DEEPAK CYBIT | VADODARA · PUNE · MUMBAI

MODULE BROCHURE
2026

COMPLIHUB

Automotive Core Tools & IATF 16949

The six AIAG core tools, the Control Plan and a gated APQP launch project on one connected register, with the clauses around them: quality manual, training needs, calibration findings that reach the customer, supplier controls, OEE and customer performance, scored audits and improvement projects.

- Six AIAG core tools
- Gated APQP launch
- PFD, PFMEA and Control Plan linked
- Quality manual from your records
- 92 of 104 clauses covered in full
- Partial clauses named in writing

Independent module — no other CompliHub pack required. · Integrates into a full IMS when additional modules are licensed.

Executive Summary

An IATF 16949 audit follows one part through the Process Flow Diagram, the PFMEA, the Control Plan, the work instruction at the station, the gauge that measures it, the people trained to run it and the supplier that provides the material. In most plants those live in separate files that somebody has to keep in agreement. CompliHub holds them on one register: an operation is one row that the FMEA and the Control Plan both point at, a risk score is computed and not typed, and an approved revision cannot be edited, only superseded.

Around the core tools the platform now covers the clauses an auditor walks next. A new work instruction revision raises a training need. A gauge found out of tolerance asks whether product has already shipped and keeps asking until the customer notice is recorded. A customer specification change is sent to the functions it affects, acknowledged by each, and linked to the documents it updated. The quality manual is assembled from the scope, processes and customer requirements already in the system, so it cannot disagree with them.

This brochure does not say the platform makes you certified. Certification is granted to your organisation. Rated clause by clause against IATF 16949, 92 of 104 supplemental clauses are covered in full, 10 are partial and 2 are procedural. The partial ones are named in the white paper and the clause mapping, with what is missing.

92 / 104
IATF supplemental clauses covered in full

13
AIAG and IATF core tools on one register

0
Hand-typed RPN, Cpk or Class values

17
Opt-in controls a super admin can switch on

The Problem

The Process Flow Diagram, the PFMEA, the Control Plan and the work instruction are usually separate spreadsheets or documents. Each carries its own revision in a header cell, and each trusts a person to update the others whenever one changes. That is how an audit finding appears: not because the analysis was wrong, but because it cannot be shown to be the one in force.

The same pattern repeats around the core tools. Training needs are remembered, not raised. A gauge found out of tolerance is recorded, and nobody asks which lots shipped on it. A customer revises a specification and the change reaches the people who need it by email. The quality manual is a document written once and corrected before each audit.

None of this is a failure of diligence. It is work that a spreadsheet cannot enforce, so it depends on memory and on a fortnight of preparation before every surveillance audit.

Three Files, One Operation

Operation 70A on the PFD, the PFMEA and the Control Plan is three typed cells that agree today. Nothing stops them drifting after the next revision.

Typed Scores

RPN, Class and capability indices are formulas a person can overwrite, delete or copy down wrongly across a merged row.

Approvals Without a Trail

An approval is an email, a scanned signature or an initial. Nothing records what the approver saw, or when.

Training Left to Memory

A work instruction changes on Monday. Whether the people who run it were retrained depends on someone remembering.

A Gauge Found Late

An instrument is found out of tolerance at calibration. The record exists. The question of which shipped lots relied on it, and whether the customer was told, does not.

The Manual Written for the Audit

The quality manual lists a scope, exclusions and process interactions that were true when it was written and are corrected before each visit.

The CompliHub Solution

One register for the core tools. Special characteristics, the Process Flow Diagram, FMEA, Control Plan, PPAP, SPC, MSA, APQP, error-proofing, warranty, product safety, contingency plans and TPM and tooling share one approval engine, one audit trail and one set of linked records. An approved record is immutable and a change is a new revision.

Controls that follow the change. A work instruction can name the competency it needs, and whoever records a set-up against it must hold that competency. A new revision, a later control plan revision or a reviewed customer specification raises a training need with an owner and a due date. A change decided as needing a PPAP raises the submission and cannot close until the customer has approved it.

