



AF 9100:2026

Aerospace Quality Management System

PROCEDURE

Technical Acceptance, Reporting and Authorized Release

AF-PR-9100-020

FIRST EDITION

30 September 2026 | English master text

Publication identity and application

Control	Publication value
Title	Technical Acceptance, Reporting and Authorized Release
Document code	AF-PR-9100-020
Edition / language	FIRST EDITION / English master text
Companion edition identity	30 September 2026
Controlling source	AF 9100:2026 — FIRST EDITION — 29 September 2026
Responsible owner function	Technical release authority
Primary source anchors	8.6, 22, 23, 24.4, AD
Delivery status	Prepared implementation companion. Actual approval, adoption, effectivity and operational decisions are recorded separately.

Use and document-control boundary

This companion implements the supplied AF 9100 requirement basis without changing the original standard. Its process allocation, examples, checklists and record design are authored implementation material. Actual mission or product limits, specialist procedures, permissions and genuine observations must be completed before consequential use. Applicable source minima and independent decision conditions cannot be reduced by this companion.

The printed edition date identifies the companion series; it is not evidence that later preparation, review or operational decisions occurred on that date. New support codes in this set are proposed allocations for controlled registration. Established AF-IG-9100-001, AF-FAQ-9100-001 and AF-TR-9100-001 identities are retained; earlier files, the corporate master list and ASTRA codes are not overwritten.

Equivalent combined or digital records are permitted when all required fields, relationships, authority and history remain intact. A completed PDF field or typed name is not evidence of an authenticated approval. Blank records in this delivery contain no invented applicant, signature, event or result.

Contents and reading route

Publication identity and application	2
Contents and reading route	3
1 Scope, responsibility and source priority	4
2 Trigger, inputs and handover	4
3 Operating sequence	4
4 Decision, interruption and escalation	5
5 Required records and receiving checks	5
6 Worked case and adverse challenge	5
Appendix A — Controlling source and evidence	7
Source tables — complete field and decision payloads	14
Appendix B — Local implementation and release	15
Select actual scope → complete application criteria → use the applicable procedure and technical book → capture authentic evidence → evaluate every applicable condition → obtain the required independent decision. Document availability does not establish implementation or conformity.	

1 Scope, responsibility and source priority

Applies to the responsible function and exact evaluated object selected from the source. Use only the duties triggered by actual activity and retained responsibility.

Boundary	Required implementation decision
Object and route	Identify ORG, PRD, SVC, PRC, PER, SUB or CAB separately. Combined records do not merge outcomes.
Activity	Apply source technical modules by performed or retained responsibility, including relevant outsourced work.
Authority	Technical release, employer task permission, independent attestation and statutory authorization remain distinct.
Source priority	AF 9100:2026 and all compatible binding obligations control. This companion does not import ASTRA programme rules or external normative schemes.

2 Trigger, inputs and handover

Trigger: Release of a unit, lot, system, service result or controlled report.

Accountable process owner: Technical release authority. Actual named appointments and deputies are maintained locally.

Input to verify	Required output / receiving function
Exact request, object and source profile	Accepted scope and controlled work package, or a reasoned hold/refusal.
Current people, authority, data and equipment	Authorized assignment and evidence-access boundary.
Original execution, adverse evidence and source history	Attributable result, identified limitations and required action.
Relevant source clocks and actual event times	Genuine due/completion history and timely recipient communication.

3 Operating sequence

3.1 Freeze the acceptance object

Record serial, lot, event or family configuration, actual scope and the approved requirement and decision basis. Separate internal release from independent conformity attestation.

3.2 Reconcile the dossier

Verify current requirements, completed route, materials, qualifications, actual results, life, software and interface evidence. Missing and contradictory evidence remain visible.

3.3 Apply individual acceptance

Use the approved attribute or numerical rule and unrounded data. Check each essential characteristic independently; a favorable average cannot substitute for a required condition.

