

Close an NCR with verified action against recurrence

Separate containment, correction and cause-based corrective action, then verify effectiveness over relevant opportunities rather than closing on paperwork.



A new label does not restore an overdue gauge

Fictional case: gauge G18 is overdue for calibration and has been used in recent inspections. The core lesson already requires removing it from use, authorized calibration/status verification, review of affected measurement/product exposure and investigation of the scheduling weakness. Coordinator Mina must turn those responsibilities into a defensible NCR response.

Your role and the reference condition

Quality-system coordinator with metrology and product-quality owners

Normal: The nonconformance, exposure, current correction, causal evidence, system action and effectiveness decision are distinct and traceable.

Gap: The initial response replaces the sticker and says staff were reminded. It does not show calibration, prior impact review or why the schedule failed.

Work within these conditions

1. No technical calibration procedure or universal NCR closure deadline is supplied.
2. The response is an original training record, not an official Nadcap form or accreditation decision.

Fictional teaching case. Supplied observations support the exercise; proposed actions are not verified customer results.

See how the method works

An NCR response separates the detected problem from the system that allowed it. Correction addresses the instance; containment limits exposure while facts are established. For an overdue gauge, changing a label alone does not restore calibration. Follow the authorized process to remove it from use, complete required calibration and status verification, and assess affected measurement records. Investigate the scheduling cause, implement a supported system change and verify effectiveness over relevant opportunities for recurrence. Retain the records and required approvals. This is an original teaching structure, not an official response form or deadline, and effectiveness evidence cannot guarantee that recurrence is impossible.



Method exhibit: Nonconformance + exposure, Correction + containment, Test cause, Implement action, Verify effectiveness.

Follow the evidence and decisions

Inspect the supplied case inputs

Evidence	Supplied status
Gauge	G18 overdue and removed from use
Recent measurements	Records must be identified and assessed
Calibration/status restoration	Authorized work and verification required
Scheduling explanation	Reminder process suspected; cause not yet verified
Proposed closure	New label/reminder alone insufficient

01 / Define the nonconformance and immediate exposure

Mina records G18's identity, overdue status and known use period, then asks the responsible team to locate affected measurement records and product. The gauge remains unavailable pending authorized status restoration.

Why: Containment limits continued exposure; it does not answer whether past measurements were valid. The scope must be based on records rather than a convenient recent date.

Evidence / check: The NCR names the gauge, known use and unresolved exposure boundary.

02 / Correct the actual condition

Authorized metrology personnel perform the required calibration/assessment and verify the gauge's usable status under the applicable method. Any amended label reflects that evidence rather than replacing it.

Why: A label is an indicator, not the technical work itself. Correction restores the identified condition; it does not necessarily prevent recurrence.

Evidence / check: Retained calibration/status evidence supports the correction.

03 / Test the scheduling explanation

Mina compares due-date records, responsibility changes, reminder delivery and escalation behavior. She distinguishes a missed message from a system that has no accountable response when a message is missed.

Why: "Operator forgot" describes an event but may leave the enabling condition unexplained. A cause claim needs corroborating evidence and consideration of competing explanations.

Evidence / check: The investigation states what records support or contradict the scheduling hypothesis.

04 / Implement an action addressing supported cause

If evidence confirms an unowned escalation path, the team assigns ownership, tests due-item visibility and defines how unresolved overdue status prevents use under the applicable system. The actual action follows the verified cause.

Why: An unrelated improvement or general retraining can leave the failure mechanism intact. Proposed controls must be distinguished from implemented and tested ones.

Evidence / check: The action record links the supported cause to a specific system change and owner.

05 / Verify over meaningful opportunities

Mina defines upcoming calibration due events and checks whether the new process identifies, escalates and resolves them before unauthorized use. She retains unsuccessful results and reassesses the action if needed.

Why: No recurrence during a period with no due events proves little. Effectiveness needs relevant opportunities, not merely elapsed days or a completed email.

Evidence / check: Closure evidence includes the opportunities observed and the limits of the conclusion.