Measurement that reaches the customer. Evaluating an out-of-tolerance calibration has to state whether shipped product was affected, and for a yes or a maybe the asset page keeps asking until the customer, the date and the notice reference are recorded. A marginal MSA study asks for a written review of the acceptance criteria.

Evidence worked out from the records. Manufacturing Metrics calculates PPM, first-pass yield, scrap, OEE and DPMO by month, and a month with nothing to measure shows a dash and not a zero. One page per customer shows the last twelve months of delivery, disruptions, claims and scorecard. A management review is opened with those figures already in it.

A manual that cannot disagree with the system. The Quality Manual page assembles the scope, the approved exclusions, each process with its owner, the handovers between processes and where each customer requirement is addressed. It lists its own gaps and prints cleanly.

Switches, not surprises. Where a control would change how a site already works, it is off by default and a super admin switches it on. Seventeen such controls exist, from requiring a qualified auditor to refusing to receive a regulated lot without a supplier declaration, and three of them take an action rather than stop one: raising a corrective action from a complaint analysis, raising a nonconformance from a failed inspection, and requiring the current FMEA before a control plan goes for approval.

Detailed Feature Breakdown

Special Characteristics

The register of product/process features where variation affects safety, fit, function, or customer satisfaction — the spine that FMEA, control plans and work instructions all reference.

IATF 16949 §8.2.3.1.2, §8.3.3.3

- Register of product/process features where variation affects safety, fit, function or customer satisfaction
- Customer-designated and organization-identified sources, each with its own symbol
- Critical to safety / critical to function / significant / standard classification
- Identified / active / obsolete lifecycle with a required obsolescence reason
- One record referenced by FMEA items, control plan rows and work instructions
- Characteristics still only identified rather than activated into production control roll into the site compliance scorecard, so one is never quietly forgotten

Process Flow Diagrams

The ordered sequence of process steps for one part or process — the manufacturing process design output a PFMEA and control plan are both meant to walk through.

IATF 16949 §8.3.5.2, §7.1.3.1

- Ordered, numbered process steps per part/process, each tagged with its AIAG flow type
- Operation / inspection / operation-and-inspection / transport / delay / storage classification per step
- Incoming source of variation, product and process characteristics, and control method recorded per step
- PFMEA and Control Plan rows can each link back to the specific step they address
- Approval through the shared approval engine; an approved diagram is immutable, changed only by a new revision

FMEA (Design & Process)

Design and Process Failure Mode & Effects Analysis: failure modes, effects, causes, current controls, S/O/D risk scoring, and the recommended actions that reduce risk.

IATF 16949 §8.3.5.1, §8.3.5.2, §10.2.4

- Design FMEA and Process FMEA on one model, distinguished by kind
- Failure modes, effects, causes and current prevention/detection controls
- Severity / Occurrence / Detection scoring with AIAG/VDA 2019 Action Priority
- Live RPN and Action Priority preview as the three scores are typed, with an AIAG rating-band reference on each field — no submit-and-see-what-happened
- Named cross-functional team recorded against the analysis itself
- Recommended actions tracked with revised scores after action
- Approval through the shared approval engine, with supersession on revision
- Open High-priority items surfaced on the FMEA list itself, not only inside the record, and rolled into the compliance scorecard

Control Plans

The central automotive manufacturing document: which characteristics are controlled at which process step, how they are measured, how often, and the reaction plan when a measurement falls outside spec.

IATF 16949 §8.5.1.1, §8.6.1

- Prototype, pre-launch and production plan types, distinct rather than one document
- Row-level links back to the PFMEA item and special characteristic that justify it
- Control method, sample size and frequency, with a reaction plan per row
- Approval through the shared approval engine; an approved plan is immutable
- Superseded on revision, kept for traceability rather than overwritten
- A control plan row, FMEA or SPC study can be named directly as what a CAPA action actually changed — the corrective-action record points at the record it revised, not a comment describing it

PPAP

The Production Part Approval Process submission package: the fixed 18-element AIAG checklist a customer reviews before approving a part for production, with the customer's own decision recorded on the record.

