

SIX SIGMA

6

PRENTICE
HALL

"Joe Ficalora has done an excellent job of updating Cohen's classic text on Quality Function Deployment to show how Six Sigma tools can be effectively used in applying the QFD methodology and how valuable QFD can be in Design for Six Sigma projects. I highly recommend it to practitioners of both disciplines. They will be well rewarded by using this book to guide them in delighting their customers."


—John L. Schoonover, Director of Quality, Global Tungsten and Powders

Quality Function Deployment and SIX SIGMA

A QFD Handbook

Second Edition

Kano Ordering of Needs



Foreword by Stephen A. Zinkgraf

JOSEPH P. FICALORA • LOUIS COHEN

Many of the designations used by manufacturers and sellers to distinguish their products are claimed as trademarks. Where those designations appear in this book, and the publisher was aware of a trademark claim, the designations have been printed with initial capital letters or in all capitals.

The authors and publisher have taken care in the preparation of this book, but make no expressed or implied warranty of any kind and assume no responsibility for errors or omissions. No liability is assumed for incidental or consequential damages in connection with or arising out of the use of the information or programs contained herein.

The publisher offers excellent discounts on this book when ordered in quantity for bulk purchases or special sales, which may include electronic versions and/or custom covers and content particular to your business, training goals, marketing focus, and branding interests. For more information, please contact:

U.S. Corporate and Government Sales
(800) 382-3419
corpsales@pearsontechgroup.com

For sales outside the United States, please contact:

International Sales
international@pearson.com

Visit us on the Web: informit.com/ph

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ficalora, Joseph P.

Quality function deployment and Six Sigma : a QFD handbook / Joseph P. Ficalora, Louis Cohen.—2nd ed.

p. cm.

On t.p. of previous ed. Louis Cohen's name appeared first.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-13-513835-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Production planning. 2. Quality function deployment. 3. Six sigma (Quality control standard) I. Cohen, Lou, 1937- II. Cohen, Lou, 1937-Quality function deployment. III. Title.

TS176.C58 2009

658.5—dc22

2009021257

Copyright © 2010 Pearson Education, Inc.

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This publication is protected by copyright, and permission must be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or likewise. For information regarding permissions, write to:

Pearson Education, Inc.
Rights and Contracts Department
501 Boylston Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02116
Fax (617) 671-3447

ISBN-13: 978-0-13-513835-9

ISBN-10: 0-13-513835-3

Text printed in the United States on recycled paper at R. R. Donnelley in Crawfordsville, Indiana.

First printing, July 2009

Foreword

One of the byproducts of the old Total Quality Management ideology was the term Voice of the Customer (VOC). While this term became ubiquitous in the marketing and product-development worlds, it was a relatively empty term because there was no clear methodology defining the Voice of the Customer, nor any roadmap to obtaining valid information about customer wants and needs. That is, until Lou Cohen's first edition of this book.

Before then, VOC was overstated and not well understood. The mantra was, "We've got to get the Voice of the Customer." Everyone in the room would simultaneously nod their heads and readily agree. Then someone would wander up to marketing to get the VOC.

What resulted was the VOC that marketing thought represented the new market. It usually didn't. This phenomenon is readily apparent in the U.S. automotive industry. The major car companies are now in trouble largely because they completely missed the real VOC, which, by the way, the Japanese car companies nailed.

Lou Cohen's first edition of this book put Quality Function Deployment (QFD) on the map as an important method and, more importantly, as a useful tool by which VOC could be clearly defined as information upon which action could be readily taken.

So, why does there need to be a second edition of a fine original? Well, there's more to defining VOC than just QFD. QFD became fairly commonly used among design teams. While at AlliedSignal in the early 1990s, I worked with a team that was developing an innovative new application. The developers showed me their completed QFD with pride and announced, "We have the Voice of the Customer." When I asked how much of the QFD input was derived from actually talking to the prospective customers (mostly from Japan), I was met with blank stares.

