

## Defect Details

<b>NC No.</b>	8000861163
<b>NC Date</b>	30/01/2024
<b>NC Submission Date</b>	
<b>Part No.</b>	550LZ00102
<b>Part Name</b>	SPACER L 50-PRF001
<b>Supplier Name &amp; Code</b>	100990-JAIRAJ ANCILLARIES PVT LTD
<b>ETL Plant</b>	1118-ETL E-92,93 Suspension
<b>Defect Details</b>	DIAMETER OVER SIZE-OVALITY & 33±0.1 GRUE OD OVER SIZE

## 1. Problem Description

<b>Defect Description</b>	Groove OD over size
<b>Detection Stage</b>	Inprocess
<b>Problem Severity</b>	Fitment
<b>NG Quantity</b>	114
<b>Is Defect Repeatative?</b>	No
<b>Defect Sketch / Photo</b>	

## Supplier Communication Details

<b>Quality Head Email ID</b>	planthead.aurangabad@jairajgroup.com
<b>Plant Head/CEO Email ID</b>	vp@jairajgroup.com
<b>MD Email ID</b>	rajiv@jairajgroup.com

## 2. Stock Details &amp; action taken for NG parts

Location	ETL End	Warehouse	Transit	Supplier FG	Supplier WIP	Total
<b>Total Qty</b>	1400	0	0	0	0	1400
<b>Check Qty</b>	1400	0	0	0	0	1400
<b>NG Qty</b>	114	0	0	0	0	114

## Action taken on NG part

<b>Scrap</b>	114
<b>Rework</b>	0
<b>Under Deviation</b>	0

## Containment Action

Immediately visited customer end for problem identification & 100% checking of all available stock at customer end completed

## 3. Process Flow

## Process Flow Description

Receipt of raw material, Inward inspection , storage, Material issue, Injection molding, Machining, Deflashing & final inspection, Packing & labelling, Pre dispatch inspection, despatch

## 4. Process Details

<b>Process / Operation</b>	Injection Molding
<b>Outsource</b>	No
<b>Machine / Cell</b>	Injection molding machine
<b>Machine / Cell No.</b>	IM-5

## 5. Problem Analysis

Type	Possible Cause	Fact Verification	Jud
Method	Sampling Inspection at Final Inspection stage & on machine	Verified that at FI inspection by gauge on sampling basis & operator was checking after every hour	X
Method	Part clamping not correct	Verified that part clamping on machine was not correct	X
Man	Operator having less awareness	Varified & found that operator was having less awareness about the issue	X
Tool	Tool not ok / wear out	Verified that there was no problem in tool	O
Material	Use of improper material	Veried that material used was as per specifications	O
Machine	Improper Cooling time in Injection moulding	Verified and found that cooling time was as per specified	O
Machine	Jaw wear out in machining	Verified and found that jaw condition was ok	O
Method	Process parameters not followed	Verified that process parameters were as specified	O

## 6. Inspection Method Analysis (Current)

<b>Inspection Method</b>	Gauge
<b>Other Inspection Method</b>	
<b>Check Point at Final Inspection</b>	Yes
<b>Checking Freq.</b>	Sampling
<b>Sampling</b>	No
<b>Sample Size</b>	Aslot size

## 7. Root Cause Analysis (Occurance)

<b>Why 1</b>	Groove OD O/S - Req Specification 33.95+/- 0.1 mm & found oval
<b>Why 2</b>	While machining for groove equal material not removed from part OD
<b>Why 3</b>	Due to part clamping was not centered in jaws
<b>Why 4</b>	Flashes not removed from part before clamping
<b>Why 5</b>	Manual error
<b>Root Cause (Occurance)</b>	Flashes on part were not removed by the operator prior its loading for machining ( Manual error)

## Root Cause Analysis (Outflow)

<b>Why 1</b>	Groove OD O/S - Req Specification 33.95+/- 0.1 mm & found oval
<b>Why 2</b>	Part skipped from machine & Final inspection stage

<b>Why 3</b>	Inspection on sampling basis on machine by operator & by inspector at FI
<b>Why 4</b>	
<b>Why 5</b>	
<b>Root Cause (Outflow)</b>	Inspection on sampling basis on machine by operator & by inspector at FI

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

Type	Countermeasure Details	Responsibility	Target Date	Actual Date	Status
Occurance	Training provided to operator on removing flashes from part , prior to loading on machine	Production	24/02/2024	24/02/2024	Completed
Outflow	1. Parts are checking 100% with GO Gauge for groove OD at FI with Identification mark. 2. Now 100% parts are checked by gauge (groove OD 33.95 +/-0.1 mm) by operator on machine. 3. Displayed OK/NG samples at work station & also displayed OPL.	QA HOD	24/02/2024	24/02/2024	Completed

### 9. Inspection Method After Customer Complaint

<b>Change In Inspection System</b>	Yes
<b>Change Details</b>	1. Parts are checking 100% with GO Gauge for groove OD at FI by inspector with Identification mark. 2. Now 100% parts are checked by gauge (groove OD 33.95 +/-0.1 mm) by operator on machine
<b>Inspection Method</b>	Gauge
<b>Other Inspection Method</b>	
<b>Check Point at Final Inspection</b>	Yes
<b>Checking Freq.</b>	100%
<b>Sampling</b>	No
<b>Sample Size</b>	100%

### 10. Evidence of Countermeasure

<b>Occurance (Before)</b>	Operator having less awareness about the issue <a href="#">656_Occurance_Before.xlsx</a>
<b>Occurance (After)</b>	Training provided to the operator ( Training Record) <a href="#">656_Occurance_After.pdf</a>
<b>Outflow (Before)</b>	Inspection on Sampling basis with gauge on machine by operator & at Final inspection by inspector <a href="#">656_Outflow_Before.xlsx</a>
<b>Outflow (After)</b>	100% Inspection with gauge by operator on machine & by inspector at FI <a href="#">656_Outflow_After.xlsx</a>

### 11. Horizontal Deployment

<b>Horizontal Deployment Required</b>	No
<b>Applicable Machine / Model / Plant</b>	Not Applicable

### 12. Document Review

<b>Documents</b>	
------------------	--

<b>Specify Other Document</b>	NO
-------------------------------	----

### 13. Effectiveness Of Action

<b>Reviewed Quantity</b>	11000
<b>Reason for submission</b>	after action implementation no any parts found defective.