IATF 16949 §8.3.4.4, §8.4.3.1, §8.5.6.1

- Fixed 18-element AIAG checklist, seeded in full on every submission
- Submission level 1–5 and reason for submission
- Department-integrity-checked links to the Control Plan and FMEA behind it
- Submission blocked while any required element is still pending, named explicitly
- Customer decision (approved / interim approval / rejected) recorded directly on the record
- Interim approvals nearing or past their expiry date surfaced as a coloured badge on the submission list, not only on opening the record

SPC (Statistical Process Control)

Control charts for a characteristic at a process step: a baseline run establishes control limits and process capability (Cp/Cpk/Pp/Ppk), then every later sample is judged against that frozen baseline, not today's running average.

IATF 16949 §8.5.1.1, §9.1.1.1, §9.1.1.2, §9.1.1.3

- All six AIAG chart types: X̄-R, X̄-S, p, np, c, u
- Control limits computed from a baseline run using AIAG's own constants, then frozen
- Cp/Cpk (within-subgroup) and Pp/Ppk (overall) computed side by side for variable charts
- Automatic baseline-vs-monitoring phasing and out-of-control judgment against the frozen baseline
- A reaction record required against every signalled point
- Optional link to the Control Plan row it verifies

MSA (Measurement Systems Analysis)

Measurement Systems Analysis: whether a gage can actually be trusted to tell two parts apart. A crossed Gage R&R study separates how much of the spread in a reading comes from the part itself versus from the gage and the person using it.

IATF 16949 §7.1.5.1.1, §8.5.1.1, §9.1.1.2

- Crossed Gage R&R via the AIAG Average and Range method
- 2–3 named appraisers measuring the same parts multiple times each
- EV, AV, GRR, PV, TV, %GRR of variation and of tolerance, and ndc computed once and frozen
- AIAG-threshold verdict, checked against the manual's own published worked example
- Optional links to the Control Plan row it qualifies and the Asset that is the gage itself

APQP (Advanced Product Quality Planning)

The phased launch project that sequences the other automotive core tools through AIAG's five gates. A gate only opens once every required deliverable for the phase behind it is actually done.

IATF 16949 §8.1.1, §8.3.1.1, §8.3.2.1, §8.3.4

- AIAG's own 5 phases as a hard-gated sequence: Plan & Define, Product Design, Process Design, Validation, Launch
- 26 fixed deliverables seeded per project across the five phases
- Phase advancement blocked until every required deliverable is complete or marked not applicable
- Deliverables link the real record as evidence — the actual FMEA, Control Plan, PPAP, SPC or MSA study
- A gate is a computed fact, never a status flip

Error-Proofing (Poka-Yoke) Register

The poka-yoke register: a specific installed device that guards one failure mode, with the periodic test-for-failure history that proves it still works — the record behind a PFMEA's own free-text prevention control.

IATF 16949 §10.2.4

- Register of installed poka-yoke devices — sensors, fixtures, interlocks, vision systems
- Links to the PFMEA failure mode a device guards and the Control Plan row that names it
- Periodic test-for-failure history with a derived, never hand-set trustworthiness state
- A failed verification requires a recorded reaction before the device reads as trusted again

Warranty Management

The field return: what the customer reported, what analysis actually found — including the No Trouble Found outcome the standard names by name — and how the claim was settled.

IATF 16949 §10.2.5

- Field-return register: what was reported, what analysis actually found, how the claim was settled
- No Trouble Found (NTF) kept as its own outcome, not a claim that quietly disappears
- A confirmed defect can raise a Finding straight into the shared RCA/CAPA engine
- Traces back to the material lot or production batch this app actually made, wherever one exists

Product Safety Management

The documented process §4.4.1.2 requires: which characteristics on this part are safety-related, which DFMEA/PFMEA and control plan carry the special approval, and the escape/lessons-learned log that proves it's actually being watched.