The final result: The developer completely missed a new emerging market, because when they actually talked with customers, they found that the customer requirements they *thought* were real in fact weren't. There are a lot of things that need to happen before and after the QFD to create effective results.

Joe Ficalora has been able to integrate QFD with product design. He did this by first mastering Design for Six Sigma (DFSS), which includes QFD. The wonder of combining QFD and DFSS emerges when QFD tells designers what they need to accomplish and DFSS provides the tools by which new designs are executed to create a product that can actually be manufactured.

Joe has done an incredible job of (1) making QFD even more accessible, and (2) linking QFD to Six Sigma and DFSS. I was first exposed to QFD while at Motorola in the late 1980s. I found in my own use of QFD that I had to start with simple 2×2 matrices and graduate to the more complex House of Quality. If this second edition had been available in the late 1980s, I believe my evolution in QFD would have been light-years faster. Use this book as written and you will see immediate improvement in your product development design targets. And, of course, that will lead to growth, which is a good thing!

—Dr. Steve Zinkgraf
CEO, Sigma Breakthrough Technologies, Inc.

Preface

Over the last 40 years, companies in the United States have moved toward new styles of doing business in the face of overseas competitive pressures, the needs of global economics, and the ever-accelerating pace of new technologies. U.S. companies have taken many steps to become more competitive. Early on came the adoption of the Total Quality Management (TQM) approach or one of its many aliases, all of which have stressed customer-driven planning, continuous improvement, and employee empowerment.

A key component of TQM was the adoption of “tools” to assist in creative thinking and problem solving. These were not physical tools, such as computers or micrometers; rather, they were *methods* that relate ideas to ideas, ideas to data, and data to data; that encourage team members to communicate more effectively with each other; and that helped teams to effectively formulate business problems and their solutions.

Quality Function Deployment (QFD) was an adaptation of some of the TQM tools. In Japan in the late 1960s, QFD was invented to support the product-design process (for designing large ships, in fact). As QFD itself evolved, it became clear to QFD practitioners that it could be used to support service development as well.

Today, its application goes beyond product and service design, although those activities comprise most applications of QFD. QFD has been extended to apply to any planning process where a team has decided to systematically prioritize possible responses to a given set of objectives. The objectives are called the Whats,¹ and the responses are

1. Credit is generally given to Harold Ross (General Motors) and Bill Eureka (American Supplier Institute) for the What/How terminology, which is now widely used by QFD practitioners in the U.S.

called the Hows. QFD provides a method for evaluating How a team can best accomplish the Whats.

The basic problems of product design are universal: Customers have needs that relate to using products; the needs must be addressed by designers who have to make hundreds or thousands of technical decisions; and there are never enough people, time, and dollars to put everything that could be imagined into a product or service.

These problems confront the developers of automobiles, cameras, hot-line service centers, school curricula, and even software. QFD can be used to help development teams decide how best to meet customer needs with available resources, regardless of the technology underlying the product or service.

Customers have their own language for expressing their needs. Each development team has *its* own language for expressing its technology and its decisions. The development team must make a translation between the customer's language and its technical language. QFD is a tool that helps teams systematically map out the relationships between the two languages.

The QFD experience has been generally glossed over, as if the process can run itself. Nothing could be further from the truth! Many QFD horror stories have at their root the uninformed decisions of an inexperienced QFD facilitator. The possibilities for wasting time and leading a team into a cul-de-sac are endless.

On the other hand, many QFD success stories have at their root the creative decisions of a capable QFD facilitator. The opportunities for helping teams save time and arrive at breakthroughs are abundant.

Who Should Read This Book

This second edition is meant to bridge the gap between traditional Quality Function Deployment (QFD) and the rise of Lean Six Sigma over the 15 years since the first edition was written. This book is written as a QFD reference for the many Black Belts and Green Belts in Six Sigma and Design for Six Sigma (DFSS).² It also fulfills a need for the many engineers, managers, and engineering supervisors who wish to improve their companies' new-product development processes by including QFD, by itself or with deployment of Lean Six Sigma or DFSS. The original great work by Lou Cohen has been retained for the most part, and I have updated it to include some of the key tools, approaches, linkages and methodologies of Six Sigma, including DFSS.

