

Report 8D

Generated By: Seb Houle Generated On: 20 Oct 2011

I. COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Origination Date	22 Sep 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							
2) Problem Description								
3 rolls were rejected for "confusion". Photos are attached. Batch# WIN0025255								
Actions Requested From The Customer								
Customer is looking for a credit and a corrective action.								
3) Containment Actions								

II. EVALUATION AND ACTION

Campula/abata Danaiyad	Van							
Sample/photo Received	Yes							
Date	28 Sep 2011							
Process Owner	Seb Houle							
Team Leader	shoule							
Is Complaint Valid?	Yes	Return The Goods	Yes	Dispose The Goods	No			
Comments								
Associated to Complaint #100625. 4 rolls of this batch were produced, one was already returned as part of complaint #100625. The customer original kept some of the material that was included in the potential material affected by Adhesive Confusion issue, in order to determine if they were in fact affected by the issue. From Complaint #100625: "Photo indicates adhesive confusion. Supplier is looking to return rolls for inspection / rewind. 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								
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same co	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore	; the 13 rolls were all fro	m the first set of 18 rolls th	nat were slit. All 57				
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same corsame liner of materialSH	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11"	; the 13 rolls were all fro	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the				
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same co	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore	; the 13 rolls were all fro	m the first set of 18 rolls th	nat were slit. All 57				
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same corsame liner of materialSH	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11"	; the 13 rolls were all fro	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the				
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same or same liner of materialSH	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11"	; the 13 rolls were all fro	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the				
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625:	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle	the 13 rolls were all fro	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625:	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle	e, the 13 rolls were all fro e, the 13 rolls which did d e material, the areas of a	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit conse	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage coutively, the damage of	e, the 13 rolls were all from the	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion show a Since all the material in quantity at the liner supplier's facily at the liner supplier's facily and the size of the supplier's facily and the size of the	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked to uestion was coated lity, coating, or	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage coutively, the damage of	e, the 13 rolls were all from the	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion show a Since all the material in quantity at the liner supplier's facily at the liner supplier's facily and the size of the supplier's facily and the size of the	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked to uestion was coated lity, coating, or	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit conse	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage coutively, the damage of	e, the 13 rolls were all from the	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion show a Since all the material in quantity at the liner supplier's facily at the liner supplier's facily and the size of the supplier's facily and the size of the	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked to uestion was coated lity, coating, or	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit consessitting. Since the material was slitting. Since the material was series of the same of	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage of was slit soon after coating the static damage. Seb Houle	e, the 13 rolls were all from the	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion show so Since all the material in quantum at the liner supplier's facining the adhesive confusion	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked westion was coated lity, coating, or n was reduced."	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit consessitting. Since the material ways Author	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage of was slit soon after coating the static damage. Seb Houle	e, the 13 rolls were all from the	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion show so Since all the material in quantum at the liner supplier's facining the adhesive confusion	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked westion was coated lity, coating, or n was reduced."	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit consessitting. Since the material way. Author 3) Possible Solutions	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage of was slit soon after coating the secutively.	e material, the areas of a nage wasn't determined.	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion show a Since all the material in quantum at the liner supplier's facining the adhesive confusion Date	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked westion was coated lity, coating, or n was reduced." 13 Oct 2011	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit consessititing. Since the material value Author 3) Possible Solutions From Complaint #100625:	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage of the static damage cutively, the damage of was slit soon after coating Seb Houle	e material, the areas of a nage wasn't determined. could've been introduced ng the likelihood of catch	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion shows a Since all the material in quantum at the liner supplier's facining the adhesive confusion Date	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked the static damage when the stat	with			
57 rolls that were slit on corrolls were from the same of same liner of materialSH Author 2) Root Causes From Complaint #100625: "The root cause appears to ink. However, the definitive consecutively and slit consessitting. Since the material value of the consecutive of of the con	nsecutive working days pating run. Furthermore 8/11/11" Seb Houle be static damage to the cause of the static damage of the static damage cutively, the damage of was slit soon after coating Seb Houle	e material, the areas of a nage wasn't determined. could've been introduced ng the likelihood of catch	m the first set of 18 rolls the display adhesive confusion Date adhesive confusion shows a Since all the material in quantum at the liner supplier's facining the adhesive confusion Date	nat were slit. All 57 were all produced with the 13 Oct 2011 static damage when marked the static damage when the stat	with			

4) Implemented Perm Corrective Actions

From Complaint #100625: "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	Seb Houle	Date	13 Oct 2011				
Estimated Date		Implementation Date					
Validation Date							
5) Corrective Actions Validation							
Author		Date					
6) Preventive Actions							
Author		Data					
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