Final Device Quality Control Unit Operation Optimization

Author: Ashley Rodriguez Cales
Advisor: Rafael Nieves Castro, PharmD, Industrial Engineering Department

Abstract

With the intent of achieving cost reduction initiatives, the Quality Control Unit operation regarding the final device release was identified as a labor cost opportunity. Through kaizen events done across site, it was determined a requirement of 20% total cycle time reduction for the final device packaging and release process and, consequently, eliminate the human interaction from the Quality Control Unit technicians.
Lean manufacturing principles and DMAIC project methodology was used to develop this project and successfully eliminate the Quality Control Unit operation at the final device release process. With the elimination of the process step, the Unit Record Review was eliminated since it was identified as not required, and the other elements contained on the eliminated step were moved to the previous step, once this was leaned out.
The implementation of this project achieved its objectives, assuring compliance to the applicable regulation agencies requirements and engagement from the employees.
Key Terms — DMAIC, Final Device Release, Quality Control, Regulation Agencies.

Project Description

As part of cost reduction initiatives, the Final Device Quality Control (QC) operation was identified as a labor productivity opportunity because the verifications completed by the QC inspector at this point are semi-automated, but the human interaction is very time consuming. In addition, inspectors do not feel motivated due to simple repetitive movements and verifications as part of this process.

Objectives

- Improve total cycle time of the units by a 20% from last fiscal year average by September 2020.
- Eliminate human interaction on final device QC operation by a 70% by September 2020.

Methodology

Define Phase:
- Interview customer, final packaging, and Quality Control unit personnel to understand problem.
- Confirm Scope and Problem Statement with project champion.

Measure Phase:
- Measure current process cycle time. Complete time measurement sheet.
- Complete Value Stream Map and include bursts (opportunities). Study the elements of the Final Device QC operation.

Analyze Phase:
- Complete root cause analysis though prioritizing causes on a Fish Bone analysis.
- Demonstrate effect on the problem of every potential causes prioritized.
- Analyze each element of the Final Device QC operation to identify which are non-value-added, value-added, or required-non-value-added.

Improve Phase:
- Generate solution ideas and implementation requirements.
- Forecast benefits. Define and execute implementation plan.
- Discuss solutions with stakeholders and customer.

Control Phase:
- Verify improvement with the targeted cause on the project goal. If required, identify further improvements to achieve project goal.
- Document and train personnel on new standard work.
- Share lessons learned.

Results and Discussion

Define Phase

The final packaging operations flow, shown in Figure 1, consists of 4 identical final packaging lines that merge on a conveyor that has the capability to feed 2 shrink wrapping machines and, finally, the units undergo the QCU verifications. Due to headcount availability, only 1 shrink wrapping machine is used every day.

Define Phase Cont.



Figure 1: Current final pack and QCU operation flow

Measure Phase

As part of the Measure phase of the project, the current times were measured for the shrink wrap operations and QCU. Per Figure 2, the shrink wrap operation has a total average time of 11.76 seconds/unit, out of which 8 seconds are on scanning and waiting time at the Manufacturing Execution System (MES).

Time Study Sheet: Shrink Wrap		Observations (secs)										Average Time		
#	Elements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Average	Std. Dev	Variance
1	The operator wait for the first scan, takes the unit and do a visual inspection (Start scanning)	4.39	4.43	4.95	4.32	5.37	5.91	5.28	3.87	5.8	5.42	4.574	0.7713	0.595
		5.27	3.72	4.16	4.8	4.9	4.25	3.34	4.2	3.6	3.5			
2	Scan the unit twice and place it on the conveyor (Wait FW screen and Close the job and place on conveyour)	7.7	8.42	7.01	8.18	5	7.99	7.88	10.38	8.47	9.34	8.002	1.2758	1.6278
		8.95	7.53	7.19	7.23	8.56	8.83	6.32	10.41	7.46	7.19			
3	Shrink Wrap full, so the operto r takes the units and put in WIP in the rack	6.67	5.15	7.35								6.39	1.1264	1.2688
	Non- Cyclical Element													
4	The operator takes the unit of the rack, put it in the camara for the fisrt scan, takes the unit after the first scan and do a visual inspection	6.09	4.65									5.37	1.0182	1.0368
	Non- Cyclical Element													
											Total Avg. Time:	11.76		

