

SUBSECTION 225.3  
DPSCM 4155.6

INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR RATION ASSEMBLY  
OPERATIONS

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE. Provide procedures applicable to Military Veterinary Food Inspection personnel performing inspections for assembly of the Meal, Ready-to-Eat (MRE) and for the assembly of other operational rations.

II. POLICY.

A. Contractor inspection shall be performed in accordance with the applicable specifications and technical data cited in the contract, Manual 4155.5, and MIL-STD-105. The contractor must inspect on a lot-by-lot inspection frequency. The contractor is limited to normal and tightened inspection severity, except when the Military Inspector-in-Charge of an MRE assembly operation authorizes reduced severity for inspection under MIL-M-44074. Switching procedures for the level of inspection severity are as prescribed in MIL-STD-105. The contractor and QAR shall inspect at the same level of severity. Application of reduced inspection severity for MRE assembly is solely at the discretion of the Military Inspector-in-Charge based on the contractor's demonstrated quality control capability and reliability, compliance with MIL-STD-105, and the economical use of inspection resources. The Military Inspector-in-Charge shall consult with the quality assurance element of the purchasing activity if any question arises in the application of this authority.

B. Military verification inspection shall be performed in accordance with the applicable specifications and technical data cited in the contract, MIL-STD-105, and guidance contained or referenced in this Subsection. Contractor's Inspection System Evaluation (ISE) shall be performed in accordance with Subsection 225.2

1. In MRE assembly plants, reduced inspection severity may be authorized by the Military Inspector-in-Charge. In addition, at the direction of the Military Inspector-in-Charge, the QAR may perform verification inspection on a skip-lot or modified skip-lot basis. Quality history records shall be maintained to support changes in severity and frequency of inspections. Reduced inspection severity, skip-lot and modified skip-lot verification procedures are authorized for inspection of crackers under MIL-C-44112, and may be applied to any or all tables/paragraphs of MIL-M-44074.

SUBSECTION 225.3  
DPSCM 4155.6

2. In ration assembly operations other than for the MRE, due to less frequent acquisitions and smaller contract quantities, reduced inspection severity, skip-lot and modified skip-lot procedures shall not be applied without the written approval of the quality assurance element of the purchasing activity.

C. The QAR is required to review the contractor's inspection reports on a daily basis for accuracy, completeness, and adherence to the requirements of DPSC Manual 4155.5, whether or not skip-lot or modified skip-lot procedures are used for MRE verification inspection. Failure of the contractor to follow DPSC Manual 4155.5 is a contract nonconformance and shall be reported through the quality assurance element to the Contracting Officer for appropriate action.

III. SIGNIFICANT CHANGES. This Subsection contains major changes and should be reviewed in its entirety.

IV. TYPES OF VERIFICATION FREQUENCY.

A. There are two general types of verification frequency.

1. Lot-by-lot (Type A).
2. Skip-lot (Types B-1 and B-2).

B. General Application.

1. When authorized by the Military Inspector-in-Charge, more than one frequency of verification (i.e., A, B-1, or B-2) may be used to verify MRE production lots.

2. If administrative review of a specific situation by the supervisory QAR (military Officer of Non-Commissioned Officer) indicates that reversion to Type A verification for all examinations of an end item is unwarranted or unnecessary, he/she may authorize reversion to Type A for only those examinations for which results in different frequencies, i.e., Type A, Type-B-1 or Type B-2.

C. Definition of Types of Verification Frequency.

1. Lot-by-lot verification is Type A. QAR verification examination of every specification table/paragraph is required for each lot offered. Type A verification is used to generate Government examination data to be used to evaluate a contractor's inspection system when the contractor has not previously produced under contractor inspection (initial evaluation), or when the contractor has been reverted to Type A verification from skip-lot verification for reasons listed in subparagraph V.B.1. Type A verification is also used for small acquisitions, infrequent contracts, and new ration items.

a. Initial evaluation period without inspection costs is limited to a maximum of six production lots (see paragraph XI).

b. Re-evaluation is performed at the contractor's expense as specified in paragraph XI until the contractor again qualifies for skip-lot verification.