2. The author's blog on DFSS can be useful if you have not read about this before: See www.dfss4u.com. Also recommended is the SBTI Web site's page on DFSS: www.sbtionline.com/OurServices/GrowthExcellence/DFSS.php.

For the novice, it might be worthwhile to read the last chapter first, as it contains a case study involving both QFD and elements of DFSS. That example is one I am intimately familiar with, for it represents my first venture into energy alternatives, namely solar power. For those versed in the QFD side of the methodologies, this second edition presents some of the links to Six Sigma and DFSS. For Six Sigma and DFSS practitioners, this second edition will help show how QFD should be put to use in your projects and tool sequences.

My Experience with QFD, Product Development, and DFSS

I first came across QFD as a methodology in the late 1980s, during my design and development efforts while at AlliedSignal, now Honeywell Corporation. At that time, I had over 10 years' engineering experience and was an optical designer leading a design team for a new family of products. QFD was introduced and taught to us. The matrix approach seemed like a great way to keep track of the multitude of requirements and relationships that drive design decisions during the course of product development. However, when it was introduced, we were taught that Marketing could fill out the customer needs and weight them as to importance. It became obvious to me that such a course of action could possibly get us off-track from the outset of the design and development efforts. In those days, most engineering personnel were not allowed to travel with the Marketing folks to the customers and find out first-hand what customers wanted or needed. I was fortunate to work in an organization that was not so limited in its thinking. At AlliedSignal, Dr. David Zomick, the late William J. Mitchell, and Ernest Lademann created an atmosphere of cooperation between Engineering and Marketing wherein engineers could travel with marketing personnel to customer locations. I learned a lot from these three men about how to link customer needs to design decisions. QFD then helped me personally to understand how to strengthen and document the linkages between customers needs and design decisions; we ultimately created a new product family that flourished and grew in size, employing many people.

When I left corporate employment for management consulting in 1998, I found many of the tools from Six Sigma being deployed into engineering and development activities. At some point, people began calling this Design for Six Sigma. When Sigma Breakthrough Technologies, Inc. (SBTI) created its DFSS program in 1997, QFD was a key part of the comprehensive approach. It has remained so ever since. I have been the product-line owner for our extensive DFSS offerings and customizations for the last few years. In each customized deployment of DFSS, QFD has been retained due to its inherent value in product and service development. I have enjoyed seeing how clients apply the QFD aspect of DFSS to their design and development efforts, and witnessing the many valuable outcomes.

The chance to add to the fine first-edition QFD book that Lou Cohen had written was one I did not wish to pass up. Lou's book highlighted many of the practical how-tos that were missing for me when I was first introduced to QFD as a product-design engineer. The QFD Handbook portion of this book focuses on the *doing* of QFD. This book also addresses other aspects of QFD as well: Parts of this text explain what QFD is, and how QFD can fit in with other organizational activities.

The QFD Handbook section is fairly unique in that it provides detailed information on how QFD can successfully be implemented, along with a wide range of choices for customizing QFD, with their advantages and disadvantages. My original goal for this work was to make the QFD implementation path easier and more accessible to practitioners. If this text continues to serve that purpose, then QFD will be used more widely in the United States, and we can hope for better products, better services, and greater market share as a result.

How to Read This Book

This book is divided into five parts. Each part looks at QFD from a different perspective.

Part I, About QFD and Six Sigma, provides motivation for QFD and puts it into perspective within the framework of the global business environment. It gives the briefest of overviews of what QFD is. It's equivalent to the type of fifteen-minute management summary often given to describe QFD. Read this part if you are new to QFD, or if you would like to find out where it came from and how it has become so well known among product developers.

Part II, QFD at Ground Level, explains QFD in an expository fashion. It's a kind of textbook within a textbook. It explains each portion of the House of Quality (HOQ) in considerable detail. I hope it will be a useful reference for QFD implementers who are looking for detailed information about the HOQ. Read this part if you would like to be fully informed about the House of Quality.

