be processed. In such cases there shall be no change in Work Address, Machinery & Plant, Bill of Material, Process defined in QAP etc. affecting the quality of product. Firm shall inform RDSO as early as possible as but not later than one month of such changes along with relevant documents in proof thereof & also other documents such as Memorandum of Article of Association, Partnership deed, Resolution passed by Board of Directors etc. The firm shall also submit the revised declarations as listed and annexed in document QO-F-8.1-7 “List of documents to be sought from the vendor at the time of fresh registration and Annexures/Forms”. If the change is of very complex in nature, the firm will be advised to apply afresh..

Approval to one firm having relevant documents confirming status as “original firm” shall be given. In case there are more than one firm claiming to be “original firm” with relevant documents, all cases shall be processed as fresh registration.

The firm shall also submit an affidavit on non-judicial stamp paper of appropriate value as applicable in the respective state and dully notarised & witnessed in the following format :

I …….. son of …… aged about …..... Years resident of …….. do hereby solemnly affirm as under –

That the deponent is the Authorised Signatory/ Sole Proprietor / Partner / Directors of (Name of the Sole Proprietor Concern/Partnership Firm/ Registered Company alongwith address).

While carrying out the changes in the entity of firm (mention the changes …….), all the legal formalities as required as per prevailing rules/procedures/laws have been adhered with. All the said changes have legal sanctity and the entire responsibility for the changes lies with the firm. In case any type of dispute on this account arises in future then the firm will be solely responsible for the same and thereof no claim in consequences against RDSO/Railways whatsoever be raised. RDSO will be absolved from any legal eventualities. If at any time after approval is accorded, it came to notice that aforesaid changes has been made without following proper procedure/rules/law, then action may be initiated by RDSO including de-listing and withdrawal of approval of the firm without giving any further opportunity.

I further certify that there is no change in Work Address, Machinery & Plant, Bill of Material, Process defined in QAP etc. affecting the quality of product.

c) Change of address of plant/works during the processing of the case shall be allowed only till no visit has been made by the RDSO officials to the vendor’s works place.

If the firm applies for change of works address after the first visit of RDSO officials to their works/plant then the old application shall not be processed further and the applicant shall be asked to apply afresh and shall be considered as per its new turn in the applicant queue, wherever applicable.

However, if the vendor re-applies within six months from the rejection of the application due to change in work address (giving reference of the earlier case), then the case can be restarted from the stage where it was closed.

4.3 Application Screening & clarifications

Application and documents once downloaded shall be scrutinized in detail. Application should also be checked-up for adequacy in respect of the information sought. Scrutinizing authority shall check that all the documents have been signed by an authorized signatory. Any information considered inadequate should be pin pointed out.

Any clarification to be sought from the firm should be pointed out at this juncture and communicated to the firm on line/ through email. Vendor shall also submit the compliance online.

4.3.1 Screening for Sister / Allied concern

The self-declaration/ undertaking submitted (*see **rec-ref-1** QO-F-8.1-7 List of documents to be sought from the vendor at the time of fresh registration and Annexures/Forms*) by the applicant shall be examined and the information submitted shall be taken on record. The basis of allied/sister concern shall be as follows:

Definition of Allied / Sister concern, as understood from various manuals, Section 40A(2)(b) of Income-Tax Act 1961 and Section 370-1(B) of Companies' Act 1956, and further modified to suit our requirements is as under -

4.3.1.1 For Proprietary Firms

In case of Proprietary firms, the firms qualifying the following criteria shall be categorized as sister concerns

- All the firms owned by the same person shall be considered as allied / sister concerns.

4.3.1.2 For Partnership Firms

In case of partnership firms, the firms qualifying the following criteria shall be categorized as sister concerns:

- All firms having the same set of partners.
- In case, any one or more partners, who has a profit sharing ratio of 20% or more in the applicant firm as well as has any of the firms already registered for the same item with RDSO, both the firms shall be considered as sister concerns.