IATF 16949 §4.4.1.2

- Which characteristics on a part are safety-related, tied to the real Special Characteristic record
- Which DFMEA/PFMEA and Control Plan revision carries the special approval those characteristics require
- Special controls, supply-chain flowdown and training requirements recorded against the plan
- Escape / near-miss / lessons-learned log with a recorded customer-notification decision
- A safety escape can raise a Finding straight from the event description

Contingency Plans

The documented, tested, annually-reviewed plan §6.1.2.3 requires for exactly the risks that could interrupt production to the customer — mirroring emergency preparedness's plan/test/review shape.

IATF 16949 §6.1.2.3

- Documented plan per production-interruption risk category — equipment failure, utility loss, supplier interruption, cyber attack, natural disaster and more
- Optional links to the risk register entry, the specific supplier or the specific asset it covers
- A live plan that has never been tested reads as overdue immediately, not merely pending
- Mandatory review clock, at minimum annual, that can raise a Finding when the plan is found inadequate
- A test that finds the plan wanting parks it under review until an actual review records what changed

TPM & Production Tooling

The documented planned-maintenance system §8.5.1.5 requires, and the tool-life/change-management register §8.5.1.6 requires — the last two items on the IATF 16949 gap-closing priority list.

IATF 16949 §8.5.1.5, §8.5.1.6

- Documented planned-maintenance system per equipment/process: criticality, spare parts, storage requirements
- A stated objective metric (OEE or whatever applies) with a target, reviewed against a real reading each time
- Production tooling register: dies, molds, jigs, gauges, with current revision level and storage location
- Tool life tracked by cycle count against a limit — a derived, never hand-set current/warning/exceeded state
- Modification history recording the exact revision moved from and to
- Explicit customer-owned tooling identification naming the owning customer

Quality Manual, Scope and Exclusions

The scope of the quality management system, the exclusions claimed and the way the processes connect, assembled into a printable manual that cannot disagree with the records behind it.

IATF 16949 §4.3.1, §5.1.1.3, §7.5.1.1

- Each supporting function (design, purchasing, logistics, laboratory, maintenance, customer service, IT) is recorded with what it does for the site, where it is done and who is responsible, and a function left out of scope has to say why
- The usual functions nobody has considered are listed, and an entry not reviewed within its interval is flagged
- An exclusion states why it does not apply and why product conformity is not affected, is approved by someone other than its owner, and for IATF 16949 only product design and development (8.3) can be excluded
- Each process has an owner, a deputy, inputs, outputs and indicators, and the handovers between processes are recorded
- The Quality Manual page assembles scope, exclusions, processes, interactions and where each customer requirement is addressed, lists its own gaps and prints cleanly
- The manual is assembled from records and does not hold the quality policy or the documented procedures, and the interactions are listed and not drawn

Responsibilities, Conformity and Production Stop

Who is responsible for customer requirements, special characteristics, product safety and corrective action, the confirmation that a part conforms, and the authority to stop production.

IATF 16949 §4.4.1.1, §5.3.1, §5.3.2

- Top management assigns each of these responsibilities to a person with a deputy, and one nobody holds shows as unassigned on the lists it affects
- A conformity confirmation for a part cannot be signed while an applicable customer requirement is a gap or not assessed, while its control plan is not approved, or if a regulatory check does not say the product conforms
- The confirmation is signed by someone other than its preparer, is valid for twelve months and then shows as expired
- A person with stop authority can order production stopped at a work centre. While the order stands no scheduled job starts there, and quality releases it only after a restart verification has been approved
- A stop order stops new jobs being started in the system and cannot stop a machine that is already running

Facilities, Housekeeping and Environment

The plan for a layout or equipment change, and a scored housekeeping record for each production area.