3.4 Review deviations and concessions

Confirm exact technical authority and lawful scope of any bounded departure. Preserve the unmet original criterion; a concession is not proof that it was fulfilled and cannot remove attestation gates.

3.5 Authorize and communicate

The competent release function records the actual decision, allowed use, restrictions and required user information. Labels and reports must match the evaluated object and required written mark permissions.

3.6 Maintain correction channels

Preserve recipients, evidence and installed or delivered identity. Correct material reporting errors transparently and review affected releases after new information invalidates the basis.

4 Decision, interruption and escalation

Unclosed release blocker, unsupported configuration or unavailable authority prevents release of the dependent claim.

State or event	Action and limit
Evidence valid and criteria met	Record the bounded result and pass it to the authorized receiving function; do not enlarge scope.
Evidence missing, invalid or inconclusive	Keep the dependent conclusion not yet demonstrated / HOLD, preserve the reason and define competent next work.
Valid evidence demonstrates failure	Record nonconformity and protect the affected population; follow actual technical disposition and source status controls.
Trigger genuinely absent	Record the exclusion and its approved responsibility basis. Resource shortages do not justify N/A.
Interrupted or changed work	Preserve prior state and actual configuration; complete impact and revalidation before claiming completion.

5 Required records and receiving checks

Document	Record purpose
AF-FR-9100-005	Technical Result and Decision Rule
AF-FR-9100-007	Independent Review and Attestation Decision
AF-FR-9100-025	Product Release, Labeling and Delivery Dossier
AF-FR-9100-026	Service, Maintenance, Life and Retirement Record

At handover the receiver checks object, scope, current version, original evidence, open conditions, true event chronology and the action they may authorize. An email sent, field marked complete or invoice paid is not acceptance of that handover.

6 Worked case and adverse challenge

Synthetic scenario: A completed service is invoiced while one required test is still unavailable.

Required reasoning: Commercial completion is separate from technical acceptance. Restrict the service claim until valid evidence and authorized release are available.

Challenge before local use	Expected behavior
Missing essential input	Dependent conclusion remains held; no favorable default.
Wrong configuration or performer	Detect the mismatch and reassess relevant evidence.
Expired or conflicted authority	Block the prohibited assignment or decision; later renewal cannot validate earlier unauthorized work.

Challenge before local use	Expected behavior
Failed mandatory condition with high total score	No compensation; preserve the failure and required action.
Correction without original history	Reject an apparent closure that erases relevant earlier evidence.

Appendix A — Controlling source and evidence

Source: AF 9100:2026, Aerospace Quality Management System, FIRST EDITION, 29 September 2026; supplied 131-page PDF. Source page references below locate the original publication. These excerpts are read with the complete applicable standard; local implementation sequences do not replace it.

8.6 Acceptance and authorized release

SOURCE p. 25 | Normative when applicable

8.6(a) Before release, the organization shall verify completion of the agreed acceptance plan, disposition of nonconformities, configuration consistency and availability of required documentation. Acceptance evidence shall identify actual results, applicable criteria and the authorized release person or controlled function.

8.6(b) Open issues shall be evaluated against explicit release-blocking criteria. A concession may address only a specifically authorized and lawful departure; it shall not waive a mandatory safety approval or conceal missing verification. Products awaiting required evidence shall remain controlled.

8.6(c) Where qualification evidence is required, it shall demonstrate the correct configuration and intended conditions. Delivery documentation shall state approved deviations, restrictions, service-life status and required user actions. Electronic release shall preserve individual accountability and tamper evidence.

8.6(d) The release authority shall identify whether it is releasing a product, a service event, a process for use or a person for a task. Release is not equivalent to third-party certification. Conformity attestation shall additionally follow Clause 22 and Annexes AA and AD; a lifecycle conditional progression decision shall not be presented as a conditional certificate.

Required evidence: Release checklist; acceptance results; closed or authorized issues; delivery dossier; release authorization.