Figure 2: Current time measurement sheet for the Shrink Wrap operation

Time Study Sheet: QCU		Observations (secs)										Average Time		
#	Elements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Average	Std. Dev	Variance
1	Track In & Unit Record Review Upload	9.54	7.91	8.51	8.62	9.16	8.86	8.85	11.9	8.39	9.12	9.086	1.088	1.1838
2	Track Out	5.37	5.56	5.47	5.94	5.49	5.62	5.61	5.25	6.06	6.12	5.649	0.2944	0.0867
3	End Processing Report	14.42	15.73	14.97	15.94	15.45	14.87	15.62	13.36	15.99	16.14	15.249	0.8633	0.7452
											Total Avg. Time:	29.984		

Figure 3: Current time measurement sheet for the QCU operation

Moreover, the time measurement assessment was completed for the QCU operation to measure the current state of the operation, refer to Figure 3. The current lead time for the QCU operation was measured to be an average of 29.98 seconds, which is 155% higher than the previous operation time. This is evidence that the QCU operation is in fact a bottle-neck operation and improvements are required.
Through the Value Stream Map (VSM) developed and shown in Figure 4, it was easier to see the flow of every step/element of the operations in scope. Most importantly, the discussion of the VSM with the users of the process was fundamental to identify wastes and pains of the current process. The proposed improvements go beyond physical stations, but also oversee the transactions required on the MES. In conjunction of the technician that currently completes it, the elements within the MES process step of the QCU operation will need to be re-located on other steps or eliminated from the overall process.



Figure 4: Value stream map for the operations contained in the scope of this project

Analyze Phase

With the intent of identifying potential root causes of the bottle neck and high cycle time of the QCU operation, a cause-and-effect analysis was completed and documented using a Fish Bone diagram, as Figure 5.



Figure 5: Fish Bone diagram for the Cause-and-Effect analysis

The causes with higher rating were evaluated through the Analyze project phase, as shown on Table 1. These assessments evaluate each high-ranked cause from the fish-bone analysis and provides the evidence on the evaluation of the effect each of these has on the project Y. Out of the 8 causes brought to the Analyze phase, 5 causes will be taken to the next project phase, Improve, due to the proven effect these have on the project.

Table 1: Analyze assessment for high ranked causes on Fish Bone

Cause	Evidence Source	Proven effect on project Y?
X8: Repetitive transactions on MES	DHR review and Gemba walk	YES
X5: QC techs don't feel motivated	Gemba walk and VOC collection	YES
X3: Issues with scanners	Gemba walk	YES
X4: Two computers are required for 1 QCU tech	Gemba walk	NO
X15: Packaging operators document trainings through DHR comments	DHR Comments Report (developed and validated for the assessment of this X)	YES
X13: High inventory WIP between shrink wrap and QCU	Gemba walk	NO
X18: Not enough physical space for the high inventory WIP pending QCU	Gemba walk	NO
X16: FDA requirements for final device release	Interviews with Compliance SMEs	YES

Improve Phase

Each element and transaction was evaluated to understand the value-added of each. In addition, given that the product being packaged and verified is a combination of pharma-medical device, the regulation agencies have strict requirements and understanding these requirements is critical to complete this assessment. Under Table 2, each element of the QCU operation is described and additional identified causes with the proposed improvement.