IATF 16949 §7.1.3.1, §7.1.4.1

- A facility plan names the multidisciplinary team, material flow, use of floor space, risks, lean considerations and contingency, and is approved by a second person and verified for effectiveness once built
- Material flow is written as steps (from, to, material, metres, trips per day, handling) and the plan adds up the distance travelled and the moves per day, so two layouts can be compared
- An approved change request raises a draft plan, once
- A 5S audit scores sort, set in order, shine, standardize and sustain, and needs findings and an action date below 80% or when any element scores 0 or 1
- Temperature, humidity, cleanliness and ESD are monitored conditions with limits and readings
- Layouts are not modelled, and the monitored conditions are not tied to the 5S audit of the same area

Work Instructions, Set-up and Restart Verification

Standardized work at each workstation, and the check that a job set-up or a restart after a shutdown is right before production runs.

IATF 16949 §8.5.1.2, §8.5.1.3, §8.5.1.4, §8.5.1.7

- An instruction carries the safety rules, steps and visual standard, is linked to the process step and control plan, is approved by a second person and cannot be edited once approved
- Approving a revision makes the one before it obsolete, so only one is in force for a code, and a By workstation page shows what is in force at a station
- An instruction can name the competency it needs. Whoever records a set-up against it must hold that competency today
- A set-up or restart verification records parameters, first-off and last-off results, needs a passing first-off part and a different person, and a rejected attempt stays on file
- A scheduled job cannot start on a line without an approved verification for the part
- The schedule has no finite-capacity calculation and does not import customer orders

Measurement, Calibration and Laboratories

Whether a gauge can be trusted, what happened when one was found out of tolerance, and what the laboratory clauses need from your laboratory system.

IATF 16949 §7.1.5.1.1, §7.1.5.2.1, §7.1.5.3.1, §7.1.5.3.2, §9.1.1.2

- A control plan row that is checked by SPC or on every piece, and names a measurement method, is flagged when no live MSA study exists
- Evaluating an out-of-tolerance calibration has to say whether product already shipped was not affected, possibly affected or affected
- For the last two the asset page keeps asking until the customer, the date and a reference to the notice are recorded
- An MSA study that comes out marginal or unacceptable asks for a written review of the acceptance criteria and the method, or why nothing changes
- Furnace accuracy tests and temperature uniformity surveys are recorded as calibration kinds
- The customer notice is recorded and not sent, and shipped lots are not listed automatically
- Internal and external laboratory clauses depend on your laboratory system. The requirements are written for its team, and results do not yet carry a scope status

Competence, Awareness and Motivation

How training needs are found, how competence is proved and how people are made aware of quality, beyond a training matrix.

IATF 16949 §7.2.1, §7.2.2, §7.2.3, §7.2.4, §7.3.1, §7.3.2

- A new work instruction revision that names a competency, a later control plan revision and a reviewed customer specification change each raise a training need with an owner and a due date
- A need stays open until it is met, with how, or shown not to be needed, with why, and is flagged when overdue
- On-the-job training has a named mentor, only the mentor can sign off, and signing off grants the competency
- Internal and second-party auditors are held to stated criteria, and a rule that only a currently qualified auditor can be assigned can be switched on
- Awareness topics are tagged on training sessions, and a coverage page shows who has not been reached in twelve months
- Awareness campaigns, quality recognition nominations and survey results are recorded, and a nomination is decided by someone who is neither the nominee nor the nominator
- A competency is checked at set-up verification and area fitness clearance, and not at every other task assignment. The system holds survey results and does not run a survey

Risk, Preventive Action and Planning

Risks that feed the system from real data, preventive action as its own record, and the inputs a launch is planned from.

IATF 16949 §6.1.2.1, §6.1.2.2, §6.2.2.1, §8.1.1

- A lessons-learned review takes the counts of warranty claims, field failures, recalls, findings and customer disruptions from the system and keeps the lessons and the risks raised with the review
- A preventive action records where the potential problem came from, an owner and a due date, and either links an error-proofing device or says why none applies
- A quality objective says which customer requirement it addresses, and top management records a review of it
- An APQP project tracks each planning input (customer requirements, specifications, logistics, feasibility, timing, resources) and cannot leave its first phase on an open one
- Rules such as a contingency plan for high risks, and every kind of planning input before the first gate, are off until a super admin switches them on

Design and Development Controls

The controls around product design that an automotive customer expects, tied to the APQP project.

