QFR No - 8000788830

Defect Details

NC No.	8000788830
NC Date	25/05/2022
NC Submission Date	
Part No.	53BKZ00102
Part Name	RUBBER BUSH
Supplier Name & Code	101023-FORES ELASTOMECH INDIA PVT. LT
ETL Plant	1136-ETL Suspension Sanand
Defect Details	EXCESS MATERIAL- FLESHES

1. Problem Description

Defect Description	Flash in ID
Detection Stage	Inprocess
Problem Severity	Aesthetic
NG Quantity	19
Is Defect Repeatative?	Yes
Defect Sketch / Photo	3jd0wsglcjllsqocql1hxmsz.jpg

Supplier Communication Details

Quality Head Email ID	malani.pritam@foresgroup.com
Plant Head/CEO Email ID	singh.barinder@foresgroup.com
MD Email ID	swamy.pj@foresgroup.com

2. Stock Details & action taken for NG parts

Location	ETL End	Warehouse	Transit	Supplier FG	Supplier WIP	Total
Total Qty	30000	0	0	6000	0	36000
Check Qty	30000	0	0	6000	0	36000
NG Qty	15	0	0	0	0	15

Action taken on NG part

Scrap	0
Rework	15
Under Deviation	0

Containment Action
100 % Stock Verification at Fores End .

3. Process Flow

Process Flow Description
Rubber & Chemical - incoming inspection - Mixing & Rubber Compound - Hardness Inspection - Molding - Visual Inspection - Packing and Dispatch .

4. Process Details

Process / Operation	Rubber Moulding
Outsource	No
Machine / Cell	Moulding
Machine / Cell No.	Moulding

5. Problem Analysis

Type	Possible Cause	Fact Verification	Jud
Machine	Curing Time Less Or More	PLC controlled in Machine If parameter not okay then machine stop	X
Man	Skip From inspection	Not sufficient training to detect the potential failure .	O
Material	Wrong Material used	Last Six month MTC report verified material found okay	X
Machine	Curing Temperature is Less or more	PLC controlled in Machine If parameter not okay then machine stop	X
Tool	Tool PM Frequency	Less PM frequency	O
Material	Variation in chemical weight	Error proofing system for chemical weighing , so there is no chances of variation in chemical weight	X
Machine	Machine temperature Less or More	PLC controlled process in machine if any temp less or more then machine will stop .	X

6. Inspection Method Analysis (Current)

Inspection Method	Other
Other Inspection Method	Visual
Check Point at Final Inspection	Yes
Checking Freq.	100%
Sampling	No
Sample Size	100 %

7. Root Cause Analysis (Occurance)

Why 1	Difficult to de flashing flash on part.
Why 2	Due to heavy flash in Mould cavity
Why 3	Flash cutting groove burnt.
Why 4	Burnt groove not detect in tool PM.
Why 5	Tool Frequency is Less
Root Cause (Occurance)	Tool PM frequency is less i.e after 20000 Shots .

Root Cause Analysis (Outflow)

Why 1	Flash In ID
Why 2	Skip from inspection
Why 3	No sufficient training to detect the Quality issue .

Why 4	
Why 5	
Root Cause (Outflow)	No sufficient training to detect the Quality issue .

8. Countermeasure (Occurrence , Outflow & System side Actions)

Type	Countermeasure Details	Responsibility	Target Date	Actual Date	Status
Occurance	Tool Pm frequency Is increase	Production Team	19/05/2022	17/05/2022	Completed
Outflow	Q gate Implement at Final inspection .	Amar Patil	19/05/2022	17/05/2022	Completed
Outflow	100 % inspection marking Starting for Next one month .	Amar Patil	19/05/2022	17/05/2022	Completed

9. Inspection Method After Customer Complaint

Change In Inspection System	No
Change Details	N/A
Inspection Method	Other
Other Inspection Method	Visual
Check Point at Final Inspection	Yes
Checking Freq.	100%
Sampling	No
Sample Size	200 %

10. Evidance of Countermeasure

Occurance (Before)	Tool PM frequency Is less. 149_Occurance_Before.xlsx
Occurance (After)	Tool Pm Frequency Is Increase . From 20000 Shots to 15000 Shots . 149_Occurance_After.xlsx
Outflow (Before)	Inspection marking not available . 149_Outflow_Before.png
Outflow (After)	Inspection marking Add for Next One month . Q gate Implement at final inspection . 149_Outflow_After.xlsx

11. Horizontal Deployment

Horizontal Deployment Required	No
Applicable Machine / Model / Plant	Not applicable

12. Document Review

Documents	
Specify Other Document	N/A

13. Effectiveness Of Action

Reviewed Quantity	5
Reason for submission	1. Tool PM frequency increased but validation report not attached. 2. Outflow side root cause not identified. Why inspector are not aware about potential failure?? 3. Countermeasure are not adequate i.e. no training given to operator, No OPL was displayed etc. 4. Q-gate implemented at FI stage, how it could be a root cause while already Visual inspection done at FI stage. 5. All relevant documents for all causes and actions are not attached. All evidences must be attached to confirm action and root cause. Zip file can be uploaded. Hence Upload multiple files in compressed form. 6. In Problem Analysis, fact verification found OK then remark 0 if fact verification found NG then remark X correct the 5th point .