22.1 Conformity evidence dossier

SOURCE p. 40 | Normative when applicable

22.1(a) The applicant shall maintain an indexed dossier linking the defined object, approved scope, applicability decisions, application profile, technical modules, implementation evidence, internal evaluations and corrective actions. Evidence shall permit a competent reviewer to follow a requirement to the relevant activity, result and decision.

22.1(b) The dossier shall identify missing, inaccessible, obsolete or unrepresentative evidence. Procedures and questionnaires alone shall not establish implementation. Confidentiality shall be protected through authorized access; a secrecy claim shall not convert unsupported assertions into verified evidence.

Required evidence: Object-specific dossier; applicable requirement set; evidence index; configuration and population coverage; limitations.

22.2 Evaluation, review and decision separation

SOURCE p. 40 | Normative when applicable

22.2(a) The scheme operator shall appoint evaluators competent for the object, sector, criticality and methods involved. Technical expertise shall be added where an auditor's competence does not cover the evaluated activity. Assignment, competence and conflicts shall be checked before work begins.

22.2(b) For third-party attestation, the decision maker shall not have performed that evaluation or supplied the relevant consultancy. A competent independent person may combine evidence review and the decision, but shall not certify their own evaluation. Internal release and internal audit independence shall follow their applicable role and criticality rules, not an inappropriate assumption that every employee is independent.

Required evidence: Assignment matrix; competence and conflict checks; evaluation record; independent review and decision identities.

22.3 Criteria, sampling and findings

SOURCE p. 41 | Normative when applicable

22.3(a) The evaluation plan shall identify criteria, locations, periods, methods and sampling limitations. Audits shall examine process implementation and actual outputs; product, service, process and personnel evaluations shall additionally apply the relevant object criteria.

22.3(b) Each nonconformity shall identify a requirement, objective evidence and the gap. Classification and decision consequences shall follow Annex AD. Audit-time planning shall follow Annex AC; personnel examinations shall follow Annex AE. A sampled review shall not be claimed to verify every item or person.

Required evidence: Evaluation plan; sample rationale; objective evidence; requirement-linked findings; assessed limitations.

22.4 Decision conditions and release blockers

SOURCE p. 41 | Normative when applicable

22.4(a) Initial grant, renewal and scope extension shall require closure of all nonconformities in the proposed scope and satisfactory independent review. Missing critical evidence, unresolved major breakdowns, falsified evidence and unfulfilled mandatory criteria shall prevent a positive decision. A percentage score shall not offset such a blocker.

22.4(b) For an existing attestation, a localized minor finding may be handled through a bounded continuation decision only under Annexes AD and AG. That decision is not a new certificate with open findings. Technical product holds, personnel restrictions and legal reporting shall be applied independently of certificate administration.

Required evidence: Requirement-by-requirement conclusion; finding closure; blocker check; reasoned and dated decision.

22.5 Statements, certificates and mark use

SOURCE p. 41 | Normative when applicable

22.5(a) A conformity statement shall identify AF 9100:2026, First Edition, the route, evaluated object, applicable profile, scope, sites or configurations, issuer, decision date, status and limitations. Self-declaration, customer assessment and independent third-party attestation shall be clearly distinguished.

22.5(b) AF marks shall require written permission for the exact use. An organizational mark shall not be placed so that it implies unevaluated product approval. No claim of official recognition, legal equivalence, accreditation or global acceptance shall be made without an actual supporting authorization or arrangement.

Required evidence: Approved claim text; certificate data; mark permission; actual recognition scope where claimed.

22.6 Continuing validity and changes

SOURCE p. 41 | Normative when applicable

22.6(a) The attestation holder shall report changes that can affect conformity, including new sites, ownership or legal identity, product configuration, service architecture, essential process variables, competence, critical subcontractors and serious incidents. Changes shall be evaluated before the affected extended claim is used.