IATF 16949 §8.3.1.1 to §8.3.6.1, §8.6.2, §8.6.3

- Design inputs are recorded by category and each of the eight target categories must be covered, or marked as not applying, before a design project is submitted
- Design tools and the level of skill required are registered, people are assessed, and a project shows any skill its owner does not meet
- Each design output is assessed for special characteristics before the project is submitted
- Verification and validation are separate records, and a validation names the customer programme date and the failure modes tested
- A prototype build is planned against the customer's deadline and recorded with the measured results by characteristic
- Layout inspection results are kept dimension by dimension and a dimension outside its limits cannot sit under a pass
- An appearance master records the lighting and conditions it is judged under and the customer's approval
- Software in the product has a process assessment, a required and assessed level and recorded test runs. Requirements traceability and the test results stay in the team's own tools

Operational Controls and Release

The controls on the shop floor between a customer order and a shipped lot.

IATF 16949 §8.5.2.1, §8.5.3, §8.5.4.1, §8.5.6.1.1, §8.6.1, §8.6.4, §8.6.6

- A traceability plan per part records the level of identification and how status is shown, and a timed trace exercise passes only if both the time and the pieces located are met
- Customer property is recorded with its condition and checked at an interval
- Storage areas are assessed for deterioration at an interval, with overdue assessments flagged
- An alternate process control records why it gives equivalent assurance and the longest it may stay in use, and its use is logged and reviewed
- A release starts with one line per control plan item and is released by someone other than its preparer, only when every line is completed or the customer's approval is recorded
- The method that assures a supplier's product is recorded per supplier and per material
- An attribute sampling plan gives the sample size for the lot, and an inspection that found a nonconforming piece needs the customer's approved acceptance level
- Traceability that the system can walk exists only for material lots and production batches, and for finished goods and work in process the rotation rule is written and not enforced

Change Control and Customer Specifications

Changes to the product or process, and changes a customer makes to its own standards, followed through to the people and documents they affect.

IATF 16949 §8.3.6.1, §8.5.6.1, §7.5.3.2.2

- A change records where it came from (internal, customer, supplier, regulator), whether the customer must approve the part again and whether it needs a trial run
- A change decided as needing a PPAP raises the submission from the approved request and cannot be closed until the customer has approved it
- A customer specification revision is logged on receipt, and working days to review and to production are counted against the target on the record
- The change is sent to the affected functions, each recipient acknowledges it, and the updated documents are linked
- A super admin can require that distribution, acknowledgement and an updated document exist before a change is recorded as in production. The rule is off by default
- Nobody is notified that a copy is waiting

Supplier Controls Beyond the Scorecard

The controls on what suppliers supply, from selection to second-party audit, and the software they supply.

IATF 16949 §8.4.1.1 to §8.4.3.1

- A supplier is scored on financial viability, quality system, technical capability and delivery, with a written supply risk assessment, and is approved outright only if every criterion reaches 3 and the risk is not high
- A declaration of conformity to a regulation or substance list is held against the supplier and the material, and a rule that a regulated lot cannot be received without one can be switched on
- Requirements passed to a supplier are recorded with the supplier's acknowledgement, and a suggestions page lists the safety and regulatory characteristics not yet passed on
- Customer-directed sources are recorded with who is responsible for quality
- Approved suppliers are ranked for audit by risk, inspection level, time since the last audit, certificate state, incidents and open nonconformances, and a draft audit programme can be filled in that order
- Supplied software carries the same process assessment as in-house software, ranked by overdue assessment
- Development plans have dated milestones with evidence of improvement

Performance Measures and Customer Performance

The plant-level figures and the customer's own view of you, worked out from the records the system already holds.