2. Skip-lot verification is Type B. QAR verification of every lot offered is not required. Contractor-employed personnel shall not be informed of random plans of verification examination because if the contractor knows which lots are to be examined by the QAR, the contractor knows where to concentrate the process and inspection efforts.

- a. Type B-1 verification is performed at a frequency of not less than one of two consecutive lots presented by the contractor as conforming.
- b. Type B-2 verification is performed at a frequency of not less than one of four consecutive lots presented by the contractor as conforming.
- c. To determine the lot to be verified when skip-lot procedures are in effect, QARs shall assign number "one" to the next lot produced and offered as conforming after a verified lot. A Table of Random Numbers shall be used to determine which lot in next 2 (i.e., for B-1) or next 4 (i.e., for B-2) is to be verified. For example, a QAR's record of verified lots using B-2 verification frequency, may be similar to the following:

<u>PROD. LOT NO.</u>	275	276	277	278	279	282	283	284	285	286	287
<u>VERF. LOT NO.</u>	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1
<u>ACTION <u>1/</u> <u>2/</u></u>	S	V	V	S	S	V	S	S	S	V	V

- 1/ From table of random numbers. QAR's may verify additional lots if observations during processing indicate the Government's interests would be best served by verifying a lot scheduled for shipping.
- 2/ S = Skip; V = Verify

3. Modified skip-lot verification is an authorized alternative to the skip-lot verification procedures defined in subparagraph IV.C.2. When it is authorized, one or several but not all tables/paragraphs are verified on each lot. An example of a plan modified skip-lot verification, when Type B-2 frequency is in effect, might be:

<u>Table of Para.</u>	Lot 275	Lot 276	Lot 277	Lot 278	Lot 279	Lot 282	Lot 283	Lot 284	Lot 285	Lot 286
Table V	-	-	V	-	V	-	-	V	-	V
Table VI	V	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	V	-
Table VII	V	-	V	-	-	V	V	-	-	-
Table VIII	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	V	-	V
Table IX	V	-	-	V	-	-	V	-	V	-
Table X	-	V	V	-	-	V	-	V	V	-
Para. 4.2.2.2.	V	V	-	-	V	-	V	-	-	V

All tables/paragraphs are to be verified at least once for every two lots offered as conforming under Type B-1 verification and once for every four lots offered as conforming under B-2 verification.

- a. When noncomparable and unreliable status for any characteristic of a table/paragraph is determined, all characteristics of that table/paragraph shall be verified. Comparability data shall be furnished to the quality assurance element. The frequency of verification shall be the same for all characteristics in a table/paragraph.

SUBSECTION 225.3  
DPSCM 4155.6

b. Since modified skip-lot verification may be more costly to be administer due to the locations of plants and QARs, and due to the special administrative effort required to plan the inspections, the Military Inspector-in-Charge shall determine whether or not to apply modified skip-lot procedures when the contractor's inspection system is reliable.

V. APPLICATION OF TYPES.

A. Military Inspection Authority.

1. The QAR shall withhold Government verification examination results until the contractor's completed examination results are presented (worksheets are acceptable).

2. The Military Inspector-in-Charge may direct a more frequent type of verification other than indicated by comparability of determinations. When a more frequent type of verification is directed, the contractor and quality assurance element shall be informed of the action and the basis for the decision. When justified, inspection costs shall be submitted (refer to paragraph XI).

3. The QAR may direct verification of additional lots without changing the type (e.g., retain Type B-1 verification and use comparability procedures but verify every lot) if there is reasonable suspicion that the contractor is not performing full and reliable inspections or if in-process inspection requirements or results cannot be statistically reflected or summarized. Inspection costs will not be assessed unless the contractor's system is declared unreliable in accordance with subparagraph V.B.

