

3. Perception of loss Market Share

not area of
team focus,
won't change
direction either
way

- What type of cigarette is a loose end/
loosely packed to the consumer?
- Eliminate consumer receiving this type
of product.

4. Perception of non-optimized particle size distribution

incl. fundamental
+ empirical

- Establish full time team to determine
optimum particle size for:

- Size
- * Blend: stalk position
SPD ball & composition of these
- Moisturize/Condition

1. The "Best" Cigt. - Regards to weight/End quality

2. The cheapest to manufacture given current
processes & makers/packer.

3. Recommend process changes to
optimize cigt. & processes.

5. Increase in domestic & TI complaints on loosely
packed.

- Determine if complaint trend is real
based on the numerous questions on data
reliability

- Determine if complaints come from certain
markets or smokers of certain brands
- Establish "zero" defect goal - establish

$$p_i = f(\cancel{a}, b, \cancel{c})$$

6. Perception that cost driven design/Process changes
— caused loosely packed

physical design
attributes are
important too!

- Determine cigt. Rod/Tobacco design that optimizes weight/loosely packed.
- Determine optimum particle size - #4
- Determine other tobacco characteristics - FC, Expansion, Stiffness, ? desired
- Implement design/process improvements - reverse detrimental changes

7. Competitors processes are better/different

- Thoroughly evaluate all R&R/TI process vs. cigt end quality

"Benchmarking"
- Short term

- Obtain tobacco characteristics (Part. size, FC, etc) of competitors from vendor/supplier questioning
- Identify "Best Design/Process" - Target our process to exceed.

8. Inadequate measurement

- Get QA engaged in the issue
- Get competitive data on a timely bases.
- Determine 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 by QA

Global Opinions On Priority Items

- Item 3 is not important to the focus of this team.
- Item 4, with its associated parts, should be the primary focus of this team.
- Items 1, 2, and 8 re-enforce the need for a reliable measurement criteria. We lack data to chart courses of action to solve the problem.
- Item 5 is simply a statement of fact, the level of outgoing quality is a separate expense.
- Item 6 may provide opportunity for reversal of recent changes ~~which~~ ^{that} changes have caused a negative impact on the loosely packed problem.
- Item 7 should be pursued from a "benchmarking" perspective as a subset of Item 4.

"A"

1. RJR - too many crumbs

where are you?

- Determine which RJR brands are inferior to like competitive brands - QA Testing - S.

Spec. based
or want to
correct it?

- Establish a crumb limit spec. or standard using "after shipment" Borgwald test based on competitive data - S.

- Determine particle size and type of tobacco of crumbs in the pack - L.

⊙ Determine if age or market conditions effect loosely packed - L

process change
to a limit

- Eliminate this tobacco component thru process changes (increase particle size, screen, divert to B-7, divert to Propane expansion - L.
- Implement binders to hold fine tobaccos. - S/L.

2. RJR - too many loose ends

meas.

- Quantify a "loose end" - Reliable measurement - S
Develop method to reproduce product like consumer is getting.
- Determine which RJR brands are inferior to like brands - S

Spec.

- Establish a loose end spec. or standard using "after shipment" test. based on comp data - S

cause?

- Determine rod₁ characteristics which cause loose ends.

correction

- Design cigarettes to "end quality" not firmness.

51305 6811