

Rapport 8D

Généré Par: Nathalie Stienlet Généré Le: 15 Dec 2011

I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION / IDENTIFICATION DE LA RECLAMATION

| Date De La Réclamation | 14 Oct 2011 | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Nom correspondant commercial | Cecile Cheval | Sales Office (Bureau Commercial) | Valence |
| Téléphone | | No. Fax | |
| Email | cecile.cheval@scapa.com | | |
| Référence réclamation client | | | |
| Nom Du Client | Labelvage | | |
| Numero De Client SAP | 120473 | N° Commande Client | 2971 |
| Rfrence Article Client | 3370 | | |
| | | | |
| 1) Factures Et Article | es Sur La Réclamation | | |
| (a) Numéro De Facture SAP | 9200295901 | Date De Facture | 11 May 2011 |
| | | | |
| - Matériel | 114844 | Lot | |
| | Description Produit | | |
| | 3370 Naturel 50mm x 50m Scapa | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

2) Description Du Problème Identifié Par Le Client

| Actions | demandées | au client |
|---------|-----------|-----------|
| | | |

3) Actions Conservatoires Sur Le Process

II. EVALUATION ET ACTIONS

| Echantillons/Photos Reçus | Yes | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Date | 26 Oct 2011 | | | |
| Responsable Processus | Nathalie Stienlet | | | |
| Responsable Action | | | | |
| Réclamation justifiée? | No | Retour marchandise | Destruction marchandise | |
| Commentaires | | | | |
| nouvel échantillon analysé | le 15/12 | | | |

1) Analyse

The customer is complaining in respect of Scapa 3370 natural 50mm x 50m (item 114844) due to coils being difficult to unwind and tearing.

The concern relates to material dispatched from Scapa Ashton on 11/05/2011, dispatch 81036692 for 2000 coils. It is understood that the affected quantity is 400 rolls, from batches 145571/1 & 13800/2.

Four coils were returned to Scapa Manchester for assessment (received on 26/10/2011).

On inspection the coils are in poor condition: the coils/core are very dirty and the coils also show evidence of mould. The coils also smell musty and damp.

Photographs of the returned coil samples are attached to Scapa complaints system for reference; the photographs show the condition of the returned coil samples, along with comparison with a fresh coil of 3370 taken from stock.

This suggests that the coils have been stored in/exposed to "unfavourable" conditions (likely to have been exposed to moisture) during storage either within or out of the carton. Such exposure would negate the products shelf life, and would likely explain the poor unwind experienced by the customer.

The Scapa Technical Data Sheet for this product would recommend product storage guidelines.

Stock of item 114844 was checked at Scapa Manchester. All coils checked are in good condition - none show the same condition as the returned samples. Example photograph of the stock check at Scapa is attached to Scapa complaints system for reference.

On the evidence of the returned samples this concern is not supported.

Update 15/12/2011: A further coil was received on 12/12/2011 at Scapa Manchester; the coil was not identified with the batch number, so provenance is unknown. The returned coil was checked subjectively and then tested principally for unwind force and breaking strength, and compared with a retained sample coil of the same vintage (May 2011).

The returned coil was unwound subjectively by hand at low speed and high speed, with clean unwind and no evidence of excessive tightness being observed. Also, no breaking or snapping or tearing was observed. The returned coil was reviewed subjectively by several members of Scapa QA & Technical, with the same conclusion.

Both coils were tested for unwind force at points along their length (start, middle & end); the results indicate a slight increase along the length but such is not unusual or excessive for an uncoated rayon tape; both coils can still be unwound without undue concern. The average unwind force were measured as: returned coil, unwind force = 5.1N/cm; retained sample coil, unwind force = 5.0N/cm. The measured unwind force is not excessive, and supports the subjective observations.

The breaking strength was tested and measured at 95.8N/cm for the returned coil, which is comparable with the published Scapa Technical Data Sheet nominal value of 80N/cm. Therefore, strength of the returned coil should be sufficient for use.

In summary, the results for the unwind force test and breaking strength test for the returned coil appear to be regular, and are comparable with the retained sample coil. The results suggest that the returned coil may be approaching its six month shelf life but is still currently functional and suitable to use.

Full testing & results are within test report attached to the Scapa complaints system for this complaint.

| ******** | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| On the evidence of the second returned sample, this concern is not supported. | | | | |
| Auteur | Philip Ward | Date | 02 Nov 2011 | |
| | | | | |
| 2) Causes | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Auteur | | Date | | |
| 3) Solutions Possible | 28 | | | |
| o, colument : colum | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Auteur | | Date | | |
| | | | | |
| 4) Mise En Place Ac | tions Correctives Permanentes | | | |
| | | | | |
| Auteur | | Date | | |
| Data Fatiméa | | | | |
| Date Estimée | | Date De Mise En Place | | |
| Date De Validation | | | | |
| 5) Validation Des Ac | tions Correctives | | | |
| o) validation bes Ac | uona concenves | | | |
| | | | | |
| Auteur | | Date | | |
| | | | | |
| 6) Actions Préventive | es | | | |
| | | | | |
| Auteur | | Date | | |
| | | | | |
| Date Estimée | | Date De Mise En Place | | |
| Date De Validation | | | | |
| 7) Mine A. Levy De sympostotics | | | | |
| 7) Mise à Jour Docu | mentation | | | |
| (a) MSR | | | | |
| Commenté? | No | | | |
| Référence | | Date | | |
| (b) Révision logigrammes/plans de surveillance/instructions de fabrication et de contrôle | | | | |
| Commenté? | No | | | |
| | | Data | | |
| Référence | | Date | | |
| (c) Révision AMDEC | | | | |
| Commenté? | No | | | |

| Référence | | Date | |
|-----------------------------|----|------|--|
| (d) Spécification du client | | | |
| Commenté? | No | | |
| Référence | | Date | |

8) Félicitations à Toute L'équipe