

<b>SPEC 2000M</b>	<b>REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION</b>	<b>1. Request No.</b> 01/IP/01 <b>Date:</b> 23.02.01
<b>2. ORIGINATOR:</b> Ken Higham – BAE SYSTEMS <b>To:</b> IPET Co-Chairs  <b>Date:</b> 23/02/01		
<b>3. SPEC 2000M REFERENCE :</b>  Para 4.5.26 1A-3 Common Breakdown Presentation Data Dictionary page for D.E. Usable On Code Assembly		
<b>4. Description Of Request for Clarification:</b>  <p>Through recent Pre-Assessment meetings on the Eurofighter project there has been discussion on whether or not the data element UOCA needs to be shown at all locations of any assemblies which are broken down in common breakdown figures. For example a General Arrangement figure is compiled to list all the looms for the cockpit. These looms are then referred out to their own figures to be broken down, some of these looms have a high degree of commonality with only minor variations for each nation and are therefore compiled in a common breakdown figure using UOCA's where applicable. It has been suggested that as these looms have been broken down in a common breakdown figure (where they have the same item number) that they should also be listed with the same item number and the applicable UOCA in the General Arrangement figure. Our (BAE SYSTEMS) interpretation of this situation is that the General Arrangement figure should not be compiled in this way as it is not a common breakdown figure and this figure does not (as stated in the Data Dictionary for D.E. UOCA) "give a clear relationship between part and assembly", however the expert teams guidance on whether this interpretation is correct or not would be appreciated.</p> <p>I have attached an example of the above scenario which may help explain the situation better.</p>		
<b>5. Answer Provided</b>  This subject was discussed in the IPET Meeting in March 2001. This extract from the minutes provides the answer to the RFC:-  BAES presented a situation that raised questions about the use of the UOCA, for items in their location in the parent figure. The IPET debated the situation and concluded that some fundamentals were wrong in the BAES example. The following "rules" were identified which, if applied, would correct the presented situation:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• End items of a figure should carry a UOCA that is then used to relate these end items to their breakdown parts within that same figure. In the BAES example, this means that the Assembly items at their location in their parent figure should <u>not</u> carry a UOCA.</li> <li>• Items fitted in the same location (as with alternative items for different Customers, for example) should carry the same item number. By giving such items a different item number, it implies that all these items are fitted to their "parent" item at the higher indent level, which is clearly not the case. These items along with their "parent" items should carry UOCAs.</li> <li>• Figures that contain multiple items, presented at a single breakdown location within the figure, should also have corresponding multiple indent 1 items. In this case, UOCAs must be used to relate the breakdown items to their indent 1's. This is essential in order maintain the configuration control and provide the identity of each unique end item. Without this identity, it would not be possible to differentiate between items fitted with the different breakdown parts.</li> </ul> <p>Another situation was presented by BAES, in the form of a Request For Clarification (RC01/IP/10), regarding the presentation of wiring looms. In this instance, the questions were whether the looms should be listed with the same Item Number in their parent assembly figure, and if they should carry the UOCA. The advice of the IPET was as follows:-</p> <p>The understanding of the situation was that the General Arrangement drawing covered the installation of all the "variant" looms (different Customers). This being case, each of the variant looms was applicable, in its own right, to the General Arrangement drawing and as such should carry its own Item Number; i.e. they should not be listed under the same Item Number. The UOCA should not be used in this because the looms are not listed at the indent 1 of the figure, nor is the figure being used to present their breakdown. Another comment made was that there was no need for a separate figure to be used to list just the General Arrangement drawing and individual looms. Instead, the parent figure of the General Arrangement should list the looms (at the next indent level to the GA), and from this figure, the looms should be referred out to a separate figure, where the looms appeared at indent 1.</p>		

**FIGURE 92 10 07 40 - GENERAL ARRANEMENT OF COCKPIT LOOMS**

ITEM	ISN	IND	PART NUMBER	PART DESCRIPTION	QPNHA	TQPL	RTX	SRV	UOCA
000	00A	1	J92101933-801	GENERAL ARRANGEMENT, LOOMS, COCKPIT	REF	REF		GYL, ITA, SPA, UK	
001	00A	2	J92101310-405	LOOM ASSEMBLY	0001	00001	92100751 000 00A	UK	
002	00A	2	J92101310-406	LOOM ASSEMBLY	0001	00001	92100751 000 05A	ITA	
003	00A	2	J92101310-407	LOOM ASSEMBLY	0001	00001	92100751 000 10A	GYL	
004	00A	2	J92101310-408	LOOM ASSEMBLY	0001	00001	92100751 000 15A	SPA	

**FIGURE 92 10 07 51 - BREAKDOWN FIGURE FOR LOOMS LISTED IN GENERAL ARRANGEMENT**

ITEM	ISN	IND	PART NUMBER	PART DESCRIPTION	QPNHA	TQPL	RTX	SRV	UOCA
000	00A	1	J92101310-405	LOOM ASSEMBLY	REF	REF	9210074001 001 00A	UK	A
000	05A	1	J92101310-406	LOOM ASSEMBLY	REF	REF	9210074001 002 00A	ITA	B
000	10A	1	J92101310-407	LOOM ASSEMBLY	REF	REF	9210074001 003 00A	GYL	C
000	15A	1	J92101310-408	LOOM ASSEMBLY	REF	REF	9210074001 004 00A	SPA	D