IATF 16949 §5.1.1.2, §8.2.1.1, §9.1.1.1, §9.1.2.1, §9.1.3.1

- Manufacturing Metrics works out PPM, first-pass yield, scrap rate, scorecard rating, jobs completed by the due date, OEE and DPMO by month, and a month with nothing to measure shows a dash and not zero
- A performance measure can take its monthly reading from those figures instead of a typed number, with a target and a direction
- One page per customer shows the last twelve months of on-time delivery, disruptions with cost, warranty claims, returns, notices and the customer's scorecard
- Trends are scored, ranked and tied to the objective they threaten, and a suggestions page lists trends the data shows that nobody has taken up
- Customer communication is logged with a reply-due date and an overdue flag
- OEE exists only where production runs are entered, DPMO only for inspections that state opportunities and defects, and nothing is received from customer portals or EDI

Inspection, SPC and the Corrective Action Loop

Readings judged against the control plan, fed into SPC, and failures and complaints taken into corrective action, with each automatic step opt-in.

IATF 16949 §8.5.1.1, §8.6.2, §8.7, §9.1.1.1, §10.2.3, §10.2.6

- A control plan row can carry numeric limits, a nominal and a unit. An inspection against the plan takes its limits from the row, so a line can be just the characteristic and the reading
- Each reading is judged in or out of tolerance as it is entered, and a dimension outside its limits cannot sit under a pass for any kind of inspection
- Readings against a row that has a live variable SPC study of the same subgroup size are recorded in it as one subgroup, so they are not typed twice
- When the FMEA a control plan was built from is superseded, or a newer one exists for the part, the plan says so, its owner is told, and a button drafts the next revision against the current FMEA with each row's FMEA item found again. A site rule can stop a stale plan being submitted for review
- A complaint, a warranty claim with a confirmed defect, a finding or a nonconformance can start an 8D with the problem carried across. A site rule can raise the finding and a draft 8D when the analysis is recorded
- A site rule can raise a nonconformance when an inspection fails, which holds the lot it names and starts the disposition, rework and corrective action steps
- Nothing revises a control plan by itself, a production batch is not held by an inspection, and the 8D's steps are not linked to the finding's root cause analysis and corrective action plan

Internal Audits, Management Review and Improvement

The audit programme, the review that follows it, and the improvement work that results.

IATF 16949 §9.2.2.1 to §9.2.2.4, §9.3.1.1, §9.3.2.1, §9.3.3.1, §10.2.3, §10.3.1

- Every QMS process is shown with its last audit and flagged when not audited within three years, and a draft programme can be filled in for the processes not covered
- A manufacturing process audit uses the organisation's own question set, each question rated, with a finding raised into corrective action
- A product audit plan per part family calculates the next due date, and its interval is halved while the last audit failed or complaints and claims exist on the part
- A management review adds the IATF inputs with figures worked out from the records, and the next review falls due after twelve months or three while an active customer measure is off target
- A site rule can stop a review closing until each IATF input is on the agenda and every customer measure that is off target has an action
- An 8D report is worked in order and closed by someone other than the team leader
- An improvement project records the method, the metric with its baseline and target and the result
- The interval of a recurring planned audit does not change by itself when problems occur, and no published question catalogue such as VDA 6.3 is included

Standards & Compliance Coverage

IATF 16949 is a supplement to ISO 9001. The product is mapped to the IATF supplemental clauses in a maintained document, with a status for every clause and the gap stated where there is one. The table below shows a selection an auditor reaches first.

The statuses are Covered, Partial and Procedural. Covered means the system holds the record the clause asks for with the workflow an auditor would expect. It does not mean certification.

