TOTAL PRODUCTIVE MAINTENANCE (TPM) APPROACH OF AUTO BASIC GROOMING MACHINE IN IMPROVEMENT OF OVERALL EQUIPMENT EFFECTIVENESS (OEE) IN TOY MANUFACTURING COMPANY

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Submitted as one of the requirements to obtain Sarjana Teknik (S.T.)

By

BERNADETA HOLLY AYUNINGRUM

ID No. 004201900053

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING STUDY PROGRAM

CIKARANG

JUNE, 2023

SIMILARITY CHECKING RESULT

Turnitin_Thesis 2023_Bernadeta Holly Ayuningrum_004201900053

by _ _

Submission date: 29-May-2023 09:03PM (UTC-0500)
Submission ID: 2104912271
File name: Thesis_for_Turnitin.pdf (1.32M)
Word count: 17630
Character count: 90118

Turnitin_Thesis 2023_Bernadeta Holly Ayuningrum_004201900053

ORIGINALITY REPORT

7%	6%	3%	1%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES


1	repository.president.ac.id Internet Source	2%
2	www.its.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
3	csg.csail.mit.edu Internet Source	<1%
4	Submitted to Universiti Malaysia Perlis Student Paper	<1%
5	pinpdf.com Internet Source	<1%
6	bzmiy.treasure-gnss.eu Internet Source	<1%
7	repository.mercubuana.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
8	repository.uin-suska.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
9	Denny Siregar, Purwahyudi Suwardiyanto, Darmono Umar. "Analisis Perhitungan OEE	<1%

	dan Menentukan Six Big Losses pada Mesin Spot Welding Tipe X", Journal of Industrial and Engineering System, 2020 Publication	
10	Musa, Mohd Azam, Nazrul Idzham Kasim, Akhtar Razul Razali, Mahadzir, and Wan Ahmad Najmuddin Wan Saidin. "Improvement of Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) through Implementation of Autonomous Maintenance in Crankcase Line", Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2015. Publication	<1 %
11	www.researchgate.net Internet Source	<1 %
12	Submitted to University of Wales Institute, Cardiff Student Paper	<1 %
13	P. Nelson Raja. "Overall line effectiveness – a performance evaluation index of a manufacturing system", International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management, 2010 Publication	<1 %
14	Submitted to President University Student Paper	<1 %
15	iptek.its.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %

16	Pengyao Sun, Haiyong Wang, Jiaxin Huang, Wenmeng Ling, Yuhe Liao, Chenguang Wang. "Competitive adsorption of alcohols over heteroatom zeolites hinders the catalytic conversion of sugar", Applied Catalysis A: General, 2023 Publication	<1 %
17	ir.library.oregonstate.edu Internet Source	<1 %
18	Masaya TAKAHASHI, Takeshi TANIGAWA, Naoko TACHIBANA, Keiko MUTOU, Yoshiko KAGE, Lawrence SMITH, Hiroyasu ISO. "Modifying Effects of Perceived Adaptation to Shift Work on Health, Wellbeing, and Alertness on the Job among Nuclear Power Plant Operators", Industrial Health, 2005 Publication	<1 %
19	Much. Djunaidi, Calvin Athallaric, Hafidh Munawir. "The Effectiveness Level Analysis of Flask Less Molding Machine Using Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) as An Improvement of Machine Productivity", Jurnal Ilmiah Teknik Industri, 2022 Publication	<1 %
20	ejbmr.org Internet Source	<1 %

	approach to lean and green operations", Journal of Cleaner Production, 2019 Publication	
21	www.youtube.com Internet Source	<1%
22	C.B. Senthilkumar, S. Nallusamy. "Enrichment of quality rate and output level in a medium scale manufacturing industry by implementation of appropriate quality tools", Materials Today: Proceedings, 2021 Publication	<1%
23	T. Modiba, A Telukdarie. "Maintenance Strategy Optimization of a Thermal Power Plant", 2021 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM), 2021 Publication	<1%
24	multanex.pl Internet Source	<1%
25	repository.uin-suska.ac.id Internet Source	<1%