Table 2: Analyze assessment for high ranked causes on Fish Bone

Element / Cause	Description	Proposed Improvement
Unit Record Report (URR) Generation and Review, X5: QC techs don't feel motivated, X15: Packaging operators document trainings through DHR comments, and X16: FDA requirements for final device release	The URR is generated to review comments documented on Final Pack Device History Record (DHR) of each unit. The report is triggered by the operator through the Manufacturing Execution System (MES). Once generated, the operator reviews the comments listed on the unit's DHR verifying conformance to Good Documentation Practices requirements.	To eliminate the DHR comments at the Final Packaging area, training was provided to the operators on a function the MES must Add users in training in the corresponding DHRs without creating comments. Elimination of the URR is proposed since the Final Pack DHRs did not contain any comments to review. An Engineering Technical Report was developed to demonstrate compliance to the requirements the final device release process has even without the URR.
Qualification Level Verification	An automatic verification at the MES, triggered by the operator, that confirms the unit is under production level. If the unit in not under production level, this verification fails and sends the unit on Hold.	Other than the process step location due to elimination of the QCU process step, no additional changes are being proposed since it is an automatic verification.
End Processing	This is an automatic process as part of the QCU process step that terminates the unit in the MES and creates it as part of the shipping inventory.	Other than the process step location due to elimination of the QCU process step, no additional changes are being proposed since it is an automatic and required process.
End Processing Report Generation and Review	The End Processing Confirmation Report is triggered by the operator on a second computer and from the browser in use. Once the report loads, which is per unit, this is reviewed to confirm and assure that each unit completes the required transactions, including the End Processing, in the MES. A PASS result on this report means the unit is ready for the Shipping process.	Train Shrink-wrap operators on the End Processing Confirmation Report generation and review.
X8: Repetitive transactions on MES	The repetitive transactions found were related to repetitive user signatures, where the operator/technician is prompted by the MES to enter his/her login ID and password.	Updates on the MES process steps to automize and merge these signatures to eliminate the repetitive waste of the processes.
X3: Issues with scanners	The scanners found in the stations were outdated and did not scanned in continuous manner, requiring the operator/technician to attend the scanner until it is ready to read the unit.	Partnered with Information Technology (IT) team to reconfigure the scanners to continuously scan in an unattended manner.

Control Phase

Having implemented the improvement plan discussed above, the final VSM and Process Flow yield to be as shown in Figure 6, where the QCU operation as a separate process step is successfully eliminated and, therefore, achieving a reduction in QCU technician head count and overall lead time. The shrink wrap inspection operation transactions on the MES were optimized, providing the space and time for this operator to overtake the End Processing Report, which is generated and reviewed on a separate computer per shrink-wrap operation. As part of the Control project phase, the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the Shrink-Wrapping process and for the QCU Final Release process were updated to reflect the changes implemented and, consequently, the associates were trained on the new instructions. The area was closely monitored by the project team after the implementation to address doubts and/or questions the associated might have regarding the new process flow and therefore assure business continuity.



Figure 6: Final Value Stream Map for the operations within scope

Conclusions

The Final Device Quality Control operation, which was identified as a labor productivity opportunity, has been successfully leaned out. Through the implementation of the Improvement plan of this project, the QCU operation as itself was eliminated since the most time-consuming verification (Unit Record Review) performed through this operation was eliminated. Refer to Figure 7 for the Final Process Flow and Cycle times of the final device packaging and release process.



Figure 7: Final Process Flow

With the successful elimination of the physical station of the QCU operation, 15 seconds for the End Processing Report Generation and Review is moved to the previous operation, shrink wrapping inspection. To complete this, the shrink wrap operation transactions were leaned out eliminating repetitive signatures and improving scanners used in the station. The improvement in the total cycle time to 58 seconds per unit, represents an improvement of 22.7%. This exceeds the project objective of improving the time by a 20%. In addition, the reduction of one (1) quality control technician was achieved.

References

[1] L Wilson, "Lean Manufacturing Simplified," in How to Implement Lean Manufacturing, 2nd ed., New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education, 2015.
[2] T McCarty, L Daniels, M Bremer & P Gupta, "Introduction to the DMAIC Process Improvement Methodology," in Six Sigma Black Belt Handbook (Six SIGMA Operational Methods), New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2005.
[3] J K. Liker, "Using the Toyota Way to Transform Technical and Service Organizations," in Toyota Way: Management Principles from the World's Greatest Manufacturer, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education, 2004.