22.6(b) Surveillance, renewal, suspension, restoration, expiry and withdrawal shall follow Annex AG. Status records shall preserve dates and scope history. Reissue of a document, payment of a fee or filing an appeal shall not extend an expired or suspended authorization.

Required evidence: Change notifications; surveillance findings; renewal evidence; current and historical status records.

22.7 Complaints, appeals and corrective communication

SOURCE p. 41 | Normative when applicable

22.7(a) A transparent complaint and appeal process shall be available under Annex AI. Persons deciding an appeal shall be independent of the contested decision and its evaluation. Good-faith complaints shall not result in retaliation or reduced access to fair assessment.

22.7(b) A substantiated concern shall trigger correction of affected outputs, evidence or public claims. Confidential information shall remain protected, while necessary safety communication shall not be suppressed to avoid reputational harm.

Required evidence: Case records; independent reviewer appointment; reasoned outcomes; affected-population action and communication.

22.8 Scheme operation and competence attestations

SOURCE p. 41 | Normative when applicable

22.8(a) Bodies operating AF assessment routes shall fulfill Clause 28 and Annex AH, in addition to the route-specific rules. A laboratory, inspection body or certification body seeking a CAB competence attestation shall undergo evaluation of its actual technical activities, not merely an organizational audit.

22.8(b) Accreditation and AF authorization shall not be self-awarded by a body using this publication. They require the separately identified authorized decision described in Annex AH. Organizations without that authorization may use the standard internally or contractually but shall describe the basis accurately.

Required evidence: Operator authority; body competence evaluation; written scope; independent decision; accurate accreditation and authorization claims.

23.1 Product identity, families and intended application

SOURCE p. 42 | Normative when applicable

23.1(a) The organization shall define the product identity, configuration, intended application, operational domain and boundaries of its responsibility. Hardware, software, model weights, supplied data and operating instructions shall be included when they affect the claim. A family shall have a documented grouping rationale and identifiable differences between variants.

23.1(b) A result from a representative variant may support another variant only where a technical review establishes that the evaluated conditions cover the relevant differences and failure mechanisms. The worst case shall be justified for each characteristic; one variant need not be worst case for every test.

Required evidence: Product definition; configuration baseline; family matrix; variant-difference and representativeness analyses.

23.2 Product application profile and acceptance plan

SOURCE p. 42 | Normative when applicable

23.2(a) The profile shall translate intended functions and obligations into verifiable characteristics, numerical limits or controlled attribute criteria. It shall identify essential safety functions, interfaces, environmental and service-life assumptions, test conditions, sampling and decision rules. Criteria shall be approved before the evaluators examine acceptance results.

23.2(b) The product plan shall distinguish design qualification, production-route qualification, routine acceptance, installation verification and field monitoring. Passing one of these activities shall not be used as evidence that the others were completed. Data or assumptions supplied by the customer shall be checked for applicability and unresolved deficiencies escalated.

Required evidence: Approved product profile; characteristic-to-method matrix; qualification and acceptance distinction; unresolved-input decisions.

23.3 Design qualification and integration evidence

SOURCE p. 42 | Normative when applicable

23.3(a) Qualification shall demonstrate the relevant design requirements for an identified configuration and defined conditions. Test articles, analysis models, equipment, procedures, uncertainty and differences from production shall be recorded. Failed, interrupted and repeated trials shall remain visible with their technical disposition.

23.3(b) Integration evidence shall address interactions, common resources and emergent behavior that cannot be established through independent component tests. Where safety depends on a supporting service, operator action or maintenance interval, the dependency shall be validated and controlled as part of the product basis.

Required evidence: Qualification dossier; test-article differences; system-interface verification; validated support assumptions.

23.4 Production, unit and lot acceptance

SOURCE p. 42 | Normative when applicable

23.4(a) Each released unit or lot shall be linked to the applicable configuration, material and component origin, approved process route, required inspections and authorized disposition. Critical-characteristic evidence shall not be replaced by a generic certificate of conformity. Any permitted sampling shall meet the application profile and Annex AD.