AI BASED PLAIGIRISM CHECKING RESULT



ABSTRACT

The Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) is a critical benchmark for a toy manufacturing company. OEE is a measure that assesses the performance, availability, and quality of equipment and production processes. In the Toy Manufacturing Company, there are several wastes occurs and the OEE level is below world class standard based on the initial performance. This waste could result in output levels that are too low and fail to reach the goal by January 2023. According to the problem analysis, two issues of push failure and material congestion have a significant impact on performance degradation. These issues will be the subject of this research. Analysis of the data is focused on identifying the causes and effects of the six big losses using TPM implementation to improve the percentage of OEE. After identifying the issue and to improve the current condition, the corrective measures can enhance the OEE rate from 73% in January to 81% in February and 95% in March while reducing all types of losses from occurring.

Keywords: Auto Basic Grooming, OEE, Total Productive Maintenance (TPM), Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE), Six Big Losses, Cause and Effect Diagram.

TABLE OF CONTENT

PANEL OF EXAMINER APPROVAL ii

THESIS ADVISOR RECOMMENDATION LETTER iii

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY iv

SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATION APPROVAL FOR ACADEMIC INTEREST v

ADVISOR APPROVAL FOR JOURNAL/INSTITUTION'S REPOSITORY vi

SIMILARITY CHECKING RESULT ix

AI BASED PLAIGIRISM CHECKING RESULT xii

ABSTRACT xiv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT xv

TABLE OF CONTENT xvi

LIST OF TABLES xix

LIST OF FIGURES xxi

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Problem Background 1

1.2 Problem Statement 3

1.3 Research Objectives 4

1.4 Scope 4

1.5 Assumptions 4

1.6 Research Outline 4

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW 6

2.1 Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) 6

2.1.1 Pillars of TPM 7

2.2 Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) 11

2.2.1 Availability 12

2.2.2 Performance Rate 12

2.2.3 Quality Rate 13

2.3 Six Big Losses 13

2.4 Cause and Effect Diagram (Fishbone Diagram) 15

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 19

3.1 Research Methodology 19

3.1.1 Initial Observation 20

3.1.2 Problem Identification 21

3.1.3 Literature Study 21

3.1.4 Data Collection 21

3.1.5 Data Analysis 23

3.1.6 Conclusion and Recommendation 24

3.2 Research Framework 24

CHAPTER IV: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 27

4.1 Process and Product Description 27

4.1.1 Production Process 27
4.1.2 Machine and Process Description 29
4.1.3 Operating Time Machine 32
4.1.4 Production Target 32
4.2 Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) Calculation 33
4.2.1 Availability Rate 34
4.2.2 Performance Rate 38
4.2.3 Quality Rate 43
4.2.4 Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) 47
4.3 Six Big Losses 50
4.3.1 Breakdown/Equipment Failure 52
4.3.2 Setup and Adjustment 52
4.3.3 Idling and Minor Stoppage 52
4.3.4 Reduced Speed 52
4.3.5 Startup Rejects 53
4.3.6 Production Rejects 53
4.4 Cause and Failure Effect Diagram (Fishbone Diagram) 54
4.5 Six Big Losses Fishbone Diagram 58
4.5.1 Machine and Tooling 59
4.5.2 Method 60
4.5.3 Material 60

4.5.4 Man 61

4.6 Recommendation Improvement and Implementation 61

4.6.1 Machine and Tooling 62

4.6.2 Method 65

4.6.3 Material 66

4.6.4 Man 66

4.6.5 Autonomous Maintenance 67

4.6.6 Training and Briefing Operator 70

4.7 Before and After Analysis 71

4.7.1 OEE Rate Comparison 72

4.7.2 Availability Rate Comparison 72

4.7.3 Performance Rate Comparison 75

4.7.4 Quality Rate Comparison 77

4.8 OEE Rate Comparison 80

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION 83

5.1 Conclusion 83

5.2 Recommendation 84

REFERENCE 85

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3. 1 Project Organization 20