4.3.1.3 For Companies

In case of companies established under the Companies' Act, the firms qualifying the following criteria shall be categorized as sister concerns:

- All companies having – "majority" of Directors common
- Any one or more Directors, or any of his/her close relatives (father, mother/step-mother, husband, wife, brother/step-brother, sister/step-sister, son/step-son, daughter / step-daughter, son's wife, daughter's husband, brother's wife and sister's husband), has 1/3rd or more shareholding in the applicant company as well as in any of the companies already registered for the same item with RDSO, both the companies shall be considered as sister concern
- Common share holder having $^{1}/_{3}$rd shares or more.

4.3.1.4 Other Conditions

In addition to this, the firms/companies operating from same office or having same manufacturing works shall be treated as allied/sister concern.

4.3.1.5 On detection of case of allied / sister concern

Having identified, from the information submitted by the firm/company, that the applicant firm/company is an allied/sister concern of other firm(s)/company(s) already registered for the same item with RDSO, a mention to this effect shall be made during scrutiny and subsequently in the 'List of Vendors for Development Orders'/ 'List of Approved Vendors' against the names of all such firms/companies so that the tendering authorities and tender committees may take a note of the same for necessary action.

The preface of 'List of Vendors for Development Orders'/ 'List of Approved Vendors' should include – "The name of sister concern have been mentioned against each item of 'List of Vendors for Development Orders'/'List of Approved Vendors' . This should be kept in view (wherever applicable) to high light the fact that the competing firms are sister concerns while dealing with tenders".

4.3.2 Legal Scrutiny

The legal documents received with the application shall not be required to be sent to legal cell for scrutiny. These documents shall be kept for record purpose only.

However even in cases warranting scrutiny of the legal documents, the respective directorate shall process the case for approval in parallel and not after the legal scrutiny is over. Further, if necessary and if everything else is in order, but legal scrutiny is getting delayed, provision for issue of provisional clearance subject to legal scrutiny clearance shall be considered

4.3.2.1 Undertaking to be submitted by the applicant.

An undertaking in the format as per Annexure A-3 of document QO-F-8.1-7shall also be taken from the applicant that all legal formalities and statutory compliances required for vendor registration in RDSO are being abided with and all/any documents submitted & when demanded by RDSO are legally correct. If any deficiency/ noncompliance is found at any stage on the part of applicant, then RDSO shall have the right to delist the applicant permanently without assigning any reasons and the delisted vendor shall have no claim in consequence thereof against RDSO whatsoever.

This undertaking shall hold good while the application is under scrutiny and also while the firm is listed on the RDSO's vendor list.

4.3.3 Technical Screening

4.3.3.1 A technical screening should also be done at this stage to establish whether on the basis of information supplied regarding infrastructure & manufacturing practices, QAP etc., firm can be considered for a visit for assessment of its capability.

4.3.3.2 Outsourcing of some minor activities by any vendor will require approval of the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level). It should be incorporated in QAP and got to be verified during assessment of the firm.

However, outsourcing of activities to any **sister concern** (as defined in para 4.3.1.1, 4.3.1.2 & 4.3.1.3 above) shall be permitted, subject to compliance of requirements of specification/STR/M&P/ ISO etc. by the sister concern. Such outsourcing shall be considered equivalent to in-house manufacturing. The activities outsourced along with details of work address of sister concern and M&P available as per STR etc. shall be covered in the QAP. The responsibility of overall quality etc. shall be of the **approved vendor** for the activities outsourced by them to their sister concern. In case of non-compliance of any issue in sister concern, suitable action to be taken against the **approved vendor.**

RDSO officials shall have to visit all outsourced work-places of sister concern to certify compliance before approval (for overseas firms and their workplaces Spl. DG/VD's dispensation can be taken on case to case basis giving justification).

4.3.3.3 It is preferable to have all the manufacturing and testing facilities covered under STR located at one premises. However, firm can be permitted to have facilities spread in more than one place provided they are under the same ownership with same name. The activities including testing and inspection carried out at these premises shall be clearly spelt out in the QAP. These locations shall be termed as Ancillary units.

The place where the material shall be offered for final inspection shall also be indicated in the QAP.

Note – The guidelines as mentioned in para 4.3.3.2 & 4.3.3.3 shall also be applicable to existing vendors.