4. In applying the above, the intent is to have a proper balance between inspection economy and adequate quality assurance to protect the interests of the Government. The guidelines detailed in the following subparagraphs establish the minimum amount of QAR verification examination required.

B. The following conditions shall be the basis for applying the various types of verification:

1. Type A verification shall be applied for initial evaluation of re-evaluation under any of the following conditions:

a. Inspection System Evaluation (ISE) has not been performed (i.e., on initial evaluation when a contractor has not previously produced under contractor inspection).

b. ISE was performed in accordance with Subsection 225.2, and the contractor's inspection system was declared unreliable.

c. The contractor on Type A verification failed to present as conforming three consecutive lots; or presented as conforming three consecutive lots, one or more of which were found to be nonconforming by the QAR; or otherwise failed to qualify for Type B-1 verification.

d. Type A, B-1, or B-2 verification was applied and more than four months elapsed since the last QAR examination was performed.

e. The QAR's examination revealed noncomparable and unreliable status for attributes (subparagraph VI.A.2. or VI.A.3.d.) and/or for average requirements (in accordance with subparagraph VI.A.1.).

f. The contractor failed to administratively comply with all terms of the contract (including DPSC Manual 4155.5 and MIL-STD-105).

g. Foreign material, as defined by the specification, was found on examination by either the contractor's inspections or the military inspectors.

h. The Military Inspector-in-Charge directs that Type A verification was applied.

2. Type B-1 verification may be applied under any of the following conditions:

a. Type A verification was applied and all of the following conditions were met:

(1) ISE was performed in accordance with procedures or this Manual and the contractor's inspection system was declared reliable.

(2) The contractor presented as conforming three consecutive lots which were found to be conforming by the QAR.

(3) Not more than four months elapsed since the last QAR examination was performed.

(4) The QAR's examination revealed comparable and reliable status for attributes (subparagraph VI.A.3.b.) and/or for average requirements (subparagraph VI.A.1.).

(5) The contractor administratively complied with all terms of the contract (including DPSC Manual 4155.5 and MIL-STD-105).

(6) Foreign material as defined by the specification was not found by either the contractor's inspectors or the military inspectors.

b. Type B-1 or B-2 verification was applied and one QAR examination revealed comparable but doubtful status for attributes or average requirements.

3. Type B-2 verification may be applied when Type B-1 verification was applied and all of the following conditions were met:

a. ISE was performed and the contractor's inspection system was declared reliable.

b. Not more than four months elapsed since the last QAR examination was performed.

c. The contractor administratively complied with all terms of the contract (including DPSC Manual 4155.5 and MIL-STD-105).

d. Foreign material as defined by the specification was not found by either the contractor's inspectors or the military inspectors.

e. The contractor presented as conforming four lots which were:

(1) Determined conforming by QAR verification and,

(2) The comparability determination for each of the four consecutively verified lots revealed comparable and reliable status for attributes (in accordance with subparagraph VI.A.3.b.) and/or average requirements (in accordance with subparagraph VI.A.1.).

(3) All of the unverified lots offered by the contractor between the first and fourth verification lots were conforming.

## VI. DETERMINING COMPARABILITY STATUS.

### A. General.

1. Comparability for average requirements (variables) is determined in accordance with Subsection 203.1 when applicable.

2. If the contractor elects to use alternative inspection procedures under the provisions of DPSCM 4155.5, and contractor data so generated cannot be statistically compared with Government data in accordance with provisions of this paragraph, acceptance

SUBSECTION 225.3  
 DPSCM 4155.6

criteria of the Specification Quality Assurance Provisions (QAPs). Comparable and reliable status shall be assumed if Government data indicates compliance with QAP criteria. Noncomparable and unreliable status shall be assumed if Government data indicates noncompliance with QAP criteria and contractor's data indicates compliance.

