Complaint Number: 100441

Report 8D

Generated By: Seb Houle
Generated On: 29 Jun 2011

I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Origination Date	14 Jun 2011		
Sales Name	Andre Chartrain	Sales Office	Windsor
Telephone	+1 514 695 3915	Fax Number	+1 613 432 9434
Email	Andre.Chartrain@scapa.com		
Customer Complaint Ref			
Customer Name	EDELSTEIN DIVERSIFIED SPECIALTIES		
SAP Customer Number	126661	Customer Order N°	
Customer Part Number			

1) Invoices And Items On Complaint

(a) SAP Invoice Number	9700031538	Invoice Date	03 Nov 2010
- Material	155774	Batch	WIN0008017

Material Description
RX894S .77IN X 1650FT

2) Problem Description

Customer has 24 rolls of our 155774 with little or no adhesive on them. Custmer requires replacement material asap - see order 558959.
Please advise what to do with the defective 24 rolls.

Actions Requested From The Customer

3) Containment Actions

II. EVALUATION AND ACTION

Sample/photo Received	No				
Date					
Process Owner	Seb Houle				
Team Leader	shoule				
Is Complaint Valid?	Yes	Return The Goods	Yes	Dispose The Goods	No

Comments

1) Analysis

Material trace indicates that this material slit at the same time as other sizes of material that trace to Jumbos which had issues with tackiness, which indicates that there was likely an issue with mixed product between the Jumbos and the slit batches that resulted. Therefore, other then the root cause/corrective action that was addressed in Scapa complaint #18789, the only 'new' issue to address is reduction in the likelihood/freqency of mixed product.

From Scapa Complaint #18789 :"Samples were returned which were considered both ‘bad’ and ‘good’. The returned samples were tested for Adhesive Thickness, FTIR, Peel Adhesion, and Shear Strength. Testing did not show the Adhesive Thickness or Shears to be out of specification or unusual. The FTIRs were compared to ‘control’ samples of other production runs, which showed slight differences between the materials. Peel testing of the returned material yielded results of 5.4 lb/in for the Exposed Side and 4.8 lb/in for the Liner Side for the ‘bad’ sections, whereas retests of the returned material were 4.57 lb/in for the Exposed Side and 5.29 lb/in for the Liner Side for the ‘good’ sections. The specifications being: 6 lb/in for the Exposed Side and 5 lb/in for the Liner Side.

Further testing was carried out on retain samples of the Jumbos that were determined to have been used to produce the returned material. The peel test results ranged from 3.61 to 8.40 lb/in for the Exposed Side and 2.71 to 3.67 lb/in for the Liner Side.

Further investigation indicated that all problem material was isolated to a single adhesive master batch. This master batch was part of a shipment of two master batches, with the second master batch not exhibiting any problems, these two batches having been mixed consecutively. In addition the raw materials used to produce the master batch were compared; this indicated that only one raw material batch was changed between the two master batches. This batch number was drum specific (which was issued upon receipt by Scapa), and while the drum was not used to produce any more material, other drums from the same raw material shipment (with a single supplier batch number) were used. The other master batches utilizing the same raw material shipment did not display any issues. The raw material supplier was contacted and only keeps retain samples on each of their batches (not drums), when contacted they did not indicate that there was anything unusual about the batch in question.

The adhesive master batch retain sample was also analyzed by viscosity and drawdown/peel. The drawdown/peel results yielded lower test results when initially tested, however yielded higher results when the mixture was mixed more thoroughly.

The adhesive production process was reviewed to investigate potential contributing factors to the problem material. While there were some opportunities for improvement including additional incoming checks and post-production testing, nothing was observed that was a definitive root cause of the issue.

Received formal response from raw material supplier of adhesive additive, stating (with redactions):
‘I am writing in response to your inquiry concerning ----'s product, ----, which was specifically identified as being used in the manufacture of one of Scapa’s products that prompted a complaint from one of your customers. This particular lot was manufactured on June 18th, 2010. We have reviewed the batch records for this particular lot and have not found anything out of the ordinary which would give us any cause for concern.

The recommended shelf life of ----- is 730 days, however, please be aware that this is a recommendation. Our guidelines are based upon historical analyses of this material when it is maintained in conditions that are consistent with those recommended for the product.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.'" [Seb Houle 31/03/2011]

Author	Seb Houle	Date	28 Jun 2011

2) Root Causes

For mixed product: There are several inherent sources for the occurance of mixed product, which broadly fall into System Based, Training Based, and Operator Error. Retroactive determination of the exact failure is difficult, however it appears that this issue is largely attributable to Training/Operator Error. Broadly based the learning curve for operators using the SAP system was relatively steep and it took some time for full acceptance/adaptation of the SAP system by the operators. The incident in question dates back to November of 2010.

From Scapa Complaint #18789 :"No root cause has been definitively determined, however through comparison of the process inputs of the problem material and the process inputs of the non-problematic material, seems to indicate that some contamination was added either directly to the master batch of adhesive or was added first to a single raw material of the master batch." [Seb Houle 31/03/2011]

Author	Seb Houle	Date	28 Jun 2011

3) Possible Solutions

For mixed product: Review/stress the importance of proper bookings with operators/supervisors, using this example specifically.

From Scapa Complaint #18789: "Add additional material handling procedures to reduce the likelihood of contamination being introduced to the process. In addition, add additional post-production testing of the adhesive master batch, to ensure any future incidents are caught prior to customer shipment.." [Seb Houle 31/03/2011]

Author	Seb Houle	Date	28 Jun 2011

4) Implemented Perm Corrective Actions

For mixed product: Review/stress the importance of proper bookings with operators/supervisors, using this example specifically.

rom Scapa Complaint #18789: "Material Handling Improvements: As a result of continuous improvement, general improvements to material handling were already made since the batch at issue was produced, these improvements will reduce the likelihood of a reoccurrence of the issue. Raw materials have begun being kitted before each set of adhesive master batches, which minimizes the amount of excessive material in the production area. Additionally, more information regarding traceability is being captured during the production process. Whereas master batches were formally traceable to raw material supplier batch numbers, master batches are now traceable to specific drums of raw material. (While in some cases, such as the master batches at issue, only a single drum of material was used during a set of master batches. Therefore, while in SOME instances we had traceability to a single drum, since the changes, we will ALWAYS have traceability to the drum(s) used.)

IR Scan, Incoming: Incoming inspection of master batches will now consist of an IR Scan, which will then be compared against a standard for the material to search for differences/deviations in the material. The incoming inspection characteristic has been updated to include this extra test.

Peel Testing, Jumbos: The frequency of peel testing will be increased, now every Jumbo will be tested for Peel, whereas before the frequency was once every fifth Jumbo (and the last Jumbo, if not a “fifth”)." [Seb Houle 31/03/2011]

Author	Seb Houle	Date	28 Jun 2011
Estimated Date	28 Jun 2011	Implementation Date	28 Jun 2011
Validation Date	28 Jun 2011		

5) Corrective Actions Validation

Author		Date	

6) Preventive Actions

Author		Date	
Estimated Date		Implementation Date	
Validation Date			

7) Review Of Documentation

(a) MSR

Reviewed?	No		
Reference		Date	

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

Reviewed?	No		
Reference		Date	

(c) FMEA

Reviewed?	No		
Reference		Date	

(d) Customer specification

Reviewed?	No		
Reference		Date	

8) Congratulate The Team