4.4 Acceptance of application

On acceptance of the firm's application on the UVAM Module for further processing after scrutiny of the documents, the firm will come to know about its current status on the UVAM Module, in IREPS portal. After scrutiny of the documents submitted by the vendor along with its on-line application, the process of capacity/ capability assessment may be started in parallel in the following cases with the approval of the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level):

i. If the applicant vendor is already registered in RDSO/ Production Units and even if some documents have not been furnished or having minor deficiencies.

ii. For vendors not registered with RDSO/ Production Units but have submitted all the documents though some documents may be having minor deficiencies.

However, in both the above cases, deficiencies have to be set right before communication of the approval for Capability and Capacity Assessment (CCA).

"In case of major deficiencies in documents submitted, same shall be uploaded on UVAM by concern Directorate, the firm can see the deficiencies in IREPS, UVAM Module and will get one month time to make good the deficiencies, however based on the Merit of the case directorate may permit more time (Maximum Three Months) before the closure of the case."

4.5 Rejection of the Application

If on the other hand, firm's application has been rejected for further processing, the case shall be closed and the firm shall be informed through IREPS, UVAM Module about the deficiencies. Once the rejection of the application is communicated, the firm will have to apply afresh. In case the number of approved vendors is less than five, no registration fee shall be paid by the vendor if reapplication is done within six months (as a onetime exception).

4.6 Visit to the firm's premises

After the acceptance of application, nominated RDSO official(s) shall visit the firm's premises for STR verification and CCA. During STR verification, digitally signed uploaded and submitted documents will be checked and verified with the originals. Legal documents will also be verified with actual copies and nominated officer shall bring all legal affidavits in original with him to RDSO. In case the visit is waived off, then RDSO will arrange the collection of these documents by itself, for which advance intimation will be given to the firm for keeping the documents ready for handing over to the authorized representative of RDSO.
Normally, visit of manufacturing works by an officer shall be done for cases of fresh registration of vendors. If the vendor desire STR verification and CCA by remote means and if the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level) is satisfied with efficacy & viability of the special procedure as devised by RDSO and placed on RDSO website "link under Vendor Interface" (www.rdso.indianrailways.gov.in), this may be used in place of physical inspection, CCA, Prototype Inspection and also for the Quality Audit.
Assessment of overseas suppliers may preferably be got done through RA Berlin/DRA Paris/London or any other Indian Railway representative posted abroad. Alternatively, approval of Spl. DG/VD may be taken for specific arrangement on case to case basis.

Normally, no postponement of date of visit will be accepted by RDSO, however in very extreme cases based on the criticality of item and the force majeure conditions as detailed in Railway Board's letter 2001/RS (G)/779/7 dated. 19.01.2012 and latest modification/revision by Railway Board at the time of consideration of the case, a

firm may be permitted to postpone the date of visit, only two times after which the case shall be closed and communicated to the applicant firm.

4.7 Capacity cum Capability Assessment (CCA) Report

On nomination of the official for CCA, the official shall prepare the inspection and CCA report electronically , on the standard format (document no. QO-F-8.1-8), convert the same to pdf, then digitally sign and submit through UVAM to the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level) along with his remarks over the CCA Report. The CCA report for overseas supplier shall be prepared by the agency engaged by RDSO as per para 4.6 above. Once deficiency found during CCA, the case shall be CLOSED and the closure advice, along with the deficiencies shall be communicated to the Firm through UVAM.

However, if the Firm re-registers itself and submits additional documents in support of the compliance of the deficiency communicated by RDSO, (giving reference of the earlier case) within next 6 months from the date of closure advice along with the deficiencies, the case may be restarted by the Directorate, from the stage where it was closed (as a onetime exception) with the approval of the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level). For the items, where the number of vendors are less than five, no vendor re-registration fee shall be payable. The decision for final closure of the case is to be taken by the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level).

4.8 Approval by the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level)

After successful verification for documents and CCA of the Firm, RDSO shall directly place such Firms in the list of Developmental Vendors for 24 months period , with a check note: -

Subjected to:

1. Technical Clearance of Test Samples/Prototype (as the case may be) and its approval by the RDSO.
2. Successful Field Trials of the Specified Quantity (as indicated by the Directorate) for the item (such details should be provided in the specification available on the UVAM for the items or in a separate published document of the concerned Directorate for the item to be indicated on the UVAM)

……..