3. When the contractor is not having alternative inspection procedures allowed under the provisions of DPSCM 4255.5 and is using the Quality Assurance Provisions specified in the contract, comparability shall be determined by calculating the standard normal deviate as defined in subparagraph a. below. The calculate value shall be applied in accordance with subparagraphs VI.A.3.b. through VI.A.3.d. below.

a. Standard Normal Deviate (denoted as Z) is equal to:

$$Z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{q} \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

where,  $p_1$  = number of defects found by the contractor out of the total number of sample units examined by the contractor divided by the total number of sample units examined by the contractor  
 $p_2$  = number of defects found by the QAR out of the total number of sample units examined by the QAR divided by the total number of sample units examined by the QAR.

$$\hat{p} = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

where  $x_1$  = defects found by the contractor  
 $x_2$  = defects found by the QAR  
 $n_1$  = total number of sample units examined by the contractor  
 $n_2$  = total number of sample units examined by the QAR

$$\hat{q} = 1 - \hat{p}$$

\_\_\_\_\_ - denotes square roots.

Note: a software package for a personal computer for performing this calculation is available upon request to DPSC-HQ, quality assurance element. The personal computer must be IBM compatible, be operated by an IBM Disk Operating System (DOS) and be loaded with IBM BASIC software.

b. Comparable and Reliable is established when  $-1.645 < Z < +1.645$ ; i.e., Z is greater than  $-1.645$  and less than  $+1.645$

c. Comparable but Doubtful is established when  $-1.96 < Z < -1.645$ ; i.e., Z is greater than  $-1.96$  and less than or equal to  $-1.645$

or

$+1.645 < Z < +1.96$ ; i.e., Z is greater than or equal to  $+1.645$  and less than  $+1.96$

d. Noncomparable and Unreliable is established when  $Z \leq -1.96$  or  $Z \geq +1.96$ ; i.e., Z is less than or equal to  $+1.96$  or Z is greater than or equal to  $+1.96$ .

B. Specific Examples of Determining Comparability/Reliability Status.

1. An example of determining comparability under Type A verification and eligibility for Type B-1 verification follows:

a. Assumption: All requirements for Type B-1 verification (subparagraph V.B.2.e.) have been satisfied except comparability for attributes.

b. Examination Results:

<u>LOT NO.</u>	<u>CONTRACTOR'S RESULTS</u>			<u>QAR'S RESULTS</u>		
	<u>SS</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	13	0	0	13	1	3
2	20	3	3	20	4	7
3	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
	41	3	3	41	8	16

c. Calculate Z for Major class of defects on a cumulative data basis.

$$Z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \hat{q}}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p} \hat{q}}{n_2}}} = \frac{\frac{3}{41} - \frac{8}{41}}{\sqrt{\frac{11}{82} \cdot \frac{71}{82} \left(\frac{1}{41} + \frac{1}{41}\right)}} = -1.620$$

SUBSECTION 225.3  
 DPSCM 4155.6

Since  $-1.645 < Z < +1.645$ , examination results are comparable and contractor is reliable for major class of defects.

d. Calculate Z for total class of defects on cumulative data basis:

$$Z = \frac{\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}\hat{q}\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}} = \frac{\frac{3}{41} - \frac{16}{41}}{\sqrt{\frac{19}{82} \cdot \frac{63}{82} \left(\frac{1}{41} + \frac{1}{41}\right)}} = -3.403$$

Since  $Z < -1.96$ , examination results are noncomparable and contractor is unreliable for total class of defects. Contractor must remain on Type A verification.

e. Comparability determinations must be made after each verification examination under Type A verification until comparable and reliable status is established for class of defects.

f. Whenever  $Z > 1.96$  or  $Z < -1.96$  an ISE shall be conducted to determine the cause. Inspection codes shall be submitted in accordance with paragraph XI.

g. QAR must be sure before each comparability determination that all requirements for Type B-1 verification have been satisfied except comparability attributes.

