Q1. Does the new IATF include VDA requirements?
Some VDA based requirements may be included in IATF 16949 however not all.

Q2. What was the date for Rule 4 to 5 being obsolete?
Rules 4th is obsolete and 5th becomes effective January 1, 2017.

Q3. If Rules 5 are in effect January 2017, does that mean it applies to the ISO/TS 16949 current version and we toss Rules 4 after that date?
Correct, Rules 5th replaces the 4th edition on January 1, 2017 and applies to the scheme governing both standards.

Q4. Is the Delta Checklist mandatory for customers?
Yes. The Auditor requires a completed checklist as an input to the Document review.

Q5. Does the auditor review the completed upgrade planner/delta checklist during preplanning? Or would technical prior to the audit? What happens if it demonstrates they are not ready?
The Auditor reviews the completed upgrade planner/delta checklist during the Document review which precedes the pre-planning and planning for the Transition audit. If the Auditor determines the client is not ready then additional effort will be required on the part of the client to describe the system changes made. Scheduled Transition audit days may be at risk if not quickly remedied.

Q6. Should support sites complete a separate checklist or include with the primary site’s checklist?
The preferred approach is one completed checklist per location. If a support location is typically audited with a manufacturing site (e.g. nearby warehouse) then it would be acceptable to complete one checklist for both.

Q7. For a remote support site -- many of the requirements in the checklist may not be applicable -- notably those which are manufacturing specific, what should we do in that case?
When completing the Delta Checklist for remote support locations, the term “not applicable-manufacturing site function” or similar may be used as appropriate. It is important to explain why the “NA” is justified for that location to assist the reviewer.

Q8. If you are exempt for (product) design are you also exempt for product safety?
There are no permissible exclusions for IATF 16949 clause 4.4.1.2 Product Safety.
Q9. Our certificate expires in September 2018. Our surveillance audit is scheduled in October 2017. Should we plan to make that scheduled surveillance to be the transition audit to IATF 16949?

Yes, any audit after October 1, 2017 must be to the IATF 16949 requirement.

Q10. How many vehicle manufacturers (as opposed to component manufacturers/suppliers) are certified to TS 16949?

This information is not publicly available however we assume that vehicle manufacturers account for much less than 1% of the global TS registrations currently.

Q11. Is internal auditor training required?

Internal and external Auditors will both require evidence of training to the new standard.

Q12. Our site provide supports to manufacturing sites, our plan is to transition to IATF in May 2017, however we have surveillance for TS scheduled in January 2017, would it make sense to NSF to move the audit from January to May 2017 to the new IATF?

If you are referring to a manufacturing location which has resident processes which support other manufacturing locations, then the January audit most likely cannot be delayed until May and still meet Rules audit boundaries for that site. If the January audit is for a remote support location then please contact your Account Manager to discuss potential for delay.

Q13. What happens in cases of combined audits with ISO 9001:2015 audits? Is there additional time? If so, how much?

If the ISO 9001:2015 registration is for the same automotive products as the IATF 16949 but for customers who do not recognize IATF 16949 then no additional time is required. If the ISO 9001 scope differs from the automotive scope (e.g. non-automotive products), then additional time would be added based on the degree of change.

Q14. I’m at a support site that will have a regular surveillance (to ISO 9001:2008) in March 2017, but oversee plants that will have IATF 16949 transition audits as soon as November 2017. I won’t be ready for a transition audit at the support site by March 2017 so what can I do?

A transition audit will be required at the remote support location before the first manufacturing plant transition audit. Time for this “extra” visit will be taken from the manufacturing site(s) required days.

Q15. We were recently acquired. Our new corporate remote site is ISO 9001 certified. But our factory is ISO/TS 16949 certified. Does the remote site need to be upgraded to IATF 16949?

The support processes at the corporate remote support location need to be audited to the applicable IATF 16949 requirements prior to the plants transition audit.
Q16. **IS the IATF TS 16949:2016 standard separate from ISO 9001:2015 (i.e. IATF 16949 standard book does not include ISO 9001:2015)?**

Correct and you will need copies of each.

Q17. **If an organization’s regular audit timing is early second quarter in 2017, would it be recommended to use that as the transition audit, or should more time be allocated for the transition?**

This depends on the organization’s resources however a Transition audit in second quarter 2017 is feasible and recommended.

Q18. **Will our Lead Auditor for ISO/TS need a new certification for IATF?**

All IATF Auditors will need to successfully pass the IATF Auditor training course (which is being made available in the very near future) prior to performing any audits to the IATF 16949 standard.

Q19. **We are with a center supporting many sites not certified by NSF-ISR. How do we handle cases like this if the development center upgrades later than the supported sites? Who is able to evaluate the Delta Checklist to IATF 16949 if the internal auditor is not qualified to IATF qualification requirements?**

According to the IATF Transition Strategy document (page 5), “All supporting functions on site or remote shall be included in the transition process in line with the current ISO/TS 16949:2009 audit cycle and shall be included at the Transition audit”. Other arrangements are also described on pages 5 and 6 however are not recommended due to added risk to the sites certification process, added cost and complexity. Each site will require several individuals whom are familiar with the IATF 16949 standard and the revised requirements.