NOTE (Calling Attention):

1. The quantity which is to be ordered on such Developmental Vendors will be decided in accordance with Railway Board's letter no. 99/RS(G)/709/1/Pt. dated 13.01.2015 para (3 A ii) which permits the qty. ordered on developmental vendors in and outside the NPQ, and the Railway Board's letter No: 2001/ RS(G)/779/7/Pt.2 dated 06.11.2018 or as amended from time to time. It is to be noted and recorded that before initiating the regular supply against such orders, the Technical Clearance of Prototype/Test sample and successful field trials as specified for item by RDSO is to be completed. Regular monitoring of such Vendors shall be done by the Respective Directorates.
2. The vendors may also approach to the RDSO for sample/prototype testing, irrespective of whether the vendor gets the order from Railway units or not in order to expedite the approval process.

After the Technical clearance of the Test Samples/Prototype/Successful Field Trials of the Specified Quantity (as the case may be), the check note shall be removed.

In case the Technical clearance and the field trials takes more than 24 months, the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level) shall decide the case of continuing the name of the firm in the list of Developmental Vendor with check note, depending on the merit of the case so recorded on the concerned file . Vendor shall approach RDSO, three months before expiry of the validity, requesting for continuing the name of the firm in the list of Developmental Vendor with check note, giving its credentials to comply the requirements with in specified time for request. Type test charges shall be levied as given in Vendor registration schedule of charges (ref.10).

a. In case the Vendor has got orders and either supplied or in the process of supply, validity of Firm as developmental vendor with check note shall be extended maximum by further two years.

b. In case the Railway Unit (PU/Shed/Workshop) as decided by RDSO is not able to install full quantity as prescribed for the trial within six months of the supply, then ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level) may consider reducing the quantity for the field trial, depending upon the criticality of the item with the approval of Spl. DG/ VD.

3. Quality Audit shall be done between 3 to 5 years. It shall be ensured that Quality Audit is conducted well within due date in all the circumstances. If Quality Audit could not be carried out within 05 years by RDSO, then the firm's name shall continue as per his status in the "List of Approved/Developmental Vendors" of RDSO, till quality audit is completed.

4. The concerned ED shall ensure that field trials period is kept within 6 month. However, there may be some items for which field trial period may be stipulated as more than 06 months and up to 01 year, for such items the concerned ED shall obtain approval of DG/RDSO. In very rare cases, some items may require field trial beyond 01 year, for all such cases the justification shall be furnished by the concerned ED for obtaining Railway Board's approval.

There should not be any item which takes more than 02 years for approval as approved vendor from the date of application by vendor, except the time take by vendor side.

4.8.1 In case, the development of firm has been undertaken against development order, the approval will be given only after the firm has completed the supply.

4.8.1.1 For firms/vendors given IPR by the principal holder of IPR (for manufacture in India of already 'Proven and Established' product on Indian Railways) the approval process to be followed shall be as stated in para 4.3 of QO-D-8.1-7.

4.8.2 Procurement of Raw Material/sub-assembly from Approved Source

When source of raw material/sub assembly for an item is not mentioned in the RDSO specification (if they are vendor's QAP specific) no RDSO intervention is normally required. However, RDSO should advise the firm to develop more than one vendor for raw material/sub assembly in their own interest to overcome dependence on single source and get the same incorporated in the QAP.

When sources of critical raw material/sub assembly for an item are mentioned in the RDSO specification, then in case of single source, the directorate should make effort for multi-sourcing. Such case of single source should be reviewed periodically, at least once a year.

4.9 Test samples /Prototype and charges

The Samples/Prototype testing charges, where ever applicable shall be paid through IREPS (See associate directive for schedule of charges under ref (10)). It shall be mandatory for the firm to offer the Samples/Prototype for testing after depositing the testing charges (if applicable). All necessary documents and internal test reports shall be uploaded online by the firm after due digital signature.