2. An example of determining comparability under skip-lot verification follows:

a. Assumption: The contractor has produced several lots under Type B-1 verification. All requirements for Type B-2 verification (subparagraph V.B.3.) have been satisfied except comparability for attributes has been determined for only three lots.

b. Examination Results:

<u>LOT NO.</u>	<u>CONTRACTOR'S RESULTS</u>			<u>QAR'S RESULTS</u>		
	<u>SS</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>Major</u>	<u>Total</u>
10	80	2	8	80	8	10

c. Calculate Z for Major Class of defects for lot 10:

$$Z = \frac{\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2}{\sqrt{\hat{p}\hat{q}\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}} = \frac{\frac{2}{80} - \frac{8}{80}}{\sqrt{\frac{10}{160} \cdot \frac{150}{160} \left(\frac{1}{80} + \frac{1}{80}\right)}} = -1.960$$



Since  $Z = 1.960$ , the examination results are noncomparable and contractor is unreliable for Major class of defects.

d. Calculate Z for Total Class of defects for lot 10:

$$Z = \frac{\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2}{\sqrt{p \cdot q \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}} = \frac{\frac{8}{80} - \frac{10}{80}}{\sqrt{\frac{18}{160} - \frac{142}{160} \left( \frac{1}{80} + \frac{1}{80} \right)}} = -0.500$$

Since  $-1.645 < Z < +1.645$ , the examination results are comparable and the contractor is reliable for total class of defects.

e. Since the contractor's results are noncomparable and unreliable for major class of defects, either the entire examination system or only the unreliable portion of the examination system may be reverted to Type A verification until eligibility for Type B-1 is attained. This is the QAR's decision. As a minimum, reversion to Type A must be affected by the QAR for the specific examination(s) found to be noncomparable and unreliable.

f. QAR must be sure before each comparability determination that all requirements for retaining skip-lot verification have been satisfied except comparability for attributes.

**VII. LOT-BY-LOT COMPARABILITY DETERMINATIONS FOR UNREWORKED LOTS.**

A. When a contractor produces a nonconforming lot (as evidenced by contractor inspection) and requests a waiver for acceptance by the Contracting Officer, the quality assurance element may request QAR verification of all characteristics in the nonconforming Table/paragraph or all Table/paragraphs for the lot.

1. After verification, comparability shall be determined under the procedures of Subsection 203.2 when contractor and Government QAR inspection criteria (sample size and acceptance number) are the same. When any of the criteria differ, comparability shall be accomplished in accordance with the provisions outlined in subparagraph VI.A.2.

2. The quality assurance element shall notified of the verification findings and the results of the comparability determination. Inspection costs (see paragraph XI) shall be reported if results are noncomparable.

3. Compute comparability in accordance with paragraph VI. and include the contractor's examination results in future comparability determinations under procedures of paragraph VI. because they do not reflect the contractor's process and inspection capabilities regardless of the contracting officer's final decision to accept or reject the lot.

SUBSECTION 225.3  
DPSCM 4155.6

B. If the contractor finds the product nonconforming and so reports through the quality assurance element to the contracting officer requesting a waiver for acceptance, the QAR shall perform verification examination (if approved to do so by the contracting officer) and provide the results to the contracting officer through the quality assurance element. Then the QAR shall proceed as indicated in subparagraph VII.A.

C. In those instances when routine verification results indicate nonconformance and the results are disputed by the contractor, the QAR may be authorized, by the contracting officer through the quality assurance element, to reinspect (re-verify) the lot, provided the contractor has presented valid technical reasons for questioning/disputing the original inspection results. Comparability between the QAR's original and reinspection results shall be determined under the procedure of Subsection 203.2.

1. If comparability is established, the original results shall be used to compute comparability between the Government results and the contractor's results in accordance with paragraph VI. The original results shall be used to determine contractual acceptability of the lot and they will be the only results used in future comparability determinations in accordance with paragraph VI.