Standard / Regulation	Clause	How This Module Addresses It
IATF 16949:2016	§4.3.1, §7.5.1.1	Scope entries for each supporting function, approved exclusions (only 8.3 can be excluded), and a printable quality manual assembled from the records.
IATF 16949:2016	§4.3.2, §7.5.3.2.1	Customer-specific requirements per customer document and revision, with a retention period a customer asks for enforced on records that carry a part number.
IATF 16949:2016	§7.1.5.2.1	Out-of-tolerance calibration records the effect on shipped product and the customer notice. A marginal MSA study asks for a review of the acceptance criteria.
IATF 16949:2016	§7.2.1, §7.2.2	Training needs raised by revisions, an owner and a due date on each, and on-the-job training signed off by a mentor who holds the competency.
IATF 16949:2016	§7.5.3.2.2	Customer specification changes logged on receipt, sent to the affected functions, acknowledged, and linked to the documents they updated.
IATF 16949:2016	§8.3.5.1, §8.3.5.2	PFMEA, Process Flow Diagram and Control Plan linked row to row, with Action Priority computed and a reaction plan required on every control row.
IATF 16949:2016	§8.4.1.2, §8.4.2.1, §8.4.2.4	Supplier selection scores, an inspection level recommended by the scorecard, and a scorecard computed from the lots booked in.
IATF 16949:2016	§8.5.1.3, §8.5.1.4	Set-up and restart verification needs a passing first-off part and a second person, and a line cannot start a job without one.
IATF 16949:2016	§8.5.6.1	A change records where it came from and whether the part needs customer re-approval. A PPAP raised from it blocks closure until approved.
IATF 16949:2016	§9.1.1.1, §9.1.2.1	PPM, first-pass yield, scrap, OEE and DPMO by month, and one customer performance page over twelve months.
IATF 16949:2016	§9.2.2.2 to §9.2.2.4	QMS process audit coverage on a three-year cycle, scored manufacturing process audits and measured product audits.
IATF 16949:2016	§10.2.3, §10.3.1	8D reports closed by someone other than the team leader, and improvement projects with a baseline, a target and a result.

Why CompliHub

Quality software for automotive is usually sold tool by tool, with consulting on top. CompliHub holds the core tools and the clauses around them on one register, with the evidence an auditor follows linked end to end.

Computed, Never Typed

RPN, Action Priority, Class, Cp, Cpk, Pp, Ppk and Gage R&R are computed when the underlying scores are saved. There is no cell to overwrite.

Immutable Revisions

An approved FMEA, Control Plan or Process Flow cannot be edited. A change is made in a new draft and the old one is superseded and stays on file. Linked control plans are not flagged automatically when an FMEA is superseded.

Changes That Pull the Right Levers

A change can raise a PPAP, a facility plan, a training need or a specification distribution, each linked back to the change that raised it.

Honest Coverage

Every clause has a status in a maintained mapping. The ten partial clauses are named, with what is missing, in the same document.

Opt-in Enforcement

Rules that would change how a site already works are off until a super admin switches them on, so adoption does not stop a running plant.

One Audit Trail

Every approval carries a named signer, a server timestamp and a stated meaning, in the same trail as permits, incidents and audits.

When Combined with Other CompliHub Modules

- **+ Audit & CAPA:** A corrective action can name the exact FMEA, Control Plan row or SPC study it changed, so the action and the record it revised are one trail.
- **+ Controlled Documents:** Updated documents are linked to the customer specification change that required them, and retention periods follow the part.
- **+ Competency, Training & Assets:** Training needs, set-up verification and mentor sign-off read the same competency register as the training matrix.
- **+ Your laboratory system:** Certificates of analysis, melt chemistry and NDT verdicts are mirrored read-only onto the lot, batch or control plan line they belong to. The laboratory clauses themselves depend on that system.

See It in Action

Thirty minutes on your worst workflow. We show one complete process end to end, on your terms.

Book a Demo

We walk through your specific use case — your forms, your approval chains, your pain points — in a live session on the actual product.

No slides. No generic walkthrough. Your workflow, your data shape, your approval matrix.

Typical Implementation

The starting point is a thirty-minute walkthrough on one real part number: a Process Flow Diagram, a PFMEA and a Control Plan built live. The plan after that depends on how many parts, customers and suppliers are loaded, and is agreed once we have seen your control plans and customer requirements. Ten clauses are only partly covered, and the white paper and the clause mapping say which and why.

www.complihub.in · Book Demo: outlook.office.com/book/BookDemo@cybit.in

CompliHub · Deepak Cybit | Vadodara · Pune · Mumbai | © 2026