Completed NCR response logic

Response part	Required evidence	Boundary / insufficient substitute
Containment	G18 removed; exposure identified	Does not settle past impact
Correction	Authorized calibration/status verification	Does not establish the cause
Cause/action	Supported scheduling weakness and implemented control	A generic reminder is insufficient
Effectiveness	Relevant due-event results	Elapsed time without opportunity is insufficient

Calibration finds an adverse condition

The authorized assessment finds a condition that may affect earlier measurements.

Decision

Use the applicable measurement/product-impact process to evaluate exposure and disposition, retaining the finding and decisions. Do not assume the scheduling fix resolves historical product risk.

Reasoning

Current correction, past impact and recurrence prevention are connected but separate responsibilities.

What would change the decision?

The NCR links technical findings to the product-impact owner and retained decisions.

Practise with a changed case

A reminder was sent but no due event occurred

New fictional NCR action adds an escalation owner. After two weeks the team reports no overdue gauges, but none became due in that period.

Evidence	Status
System change	Owner assigned and workflow configured
Elapsed period	Two weeks
Relevant due events	Zero
Claim	Effectiveness proven

Your task

1. Distinguish implementation evidence from effectiveness evidence.
2. Design a bounded verification using relevant opportunities or an approved challenge.
3. State a truthful current closure status without inventing a mandatory deadline.

Use the next page to record your reasoning before reading the answer.

Your practice worksheet

A reminder was sent but no due event occurred

Cause-action link

Implemented evidence

Verification opportunity

Observed result

Remaining decision

Complete your reasoning before turning to the answer. Use the separate learner workbook for group practice.

Check your reasoning and transfer it

1. The configuration and ownership record support implementation; zero due events do not establish effectiveness in handling a due item.
2. Plan verification over relevant upcoming events and, where appropriate, an authorized workflow challenge. Current status should say action implemented, effectiveness evidence pending, with the responsible owner and review plan.

Suggested completed record

Evidence	Supports	Does not establish
Configured workflow	Implementation	Handling of a real due event
Two quiet weeks	No observed recurrence in that period	Effectiveness with zero opportunities
Next verification	Relevant event/challenge plan	A fabricated successful result

Plausible wrong turns

1. Relabeling alone does not correct overdue calibration.
2. No recurrence without opportunity is weak effectiveness evidence.

Evidence of a sound answer

1. Keep correction and corrective action distinct.
2. Link the action to evidence of cause.
3. Define meaningful verification opportunities.

Take the learning back to work

Commitment	Agreed follow-through
Owner	Quality-system owner with metrology and product quality
Record	NCR, exposure assessment, correction, cause/action and effectiveness records
Review	At defined response reviews and relevant calibration opportunities
Verification evidence	Technical status restored, impact assessed and recurrence control tested
If unresolved	Reopen investigation or redesign the action when evidence contradicts the cause or the new control fails.

Help someone else apply the method

Prepare

1. Gauge/status and schedule records
2. Blank NCR logic map
3. Separate implementation/effectiveness cards

Minutes	Activity and coaching prompt
5	Separate the responsibilities Which action restores the gauge and which addresses recurrence?
8	Test the cause What would contradict the reminder hypothesis?
10	Assess the quiet fortnight What opportunity was actually observed?
5	Debrief closure Which decisions remain open?

Debrief

1. Challenge a label-only correction and a reminder-only cause action.
2. Require an honest pending status when effectiveness evidence is absent.

Individual or remote practice

Write the response in four distinct evidence paragraphs before evaluating its completeness.

Connect the method and check its boundaries

Before application

1. A documented nonconformance and exposure scope
2. Evidence and ownership for investigation

Outside this lesson

1. An official NCR response form or deadline
2. Proof that recurrence is impossible

PRI: Industry-managed-program RCCA learning resource

PRI: Industry-managed-program RCCA learning resource

RCCA connects causes, corrective action and evidence of effectiveness; the original example here is not an official response form.

Program-specific response requirements and authorized decisions still apply.

ASQ: Root cause analysis

ASQ: Root cause analysis

Investigation should establish causes using evidence and connect them to effective actions.

A method overview does not establish the cause or closure status of this fictional NCR.

Open this lesson and its visual aids