2. If comparability is not established, the reinspection results shall be used to compute comparability between the Government results and the contractor's results in accordance with paragraph VI. The reinspection results shall be used to determine contractual acceptability of the lot and they will be the only results used in comparability determinations in accordance with paragraph VI.

D. When the specific examination is for average requirements, the procedures of Subsection 203.1 shall be used to determine comparability.

VIII. ACCEPTANCE OF PRODUCT.

A. Acceptance of product is based on the QAR's findings. For lot-by-lot (Type A) verification, this means that each lot is accepted or rejected, based on the Government's determination of conformance or nonconformance.

B. Contractors who elect to use alternative inspection procedures under the provisions of DPSCM 4155.5 shall have their lots accepted or rejected based on Government inspection results compared to Specification QAPs.

C. For skip-lot (Type B) verifications, lots are accepted or rejected based on Government findings for verified lots and contractor's examination results and reports for unverified lots.

D. For modified skip-lot verification, lots are accepted or tables/paragraphs and contractor's examination results and reports for the unverified tables/paragraphs.

E. Verification shall be performed only on those lots which are found conforming by the contractor (i.e., as indicated by contractor's examination report) unless QAR verification of a lot is presented by the contractor as nonconforming is requested and approved through the quality assurance element by the contracting officer in accordance with DPSCM 4155.5. Comparability shall be performed in accordance with Subsection 203.2.

F. Apparent nonconformances based on average requirements shall be processed in accordance with procedures of Subsection 203.1 before classifying the supplies as nonconforming.

G. Lots deemed nonconforming shall be reported in accordance with Subsection 209.1

#### IX. CONTRACTOR'S REPORTS AND REQUIREMENTS.

A. DPSCM 4155.5 requires the contractor to present inspection reports (original and three copies) to the QAR for each lot inspected and found conforming, or found nonconforming but presented for verification under Individual Lot Comparability procedures. Reports must be presented immediately upon completion of this examination. The contractor must include the data required by DPSC Manual 4155.5.

B. If the contractor's reports indicate a serious discrepancy of omission, such as failure to inspect for certain characteristics, use of improper sampling plans, or failure to reject a lot when so required, the QAR shall immediately notify the contracting officer through the quality assurance element.

1. If, prior to sampling, the QAR determines by a review of DPSC Form 4275, Report of Sampling Inspection (Attributes), that the contractor failed to institute required switching procedures, the QAR shall advise the contractor that inspection severity must comply with MIL-STD-105. The QAR shall then sample the lot under the required inspection severity.

2. When failure of the contractor to follow switching procedure is discovered after verification has been performed, the QAR shall advise the contractor of the proper inspection severity for subsequent lots and direct the contractor accomplish proper sampling of the next lot offered.

3. The contractor's deliberate or repeated failure to comply with switching procedure requirements shall result in a determination of unreliability and reversion to Type A verification. The quality assurance element shall be notified of the contractor's unreliability. Inspection costs shall be submitted in accordance with paragraph XI.

C. Contractor's reports shall be reviewed by the origin QAR for completeness and accuracy and processed as follows:

1. When DD Form 250 procedures apply:

a. When the origin QAR is assured that all prerequisites of acceptance have been met, the contractor's inspection reports shall be stamped with either the DODCIA stamp (F.O.B. Origin) or DOPIA stamp (F.O.B. Destination) as applicable.

b. These reports shall be signed and dated below the stamp impression and annotated as to the type of verification performed. For example, if modified skip-lot verification (e.g., Type B-1 for Tables I and VII) shall be annotated on the form, Type B-1 for Tables I and VII) shall be annotated on the form.

c. Reports for F.O.B. Destination contracts shall be annotated "Origin Inspection Completed."