23.4(b) A known nonconforming sampled unit shall be controlled even when a statistical lot rule permits lot acceptance. Repair, rework and concessions shall preserve identity, life consumption and the distinction between original conformity and an authorized departure. Product acceptance shall follow Clause 8.6 independently of an organization's certificate status.

Required evidence: Unit or lot dossier; critical characteristics; sampling decision; controlled departures; final release record.

23.5 Changes, family extensions and digital updates

SOURCE p. 42 | Normative when applicable

23.5(a) The organization shall assess changes to materials, components, dimensions, firmware, algorithms, model parameters, energy architecture, production site and intended use for their cumulative effect. Approval shall identify which prior evidence remains valid and which evaluation must be repeated.

23.5(b) A product-family extension or digital update affecting the attested scope shall be evaluated before the extended claim is used. Fielded instances shall be traceable to the actual installed configuration. A new software version shall not inherit approval solely because its commercial product name is unchanged.

Required evidence: Change-impact record; evidence reuse rationale; repeated qualification; instance effectiveness; updated scope.

23.6 Product statements, labeling and user information

SOURCE p. 43 | Normative when applicable

23.6(a) Statements shall identify exactly which characteristics or requirement set were evaluated and which configurations, sites or lots are covered. Restrictions, safety information, life limits and installation dependencies shall accompany the product where needed for correct use. A label shall not imply whole-system approval from a component evaluation.

23.6(b) The organization shall control label content, serial linkage and mark authorization, including labels printed by subcontractors. Misleading, obsolete or counterfeit labels shall trigger containment and correction. Claims of space suitability, mission readiness or equivalent performance shall require application-specific evidence, not an unqualified grade label.

Required evidence: Approved claim and label master; mark authorization; traceable labeling records; user-information delivery.

23.7 In-service evidence, corrective campaigns and retirement

SOURCE p. 43 | Normative when applicable

23.7(a) Field information shall be analyzed with configuration, exposure and failure-definition context. The organization shall identify whether a new issue invalidates product qualification, acceptance methods, life limits or other products using a shared element. Required notifications and protective actions shall not await a scheduled surveillance audit.

23.7(b) A corrective campaign shall define the affected population, interim restrictions, approved correction, verification, completion tracking and residual users. Retirement and reuse decisions shall preserve life and condition history. A repaired or transferred product shall not receive an unsupported new-life status.

Required evidence: Field data and exposure; affected-population analysis; campaign records; verified completion; retirement and reuse decisions.

24.4 Service acceptance and performance decisions

SOURCE p. 44 | Normative when applicable

24.4(a) Acceptance shall compare actual service outcomes with the approved criteria. Customer receipt or payment shall not alone establish technical conformity. Where outputs include measurements, calculations or inspection conclusions, the underlying methods and decision rules shall meet Clauses 7.7 and 7.12 and Annex AD.

24.4(b) An availability percentage shall not conceal incorrect results, failed safety functions or unacceptable response times. A recurring service may be evaluated over a defined window, but critical events shall be reviewed individually. Excluded downtime or transactions shall be disclosed under the pre-agreed metric definition.

Required evidence: Actual outcome records; acceptance decision; metric calculations and exclusions; critical-event review.

AD.1 Decision basis and non-compensable conditions

SOURCE p. 112 | Normative when applicable

AD.1(a) Before evaluation, the responsible authority shall define the object, applicable requirements, criterion for each characteristic or competence, evidence needed, uncertainty treatment, required independence and permitted outcomes. Criteria shall not be selected retrospectively to obtain a favorable result.

AD.1(b) Every applicable mandatory criterion shall be fulfilled for a positive initial conformity attestation. No aggregate score, favorable delivery performance, commercial benefit or passing result in an unrelated area shall

compensate for an unmet mandatory requirement, missing critical evidence or unresolved unacceptable risk.

