



Complaint Number: 101445

Report 8D

Generated By: Beatrice Porchier
Generated On: 04 Jan 2012

I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Origination Date	23 Sep 2011		
Sales Name	Paul Bican	Sales Office	Valence
Telephone	+33 4 66 20 00 26	Fax Number	-
Email	paul.bican@scapa.com		
Customer Complaint Ref			
Customer Name	Corning Cable Systems Poland		
SAP Customer Number	119971	Customer Order N°	
Customer Part Number			

1) Invoices And Items On Complaint

(a) SAP Invoice Number	9200305468	Invoice Date	19 Sep 2011
- Material	160528	Batch	
Material Description			
WSL2250-T 15MMX15400M R30-22-10			

2) Problem Description

During the production process was observed the cracks of the film layer tape. They appeared at about 4800 meters in length reel 15 400 mtr. Over the next kilometer cause tape breaking (weakened place with incised and separated a layer of foil). Defect of the tape may cause serious delays in production and customer dissatisfaction. Since this is one production batch, the customer is afraid that all the reels may have a defect that is detectable after about for example 4 - 5 km. This carries a risk of generating a great scrap of the material and human effort with rework. If the next reel has any defect the cable production will be immediately stop.

Also, they notify the poor quality of winding and some kind of impurity between coils of tape. Please see attached picture. It also may cause damage of individual sections tape and their final product. They want to return two mention spools with these defects.

At the moment their expectation is the reimbursement for the rework of cable, due to the tape's flaw. The cost of the repair / rework of the cable, caused by faulty tape, amounted 1673,75 EUR. (It includes cost of scraped material and work of our operators).

More details can be saw in pictures sent by seperate e-mails.

Actions Requested From The Customer

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="Krystyna DeVries"/>		
Team Leader	<input type="text" value="sterry"/>		
Is Complaint Valid?	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	Return The Goods	<input type="text"/>
		Dispose The Goods	<input type="text"/>
Comments	<input type="text"/>		

1) Analysis

Customer complains about splits or cracks in the film layer and also about poor winding and contamination of the winding. Analysis of the pictures indicates the winding deviates at the spool edge in several places and also that pieces of tape are wound in. Break were reported but can't be evaluated by photo.

All of the above issues are consistent with poorly slit material being wound into spools. The spool process runs 4 spools at a time and the 4 ends must be cleanly slit to wind properly. If the ends are not cleanly slit, the tape film layer will tear resulting in breaks in our customers process. If the tape breaks in our process, the subsequent repair can result in poorly wound spools and tape sections being wound into the spool, but only if the operators at spooling do not follow proper protocol.

Author	<input type="text" value="Simon Terry"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="30 Sep 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

2) Root Causes

Root cause is improperly slit S code due to the condition of the slit 23 bed roll surface.

The bed roll is worn out and requires replacement

Author	<input type="text" value="Simon Terry"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="30 Sep 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

3) Possible Solutions

<input type="text"/>			
----------------------	--	--	--

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

4) Implemented Perm Corrective Actions

Not yet implemented requires investigation of cost

Author	<input type="text" value="Simon Terry"/>	Date	<input type="text" value="14 Oct 2011"/>
Estimated Date	<input type="text" value="14 Nov 2011"/>	Implementation Date	<input type="text"/>
Validation Date	<input type="text"/>		

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