





# Report 8D

Generated By: Karim Fekih Generated On: 03 Aug 2011

### I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Origination Date	18 May 2011						
Sales Name	Mark Matyas	Sales Office	Windsor				
Telephone	-	Fax Number	-				
Email	Mark.Matyas@scapa.com						
Customer Complaint Ref							
Customer Name	Great Lakes Tape Corporation						
SAP Customer Number	122163	Customer Order N°					
Customer Part Number							
1) Invoices And Items On Complaint							
(a) SAP Invoice Number	9700034932	Invoice Date	01 Feb 2011				
- Material	165331	Batch					
	Material Description						
	136 TR 50INX60YD MIC 9						

#### 2) Problem Description

Extremely difficult unwind on material. Takes 2 people to pull material off roll. Customer converts material and adds perforations, ease of removal from roll is important in their customer's process.

Their customer is charging them a \$250.00 non-conformance fee, and there will be sorting charges passed on as well.

#### Actions Requested From The Customer

Customer requesting credit for suspect material, \$250 non-conformance fee from their customer, and sorting charges from their customer.

Customer requesting return approval for 69 logs of material at \$5313.00 USD

## 3) Containment Actions

Representative samples of defect have been requested as well as lot information and exact qty of material affected. Customer sent back sample rolls of 3.75"x60yds.

Inventory verification was conducted and no suspect material was identified.

# II. EVALUATION AND ACTION

Sample/photo Received	No								
Date									
	Thomas Daneit								
Process Owner	Theresa Benoit								
Team Leader									
Is Complaint Valid?	Yes	Return The Goods	Yes	Dispose The Goods	No				
Comments									
1) Analysis									
Samples from the customer show a brownish tint to the adhesive, this is indicative of potential thermal degradation in the adhesive film.									
Held conference call with customer to discuss issue and propose taking the material back for sorting., Customer has ove 70 logs									
of material in stock.									
Our evaluation of the samples against a control, clearly showed the degraded adhesive had a very high unwind.									
Customer elected to keep the material and work through itthere will be no material returned at this stage.									
Update as of June 15, 2011	1.								
Customer called back and changed there mind they want to return the questionable material for review, since this was our									
original position and offer we will be taking the material back for review and evaluation.									
Author	Karim Fekih		Date	09 Jun 2011					
2) Root Causes									
Adhesive appearance is brownish, indicative of a possible thermal degradation due to over mixing in compounding.									
Author	Karim Fekih		Date	09 Jun 2011					
3) Possible Solutions									
Review adhesive mixing procedure and ensure mixing time are updated									
Author	Karim Fekih		Date	09 Jun 2011					
4) Implemented Perm Corrective Actions									
Ensure operators are following the mixing instructions. No over mixing of batches, Cell leader is addressing with operators to raise awareness and ensure re-enforcement of importance to adhere to the proper mixing times.									
Author	Karim Fekih		Date	16 Jun 2011					
Estimated Date	16 Jun 2011		Implementation Date						

# 5) Corrective Actions Validation Audited compounding process and ensure that the mixing times are respected. Replacement order run on 6/16 run was supervised in compounding/ coating and slitting and no issues noted with color of adhesive or adhesion properties. 17 Jun 2011 Author Karim Fekih Date 6) Preventive Actions Schedule monthly compounding process audits. 17 Jun 2011 Author Karim Fekih Date **Estimated Date** Implementation Date 15 Aug 2011 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

Date

Date

### 8) Congratulate The Team

No

(d) Customer specification

Reference

Reviewed?

Reference