AD.1(c) A technical release may include a lawful, explicitly approved concession for a bounded departure where the underlying technical and contractual framework permits it. The record shall identify that departure; it shall not falsely state that the original requirement was fulfilled. A concession cannot waive a mandatory legal approval or alter the AF requirements for an attestation.

Required evidence: Pre-agreed decision basis; complete criterion register; blocker review; concession and release distinctions.

AD.2 Measurement decision preparation

SOURCE p. 112 | Normative when applicable

AD.2(a) The measurement decision shall use the corrected result, applicable specification, validated method, justified uncertainty model and pre-agreed rule. Known significant systematic effects shall be corrected or otherwise treated through an approved model; an uncertainty allowance shall not conceal an ignored known bias.

AD.2(b) The record shall distinguish specification limits, control limits, resolution, uncertainty and acceptance limits. Units, significant figures, confidence or coverage interpretation and treatment of correlation shall be stated. The uncertainty shall be appropriate to the actual result and conditions, not copied from an unrelated calibration capability.

AD.2(c) Decisions shall use sufficient unrounded precision. Rounding is applied to reported values after the decision and shall not turn a failing or indeterminate result into a pass. When both lower and upper limits apply, both shall be evaluated; one favorable characteristic shall not substitute for another.

Required evidence: Measurement model; corrections; uncertainty budget; specification and acceptance limits; recorded rule and precision.

AD.3 DR-A — Full-interval decision rule

SOURCE p. 112 | Normative when applicable

AD.3(a) For a two-sided numerical specification [L, H], DR-A shall conclude “conformity demonstrated” only when the entire stated uncertainty interval lies within the inclusive specification limits. It shall conclude “nonconformity demonstrated under DR-A” when the entire interval lies outside one specification limit. All other results are indeterminate and shall be held from acceptance pending valid disposition.

AD.3(b) For C2 or C3 acceptance characteristics whose uncertainty can materially change the decision, DR-A shall be the default unless a documented alternative is approved under AD.5 by the metrology and relevant independent technical authorities. Applicable binding rules take precedence where they mandate another lawful rule.

AD.3(c) A one-sided specification shall use the corresponding single bound. For asymmetric uncertainty, the actual lower and upper coverage endpoints shall replace $y - U$ and $y + U$. The interpretation remains conditional on the stated measurement model and coverage; it is not an absolute guarantee of physical truth.

Required evidence: Declared DR-A application; actual result and coverage endpoints; criterion-by-criterion disposition; independent alternative approval where used.

Source calculation note: (AD-1) Conform: $y - U \geq L$ and $y + U \leq H$. Nonconform: $y + U < L$ or $y - U > H$. Otherwise: indeterminate. y is the corrected result and U the justified expanded uncertainty for the symmetric case. Equality at a specification boundary is inside the limit. An interval overlapping a limit is not automatically a proven physical defect, but conformity has not been demonstrated by this rule.

AD.4 DR-B — Simple acceptance with disclosed decision risk

SOURCE p. 112 | Normative when applicable

AD.4(a) Simple acceptance compares the corrected result directly with the specification limits. It may be used for C0 or C1 characteristics only where the rule is agreed before evaluation, the method is suitable, uncertainty and decision risk have been reviewed, and no binding obligation requires a more protective rule.

AD.4(b) The report shall disclose that acceptance does not use a guard band and that uncertainty can create false acceptance or false rejection near a limit. The operator shall not describe simple acceptance as zero risk. C2 or C3 use requires the independent alternative-rule approval in AD.5; it shall not be selected solely to accept a result that failed DR-A.

Required evidence: Prior agreement; uncertainty and risk review; scope and criticality; clearly disclosed acceptance rule.

AD.5 DR-C — Risk-targeted or other justified alternative

SOURCE p. 113 | Normative when applicable

AD.5(a) An alternative rule shall define the decision objective, allowable risks, statistical or physical model, prior information where used, distribution, dependence, measurement uncertainty, acceptance region and validation. Consumer and producer risks shall be distinguished. Approval shall occur before results are evaluated.

