

Scheduling case study – Ti LD Full delivery

- 48 Ti Full bare plates received from Madras
- 47 pieces passed our QC measurements
- 3 pieces made without Tape for UCSB (end-of-life study)
- 1 piece had a broken piece of Kapton → 43 Ti LD Full pieces sent to TTU/CMU
 - Turnaround time of 7 working days.

	Jun. 4 (Wed)	Jun. 5 (Thurs)		Jun.6 (Fri)	Long weekend	Jun.10 (Tues)	Jun.11 (Wed)		Jun.12 (Thurs)		Jun13 (Fri)
9:00		Meas. x18 Yaya	Tape (other) Obi	Inspection x20 Yi-Mu			Lam. x 19 Gregor, Sven	Post qc. Meas. x17 Yi-Mu	Inspection x27 Obi,Yaya		Final packaging x43 Yi-Mu, Jay
10:00				Recovery x6 Yi-Mu							
11:00											
12:00									Post qc. Meas. x27 Yaya		
13:00	Measurement x14 pieces Waldemar	Meas. x15 Waldemar	Lam. x 20 Christian Yeongseo	Post qc. Measure x3 (Jay)			Lam. x 8(+8) Obi, Yaya		Rec. x16 Christian	Tape x43 Yi-Mu	
14:00				UCSB shipment x3							
15:00											
16:00		Meas. (other) Waldemar							Final indexing x43 (Christian, Yi-Mu)		

Scheduling – some discussion

- This past week was optimized for turn-around, not throughput.
 - Additional items produced in parallel:
 - TapingTi Partial (For UCSB ~40 pieces)
 - CuW Full pieces x 8
- **Some concerns:**
 - **Bare plate Measurement** is taking as long as the **lamination step**
We should not need this step in the future
 - **Post QC inspection/Recovery** is taking as long as the **lamination step**
For high throughput, we would collect multiple items for larger recovery shift
 - **Post QC measurements** is taking less time than **bare measurements**
Bare measurements processes are more brittle due to profile requirements

Most common failure - delamination

Most common failure that takes up recovery time is pad/edge delamination.

- **Tried:** Attempt to fix with by introducing glue overflow along with mousebit reinforcements
- **Problem:** overflow ammount is difficult to quantify and control
- Will try a new dispensing processes this afternoon (roll application on side face)