SUBSECTION 225.3  
DPSCM 4155.6

d. When the QAR determines the contractor's inspection reports are not complete, the QAR shall expeditiously request the necessary information from the contractor. When the reports are deemed complete, they shall be processed accordingly.

e. When the contractor's inspection report(s) include test results and the lots are sampled for testing by the QAR, a copy of the DD Form 1222, Request For and Results of Tests, shall be attached to each copy.

2. When DD Form 250 procedures do not apply:

a. The QAR shall select only one copy of the contractor's applicable inspection report for acceptance and payment purposes.

b. The report shall be stamped with the appropriate inspection stamp, signed and dated by the verification QAR.

c. Information required in DPSCM 4155.5 shall be conspicuously circled in red and the report shall be annotated in red "For Payment Purposes" immediately above the inspector's stamp, date, and signature.

d. Additional copies of the contractor inspection reports may be processed by the QAR according to the instructions above or the one processed report may be photocopied by the QAR so that sufficient copies are available for distribution in accordance with subparagraph IX.D.

D. Distribution of contractor's inspection reports.

1. P.O.B. Origin Contracts.

a. When DD Form 250 procedures apply.

(1) One copy - ACO.

(2) One copy - Destination QAR.

(3) One copy - QAR's file.

(4) One copy - returned to the contractor for transmittal with the shipment.

(5) One copy - DPSC-HQPN, only for nonconforming lots.

b. When DD Form 250 procedures do not apply:

(1) One copy - (annotated in red by QAR) paying offices.

(2) One copy - destination QAR.

(3) One copy - QAR's file.

(4) One copy - returned to contractor for transmittal with the shipment.

(5) One copy - DPSC-HQPN, only for nonconforming lots.

2. F.O.B. Destination contracts.

a. Two copies - destination QAR.

b. One copy - QAR's file.

c. One copy - DPSCM-HQPN, for only nonconforming lots.

**X. PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS.**

Government verification examination reports, worksheets, and other documents generated by the QAR shall normally not be forwarded to the contracting officer or ACO, except when these documents are required to substantiate a nonconformance. Such documents are forwarded through the quality assurance element only when requested. Preparation and distribution of required reports shall be as follows:

- A. DD Form 1734, shall be accomplished and distributed as specified in Subsection 213.1. The supervisory QAR may require a copy for the contractor's performance file maintained by his/her office.
- B. DPSC Form 4275 shall be accomplished as specified in Subsection 216.2.
- C. DD Form 1232, when used to report a nonconformance, shall be annotated with the type of verification performed; distribution shall be the same as for DD Form 1714.

XI. INSPECTOR COSTS.

- A. The QAR shall report through the quality assurance element to the ACO and contracting officer and the contractor in the most expeditious manner (by telephone, if necessary) when the contractor's system is declared unreliable. Inspection costs shall be submitted as required and defined by Subsection 231.1 and DPSCM 4155.5 until the QAR declares the contractor's system to be reliable and so reports through the quality assurance element to the ACO and the contractor in the most expeditious manner.
- B. The ACO shall confirm the unreliable status by letter to the contractor, with copies to the QAR, and to Directorate of Subsistence, ATTN: HQ. The letter shall direct the supervisory QAR to prepare and submit to the ACO inspection costs for the full period of unreliability.
- C. The ACO usually will collect from the contractor all inspection costs and shall notify the supervisory QAR, with copy to DPSC-HQ, when costs are collected.
- D. The contractor's examination system shall be declared unreliable when:
  - 1. Initial evaluation period under Type A verification extends beyond six lots.
  - 2. Re-evaluation under Type A verification is required for reasons given in subparagraphs V.B.1.b. through V.B.1.h.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER

LEONARD N. AQUILINO  
Chief, Administrative Services Division  
Offices of Installation Services

DISTRIBUTION

Special  
ST-B, ST-E thru ST-H

DoD IGROs - 6  
DLA-QL - 1  
DLA-QV - 1  
DPSC-WXA/Library -2  
DPSC-WS - 25