AD.5(b) A posterior probability of nonconformity conditional on a result shall be reported only when the underlying prior and likelihood are specified and justified. A coverage interval shall not automatically be reinterpreted as that posterior probability. Likewise, a sampling plan's operating characteristic shall not be interpreted as the probability that an accepted particular lot is conforming.

AD.5(c) For a C2/C3 alternative, the independent technical reviewer shall evaluate consequences, model limitations, sensitivity and whether the rule provides the required protection. The metrology authority, relevant safety or mission authority and contractual authority where required shall approve its exact scope. The rule shall be reviewed after a material model or process change.

Required evidence: Alternative-rule model; risk constraints; validation and sensitivity; independent approvals; application limits.

AD.6 Indeterminate results, repeat testing and multiple criteria

SOURCE p. 113 | Normative when applicable

AD.6(a) An indeterminate result shall remain held until a validated improved measurement, relevant additional evidence or a lawful technical disposition resolves it. Repeating observations until a favorable reading appears is prohibited. A repeat or pooled-result method shall be specified in advance or independently justified with the original results retained.

AD.6(b) Where a guard band leaves an empty acceptance region, the method cannot demonstrate conformity under that rule. The response shall improve the method or obtain an approved technically justified alternative, not quietly widen the product specification. Known nonconforming material shall remain controlled under Clause 8.7.

AD.6(c) For many characteristics or repeated decisions, the plan shall consider cumulative false-decision risk, dependence and the consequences of multiple comparisons. A nominal interval for each characteristic shall not be represented as the same confidence for all characteristics jointly without a justified analysis.

Required evidence: Hold and disposition record; repeat-test plan; retained original results; cumulative-risk review.

AD.7 Finding classification and immediate action

SOURCE p. 113 | Normative when applicable

AD.7(a) A finding shall identify the exact requirement, objective evidence, affected scope and gap. The evaluator shall classify the finding using Table AD-2 and separately decide whether an immediate technical hold or protective action is necessary. Administrative classification shall never delay protection.

AD.7(b) Related localized findings shall be reviewed together for evidence of systemic breakdown. An opportunity for improvement shall not replace a nonconformity where a requirement is unmet. A mere preference for a different method, where the actual requirement is fulfilled, shall not be raised as a nonconformity.

Required evidence: Requirement-evidence-gap statement; classification rationale; systemic extent; immediate technical action.

AD.8 Attestation decisions and open findings

SOURCE p. 114 | Normative when applicable

AD.8(a) Initial grant, renewal and extension shall require all nonconformities in the granted scope to be closed, adequate evidence for all mandatory criteria and independent review. A restricted scope may be granted only where its boundary is real, independently evaluated and unaffected by unresolved systemic deficiencies; it shall not conceal the failed scope.

AD.8(b) An existing attestation may be maintained with a localized minor finding only when immediate correction or containment is adequate, cause and extent are reviewed, a corrective plan is accepted within the Annex AG time limit, and no essential control or mandatory output criterion is compromised. The decision maker shall record why continued status is justified and verify closure within the required period.

AD.8(c) An existing major finding shall trigger an immediate assessment of continuing conformity. Where the underlying ability to meet requirements is not demonstrated, the affected status shall be suspended. Limited

continuation is permitted only for a specifically evidenced unaffected scope, through a documented restriction decision. A planned future correction alone is not evidence of current conformity.

AD.8(d) A conditional lifecycle gate or conditional supplier-development approval may permit bounded non-dependent work. Neither is a conditional conformity certificate. Annex AG controls closure, suspension and restoration deadlines; an expired deadline shall not be reset by reissuing the same finding.

Required evidence: Independent grant or continuation decision; closed findings; real scope boundaries; verified corrections and corrective action.

