



Complaint Number: 100625

## Report 8D

Generated By: Seb Houle  
Generated On: 12 Aug 2011

### I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Origination Date	29 Jun 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		
- Material	155191	Batch	WIN0025255
	Material Description U798 POLYMER 54IN X 750FT		
- Material	155191	Batch	WIN0025279
	Material Description U798 POLYMER 54IN X 750FT		
- Material	155191	Batch	WIN0025288
	Material Description U798 POLYMER 54IN X 750FT		

- Material

155191

Batch

WIN0025292

Material Description

U798 POLYMER 54IN X 750FT

## 2) Problem Description

Customer encounter a problem with 13 rolls of U798 transfer adhesive. The issue is one of confusion. Customer wants to return all 13 rolls immediately to Scapa for us inspect/rewind to insure that they don't all exhibit the same confusion problem. Our desire is to ship these 13 rolls back to you no later than tomorrow, July 1st, so that you can inspect them and return the good ones, if there are any, as soon as possible. For what it's worth, someone here ventured the thought that you might have had an issue with your static bar or got in a bad batch of release paper causing the confusion we've seen.

Actions Requested From The Customer

Corrective and Preventive Action Report and credit.

## 3) Containment Actions

## II. EVALUATION AND ACTION

Sample/photo Received	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>				
Date	<input type="text" value="30 Jun 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

Photo indicates adhesive confusion.

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="30 Jun 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

### 2) Root Causes

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="11 Aug 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

### 3) Possible Solutions

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="11 Aug 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

### 4) Implemented Perm Corrective Actions

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="11 Aug 2011"/>
--------	--	------	--

Estimated Date	<input type="text"/>	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