In case, the firm fails to submit Samples/Prototype, within the specified time mentioned in Para 4.8 of ISO Document No. QO-D-8.1-6, the case shall be dealt in accordance with provision given in Para 4.8 of ISO Document No. QO-D-8.1-6.

In the circumstances, where CCA is accepted by the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level) and the firm is already placed in developmental list as per Para 4.8 of this document, however the sample/prototype offered by firm and tested at firm's works in presence of the RDSO representative or the sample/prototype tested at RDSO/NABL Lab has failed, the firm shall be given :-

1. One more opportunities by the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level) to submit the improvised sample/prototype within the specified time mentioned in Para 4.8 of this document.

2. However, if the total number of approved vendors is less than five, the firm shall be given two more opportunities by the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level).

After giving all the opportunities as stated above if sample/prototype doesn't get cleared, the case shall be rejected & the vendor shall be informed accordingly through UVAM.

4.10 Management of testing Samples/Prototype

Each Directorate shall lay down its own procedure for management of the Test Samples/Prototype of all the categories of items. Individual equipment /assembly, where no destructive testing is involved or wherever feasible, all the prescribed Tests shall be carried out on the same sample/prototype.

4.11 Non-conforming results or inadequate information

4.11(a) Non-conforming results: If during scrutiny by nominated official, the test results are found not conforming to the specifications, the further action to be taken as per Ref doc –6 at para 5.0.

4.11 (b) Inadequate information: If during scrutiny by nominated official, the information is found inadequate, and some more information is required, the same shall be collected and case to be processed further, **as per the directives of the ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level), placed on record of that case.**

4.12 Approved copy of QAP

While communicating the fresh registration to the vendor, the approved and digitally signed copy of QAP (Quality Assurance Plan) shall be sent to the vendor for implementation, duly stamped as 'approved'. The QAP shall be for the products for which the firm is approved. QAP must mention the work address of the firm.

4.13 Review / Up-gradation of QAP

The QAP shall be approved by the officer of rank not below Jt. Director of the field unit. This will be subject to review/ up-gradation by RDSO in the light of fresh technical information received from Design Directorate & Information Received after field trial from the Users.

4.14 Communication of approval

The approval under category 4.8 (i.) or 4.8 (ii.) shall be communicated through a letter generated through 'UVAM" and status of vendor be updated in respective 'List of Vendors for Development Orders'/ 'List of Approved Vendors' on 'UVAM" portal.

5.0 Referenced Documents

The list of related documents for multi-sourcing of items / equipment are given below.

Ref. SNo.	Document Number	Document Name
1.	QO-D-8.1-5	Application for registration of vendor
2.	QO-D-8.1-6	Vendor application processing
3.	QO-D-8.1-7	Relaxation of Vendor registration requirements
4.	QO-D-8.1-8	Vendor registration EOI
5.	QO-D-8.1-9	Vendor List
6.	QO-D-8.1-10	Vendor sample type testing
7.	QO-D-8.1-11	Vendor changes in approved status

8.	QO-D-8.1-12	Vendor changes in vendor entity
9.	QO-D-8.1-13	Quality Audit of Approved Vendor
10	QO-D-8.1-14	Vendor registration schedule of charges

6.0 Associated Records

Rec-Ref. S. No.	Document Number	Document Name
1	QO-F-8.1-2	Fresh Registration & Quality Audit of Vendors
2	QO-F-8.1-7	List of documents to be sought from the vendor at the time of fresh registration and Annexures/Forms
3	QO-F-8.1-8	Capability assessment report for registration.

As required by the directorate documentation.

6.0 Responsibility and Authority

Activity	Responsible	Approver	Supporting	Consulted	Informed
Creation, maintenance of this document	MR/ISO Cell	Spl. DG/VD	Staff of ISO Cell	Standing Committee	All directorates through intranet
Compliance of directives contained in this document.	Director In-charge of Directorate	ED controlling the item (when final decision is taken at ED level)/ PED of Vertical (where final decision is taken at PED level)	Directorate Staff		
Requirement of deviation from directive.	PED of the concerned Vertical	Spl. DG/VD	Respective officer of directorate	MR/ISO Cell	All directorates through intranet

7.0 Abbreviations

None