Source calculation note: (AD-2) Grant = scope valid AND all applicable criteria fulfilled AND evidence adequate AND findings closed AND independent decision authorized This is a logical conjunction, not a weighted score. "Findings closed" refers to nonconformities in the scope being granted; observations do not create a mandatory failure.

AD.9 Decision record and challenge

SOURCE p. 114 | Normative when applicable

AD.9(a) The record shall identify the applicant and object, route, profile, evidence package, evaluator and reviewer, findings and closure, independence, limitations, decision, reasons, actual date and signatory. Automated workflow may enforce checks, but an accountable authorized person shall approve the conformity decision.

AD.9(b) Technical dissent shall remain in the record with its resolution. An appeal shall follow Annex AI. A revised decision shall preserve the earlier decision and explain the new evidence or corrected interpretation. No record shall be backdated or altered to make the earlier basis appear stronger than it was.

Required evidence: Complete decision record; documented dissent; accountable signatory; preserved history and appeal disposition.

Source tables — complete field and decision payloads

Table AD-1 — Illustrative DR-A outcomes for the Annex H example

Source p. 113 | Illustrative or explanatory source table

Corrected result y, mm	Expanded uncertainty U, mm	Outcome under the stated example rule
50.0240	0.00444522	Conformity demonstrated: the full interval is inside [49.970, 50.030] mm.
50.0280	0.00444522	Indeterminate: nominal result is inside the specification, but the interval overlaps the upper limit. Hold acceptance.
50.0360	0.00444522	Nonconformity demonstrated under DR-A: the full interval is above the upper limit.
50.02555478	0.00444522	Upper interval endpoint equals 50.03000000 mm: inside the inclusive limit using these stated numbers. Actual decisions use unrounded inputs.

Table AD-2 — Finding categories and minimum consequences

Source p. 113, 114 | Required structure when applicable

Class	Decision definition	Required consequence
Critical	Evidence of an uncontrolled unacceptable safety/mission risk, deliberate material falsification, serious compromise of essential evidence, or another condition requiring immediate protection.	Stop or contain the affected activity immediately. Block grant/renewal. For an existing affected attestation, suspend or impose an effective evaluated restriction without delay; apply Annex AG notifications.
Major	Absence or breakdown of a required control, or a group of deficiencies, materially undermining the ability to fulfill requirements; not necessarily an immediate hazard.	Block initial grant/renewal/extension until verified closure. Assess existing scope promptly; suspend when continuing conformity cannot be demonstrated.
Minor	Localized failure to fulfill a requirement where evidence does not show a material system breakdown or loss of essential control.	Correct and address cause. No open minor at initial grant, renewal or extension. Existing status may continue only under the bounded AD.8 decision.
Observation / improvement	No demonstrated failure of an applicable requirement; a documented possibility to improve effectiveness.	May support improvement. Shall not be used to conceal nonconformity or require uncontracted consultancy.

Appendix B — Local implementation and release

Readiness condition	Evidence before consequential use
Authority and responsibility	Actual legal operator, owner, competent technical authority, independent reviewer and permitted result class are recorded.
Scope and criteria	Object, configuration, site, period, trigger, every technical value or observable attribute, units and prospective approval are complete.
Evidence and methods	Original accessible evidence, representative observations, valid methods, uncertainty, adverse cases and limitations support the intended conclusion.
People and independence	Competence is current for each task; genuine conflicts, relevant prior work and needed separation have been checked.
Records and tools	Field meanings, unique IDs, original history, access, retention, recovery and actual deployed workflows have passed local validation.
Decision and public use	All relevant blockers are resolved; required independent decision and written permissions precede the exact public claim.
Continuity and handover	Receiving custody, unresolved duties, corrections and historical decisions survive transfer, retirement or provider closure.

Record the completed local readiness and actual authorization in AF-FR-9100-032 or an equivalent controlled record. Preserve the unchanged source standard and each earlier decision basis. A blocked activity may continue only within a genuinely permitted development boundary, not as a provisional conformity certificate.