8D report

8D report no.	Date opened	Last updated

Customer	Customer complaint / reference no.

Part number	Part name	Supplier / site

Prepared by	Status
	☐ Open ☐ Closed

D0 Emergency response

Protect the customer the same day, then decide whether a full 8D is needed.

Symptom as reported

What was found, by whom, where and when

Customer impact

Line stoppage, field returns, stop shipment, cost

Emergency response actions

Action	Owner	Date	Result

Full 8D required?	Customer notified on	Notified by
☐ Yes ☐ No		

D1 Establish the team

A small, dedicated team: a leader who drives the investigation, a sponsor who removes roadblocks and keeps the customer informed, experts only when needed. Review the team at the start of each discipline.

Team

Role	Name	Function / title	Contact (phone, email)
Sponsor			
Team leader			
Member			
Member			

Role	Name	Function / title	Contact (phone, email)
Member			
Member			

D2 Describe the problem

One failure mode in measurable terms: what is wrong with what, where it is first seen, since when, how many parts, what it costs.

Problem statement

What is wrong with what? Object and defect, in the customer's terms

Where first observed (discovery point)

Earliest process step where the problem can be seen

Effect at the customer

What the customer experiences

IS / IS NOT

	IS	IS NOT
What		
Where		
When		
How many		

Parts affected

Parts produced in the same period

Share affected, %

Impact: quality, reliability, productivity, cost

In financial terms where possible

Failure mode listed in the FMEA / control plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Recurring problem?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence attached

Photos, measurements, reports

D3 Interim containment

Sort suspect parts as far upstream as possible, on a criterion that demonstrably predicts the customer's experience, and name the breakpoint from which shipments are clean.

Sorting criterion

How a suspect part is told from a good one: measured value or attribute, and the evidence that it predicts the customer's experience

Measurement system checked for the sort?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Checked on

Containment actions

Action (sort, 100% inspection, rework, certified stock)	Process step / location	Owner	Implemented on	Effective?
				☐ Yes ☐ No
				☐ Yes ☐ No
				☐ Yes ☐ No
				☐ Yes ☐ No

Breakpoint

First lot, serial or date protected

Parts inspected / rejected so far

D4 Root cause and escape point

The cause–effect relationship that explains the difference between good and bad parts, proved by switching the problem on and off — and the control that should have caught it.

Root cause

The single cause that explains the difference between good and bad parts

Verification: how the cause was proved

Evidence that the problem can be switched on and off by controlling this cause; sample sizes and statistical confidence

Root cause verified?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Verified on

Methods used

Multi-vari study, designed experi

Escape point

The last control that should have caught the problem, and why it didn't

System cause

Which weakness in the management system allowed the cause to exist (feeds D7)

D5 Choose and verify the permanent corrective action

Set a tolerance or control for the proven cause, choose the action with the people who will live with it, and show in a trial that it improves the output before it is implemented.

Corrective actions

#	Corrective action	Addresses	Owner	Planned date	Verification before implementation	Verified?
1		☐ Root cause ☐ Escape point ☐ System cause				☐ Yes ☐ No

#	Corrective action	Addresses	Owner	Planned date	Verification before implementation	Verified?
2		☐ Root cause ☐ Escape point ☐ System cause				☐ Yes ☐ No
3		☐ Root cause ☐ Escape point ☐ System cause				☐ Yes ☐ No
4		☐ Root cause ☐ Escape point ☐ System cause				☐ Yes ☐ No

Tolerance or setting for the cause, and how it will be controlled

What the trial data say about the relationship between the cause and the output

Expected effect

Defect rate or output before and after the trial

D6 Implement and validate

Implement as a project, prove the effect with a before-and-after run chart, update standard work, and remove the containment once it stops finding suspect parts.

Implementation

#	Action	Implemented on	Validation evidence (run chart before/after, capability, audit)	Result
1				
2				
3				
4				

Containment removed on

Defect-free production from

Date, lot or serial

Customer concurrence

Name and date

D7 Prevent recurrence

Fix the system that allowed the cause, update the documents, and read across to similar products, processes and plants.

Systemic change

What changes in procedures, standards or design rules so this cause cannot act again

Read-across

Similar product / process / site	Action	Owner	Date

Similar product / process / site	Action	Owner	Date

Documents updated

Document	Change	Owner	Date
Process FMEA			
Control plan			
Work instructions			
Inspection standard			
Drawing / specification			
Training records			
Other			

Lessons learned

What the investigation taught about the product, the process and the way the cause was found

D8 Close and recognize the team

Record the business result, recognize the team, and get the customer's sign-off.

Results achieved

Cost avoided, PPM before and after, customer status

Team recognition

How the team's work was acknowledged and shared

Sign-off

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Team leader			
Sponsor			
Quality manager			
Customer representative			

Date closed

Customer sign-off received?

☐ Yes ☐ No