Table 4.1 Operating Time Machine 32
Table 4.2 Total Amount Produced in January 2023 32
Table 4.3 Downtime Machine in January 2023 (minutes) 34
Table 4.4 Operating Time Machine in January 2023 (minutes) 35
Table 4.5 Availability Machine in January 2023 37
Table 4.6 Amount Produced Machine in January 2023 38
Table 4.7 Standard Output Per Hour (Pieces) 39
Table 4.8 Operating Time Machine in January 2023 40
Table 4.9 Performance Rate Machine in January 2023 42
Table 4.10 Amount Produced Per Machine in January 2023 44
Table 4.11 Total Defect Per Machine in January 2023 45
Table 4.12 Total Amount Produced in January 2023 46
Table 4.13 Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) Per Machine 47
Table 4.14 Six Big Losses January 2023 51
Table 4. 15 Why and Answer Machine and Tooling 59
Table 4. 16 Why and Answer Method 60
Table 4. 17 Why and Answer Material 60
Table 4. 18 Why and Answer Man 61
Table 4. 19 Six Big Losses Comparison 71
Table 4.20 Downtime Comparison (minutes) 73
Table 4. 21 Availability Rate Comparison 74
Table 4. 22 Availability Rate Comparison (cont.) 75
Table 4.23 Performance Rate Comparison (minutes) 76
Table 4.24 Defect Comparison 78
Table 4.25 Quality Rate Comparison 79
Table 4.26 OEE Rate Comparison 80

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 TPM Pillar 11
Figure 2.2 OEE World Class Standard 13
Figure 2.3 Six Big Losses Category 15
Figure 2.4 Cause and Effect Diagram (Fishbone Diagram) 17

Figure 3.1 Research Methodology 19
Figure 3.2 Research Framework 25

Figure 4.1 Piloting Stages of Doll Manufacturing 27
Figure 4.2 Production Process in Toy Manufacturing 29
Figure 4.3 Auto Basic Grooming Machine 31
Figure 4.4 Before and After Grooming Process of Machine 31
Figure 4.5 Target Produced and Actual Produced in January 2023 32
Figure 4.6 OEE in January 2023 33
Figure 4.7 OEE Comparison 48
Figure 4.8 OEE Actual and World Class Standard Standard 49
Figure 4.9 OEE Trend of Availability, Performance, and Quality Rate 50
Figure 4.10 Six Big Losses Diagram 51
Figure 4.11 Fishbone Diagram Breakdown/Equipment Failure 54
Figure 4.12 Fishbone Diagram Setup and Adjustment 55
Figure 4.13 Fishbone Diagram Idling and Minor Stoppage 56
Figure 4.14 Fishbone Diagram Reduced Speed 56
Figure 4.15 Fishbone Diagram Startup Reject 57
Figure 4.16 Fishbone Diagram Production Rejects 58
Figure 4.17 Fishbone Diagram Six Big Losses 59
Figure 4.18 Actual Condition of Machine 62
Figure 4.19 New Design Plat Retaining Valve 63
Figure 4.20 Propose Trash of Leftover Hair 63
Figure 4.21 Actual Condition of Aquadest Place 64

Figure 4.22 Safety Place of Aquadest 65
Figure 4.23 Matrix Toy Based on Type 65
Figure 4.24 Spraying Aquadest to Hair 66
Figure 4.25 Autonomous Maintenance Checklist 68
Figure 4.26 Training and Briefing Operator 70
Figure 4.27 Six Big Losses Comparison Graph 72
Figure 4.28 Downtime Comparison Graph 74
Figure 4.29 Availability Rate Comparison Graph 75
Figure 4.30 Performance Rate Comparison Graph 77
Figure 4.31 Defect Comparison Graph 78
Figure 4.32 Quality Rate Comparison Graph 80
Figure 4.33 OEE Rate Comparison Graph 81