Keurig DrPepper[™]

Joe Boateng, Malik Murray, Cody Ramangkoun, Clayton Todd, Rachel Ware, and Abbey Randolph

Introduction

Keurig Dr. Pepper (KDP) is a leading producer and distributor of hot and cold beverages with a 24/7 production plant in Knoxville, TN. Our team has been working with KDP to determine

- Processes
- Practices
- Equipment

needed to reduce and sustain their **overall** scrap rate from **1.8% down to 1.0%**

Definition

production KDP five-step has а process that most loads are subject to once they enter the facility (**Figure 1**).

To reduce the overall average scrap rate, our team evaluated each of the processes to locate which area is significantly contributing to this high scrap rate. Using

Our team



Given the results of our fishbone diagram, we then established quantifiable action items that would provide improvement to the identified areas and their intersection within the packaging process.



Production Process Flowchart



Figure 1- Production Process Flow Diagram

Keurig Dr. Pepper: Reducing Scrap off Production Lines

Initiation

fishbone diagram used as а a brainstorming technique to determine the root causes of waste. Alongside this diagram, we used the 5 WHYS investigative technique. At the end, our discussion ended with the heaviest content in: Machine, Material, and Man/Brain Power.

> Weight Control Data Analysis

Our team was able to analyze weight data pertaining to one of the most problematic lines within the process. We compared the data of five brands before and after the installation of the new auger tubes. After analyzing, we were able to determine the standard deviation decreased by at least 29% for every product with one product even experiencing a 70% decrease. Thus, confirming the new auger tubes are helping control the weights of the pods.



Planning

Design of Experiments (DOE) Our team devised a series of experiments to determine the optimal settings for KDP's installation of new lipless auger tubes. The experimentation was executed in two separate series. In the first series, we tested 8 runs of high/low setting combinations with an added 9th run considering the center points. These 9 runs were replicated 5 times, and the results of the 45 experiments are shown in the table and graph below.



After analyzing the results of our first experimentation, we were able to create a linear model for the response surface and use the steepest decent minimization technique to calculate the setting intervals for our second run of experiments. Upon running the second run, we were able to determine the optimal settings for the auger tubes.

Execution

		Rejects @					
x2	x3	2000	4000	6000	8000	10000	Total Rej
1	1	20	48	43	48	29	188
0	0	27	39	24	22	58	170
1	-1	45	26	59	14	23	167
-1	1	14	12	8	11	104	149
1	1	17	9	19	17	20	82
-1	1	18	16	20	11	12	77
1	-1	18	28	3	10	13	72
-1	-1	16	11	6	6	5	44
-1	-1	2	7	13	12	9	43
¢		177	196	195	151	273	992
	0						





p	6.79			
pk	5.76			
pU	7.83			
pL	5.76			
pm	1.21			
r	0.15			
Target/∆Z	0.66			
p	1.45			
pk	1.23			
рU	1.67			
pL	1.23			
kewness	0.67			
tdev	0.07			
lin	11.95			
lax	12.23			
ange	0.280			
Bench	17.28			
Defects	0.0%			
PM	0.00			
xp PPM ST	0.00	2		
xp PPM LT	116.58			
igma	6.00			
.77.0.05				
		-		1
9.3.3	2.8	N	No	þ
YY	$\gamma \gamma$	Y	Y Y	





