



Complaint Number: 101363

Report 8D

Generated By: Seb Houle
Generated On: 20 Oct 2011

I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Origination Date	22 Sep 2011		
Sales Name	Jeff Gorman	Sales Office	Windsor
Telephone	NULL	Fax Number	NULL
Email	amy.stack@scapa.com		
Customer Complaint Ref			
Customer Name	Polymer Technologies		
SAP Customer Number	127720	Customer Order N°	
Customer Part Number			

1) Invoices And Items On Complaint

(a) SAP Invoice Number	9700039742	Invoice Date	10 Jun 2011
- Material	155191	Batch	
Material Description			
U798 POLYMER 54IN X 750FT			

2) Problem Description

3 rolls were rejected for "confusion". Photos are attached. Batch# WIN0025255

Actions Requested From The Customer

Customer is looking for a credit and a corrective action.

3) Containment Actions

II. EVALUATION AND ACTION

Sample/photo Received	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>				
Date	<input type="text" value="28 Sep 2011"/>				
Process Owner	<input type="text" value="Seb Houle"/>				
Team Leader	<input type="text" value="shoule"/>				
Is Complaint Valid?	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	Return The Goods	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	Dispose The Goods	<input type="text" value="No"/>
Comments	<input type="text"/>				

1) Analysis

Associated to Complaint #100625. 4 rolls of this batch were produced, one was already returned as part of complaint #100625. The customer original kept some of the material that was included in the potential material affected by Adhesive Confusion issue, in order to determine if they were in fact affected by the issue.

From Complaint #100625:

"Photo indicates adhesive confusion. Supplier is looking to return rolls for inspection / rewind.

13 Rolls (11 full and 2 partial rolls) were rewound to look for adhesive confusion, 5.9 rolls worth of material was yielded out of the returned material. The remainder of the material was affected by the adhesive confusion. The 13 rolls were from a run of 57 rolls that were slit on consecutive working days; the 13 rolls were all from the first set of 18 rolls that were slit. All 57 rolls were from the same coating run. Furthermore, the 13 rolls which did display adhesive confusion were all produced with the same liner of material. -SH 8/11/11"

Author	<input type="text" value="Seb Houle"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="13 Oct 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

2) Root Causes

From Complaint #100625:

"The root cause appears to be static damage to the material, the areas of adhesive confusion show static damage when marked with ink. However, the definitive cause of the static damage wasn't determined. Since all the material in question was coated consecutively and slit consecutively, the damage could've been introduced at the liner supplier's facility, coating, or slitting. Since the material was slit soon after coating the likelihood of catching the adhesive confusion was reduced."

Author	<input type="text" value="Seb Houle"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="13 Oct 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

3) Possible Solutions

From Complaint #100625:

"Make Operators and Supervisors (both in slitting and coating) aware of the issue, as well as the supplier of the liner to reinforce and ensure that controls for static are being utilized. Additionally, update production notes, defect database to include this issue."

Author	<input type="text" value="Seb Houle"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="13 Oct 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

4) Implemented Perm Corrective Actions

From Complaint #100625:

"Make Operators and Supervisors (both in slitting and coating) aware of the issue, as well as the supplier of the liner to reinforce and ensure that controls for static are being utilized. Additionally, update production notes, defect database to include this issue."

Author	<input type="text" value="Seb Houle"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="13 Oct 2011"/>
Estimated Date	<input type="text"/>	Implementation Date	<input type="text"/>
Validation Date	<input type="text"/>		

5) Corrective Actions Validation

<input type="text"/>			
Author	<input type="text"/>	Date	<input type="text"/>

6) Preventive Actions

<input type="text"/>			
Author	<input type="text"/>	Date	<input type="text"/>
Estimated Date	<input type="text"/>	Implementation Date	<input type="text"/>
Validation Date	<input type="text"/>		

7) Review Of Documentation

(a) MSR

Reviewed?	<input type="text" value="No"/>		
Reference	<input type="text"/>	Date	<input type="text"/>

(b) Flow chart, control plan, work inspection instructions

Reviewed?	<input type="text" value="No"/>		
Reference	<input type="text"/>	Date	<input type="text"/>

(c) FMEA

Reviewed?	<input type="text" value="No"/>		
Reference	<input type="text"/>	Date	<input type="text"/>

(d) Customer specification

Reviewed?	<input type="text" value="No"/>		
Reference	<input type="text"/>	Date	<input type="text"/>

8) Congratulate The Team