Part III, QFD from 10,000 Feet, assumes the reader has some familiarity with QFD. It provides an organizational perspective on the way product and service development occurs. It shows how QFD can help organizations become more competitive by developing better products and services. Chapter 13 paints a picture of the way the world ought to be, and Chapter 14 discusses the world the way you may have experienced it. If you want to introduce QFD into an organization, you'll find the ideas in Part III to be helpful for developing your strategy for organizational change.

Part IV, QFD Handbook, is where the rubber meets the road. It assumes you have decided to implement QFD, and it shows you how to start, what to anticipate, and how

to finish successfully. Part IV assembles the accumulated lessons from the authors' mistakes and from those of many of our colleagues. Read this section before you try to implement QFD. We think it will be a good investment of your time.

Part V, Beyond the House of Quality, points the way to extensions of the HOQ that can take the development team all the way to the completion of its project. Although it is used predominantly for product planning, QFD has the potential to help the development team deploy the VOC into every phase of development. Part V describes some of the possible paths teams can take after completing the HOQ. It also includes some topics that may be of interest to only some readers. These include specialized adaptations of QFD for software and service development, as well as for organizational planning. Read this part if you are comfortable with QFD concepts and are ready to make QFD a key part of your development process. This section ends with a solar energy case study showcasing one of the many ways to integrate the VOC, QFD, and DFSS.

What Are QFD and Six Sigma?

This chapter provides an orientation to Quality Function Deployment (QFD) and Six Sigma. It begins with a brief overview of each of these topics. It then provides a chronology of events that led to the current state of QFD and its integration with Six Sigma in the United States. Finally, the chapter discusses some of the ways QFD is being used, independently and together with Six Sigma methodologies today, to provide a sense of the applicability and flexibility of the methods. Current best practices have evolved in the Six Sigma community to include Lean Manufacturing Methods and tools, and therefore is sometimes called Lean Six Sigma or Lean Sigma. For the sake of avoiding certain definition issues, the term Six Sigma will be used for a broad description of the Six Sigma methodologies described herein.

1.1 BRIEF CAPSULE DESCRIPTION

1.1.1 QUALITY FUNCTION DEPLOYMENT DEFINED

Just what is **Quality**? In English, as an adjective it means “excellent.” The original Japanese term for QFD has meanings of features or attributes too. Quality is determined by customer expectations, so you cannot have a quality product or a quality service without identifying your customers and discovering their expectations. The second word, **Function**, means how you will meet customer expectations, or how your products or services will function to meet them. The third word, **Deployment**, defines how you will

manage the flow of development efforts to make certain that customer expectations drive the development of your new products and services.

This book provides both formal and informal examples of QFD. In many ways, successful businesses large and small are applying QFD in formal and informal ways. No business can have continued success in the 21st Century without listening and responding to customers. Enabling the reader to learn how to do this better is the fundamental purpose of this book. In the words of W. Edwards Deming: “Learning is not compulsory, but neither is survival.”

QFD is a method for structured product or service planning and development that enables a development team to specify clearly the customer’s wants and needs, and then evaluate each proposed product or service capability systematically in terms of its impact on meeting those needs. QFD is fundamentally a quality *planning and management* process to drive to the *best possible product and service solutions*. A key benefit of QFD is that it helps product-introduction teams communicate to management what they intend to do, and to show their strategy in the planned steps forward. Management can then review these plans and allocate budget and other resources. QFD helps enable management to evaluate whether the product plans are worth the investment. Working through the QFD process together provides the important benefit of alignment—within the project team, and to management desires.

The QFD process tends to vary from practitioner to practitioner. In all cases, however, successful QFD work requires accurate assessment of customer needs. This begins with gathering the Voices of Customers (VOC), and ends with validating their needs. Some variant of the VOC process is included in most definitions of QFD, Six Sigma, Design for Six Sigma (DFSS), Marketing for Six Sigma (MFSS), Six Sigma Process Design (SSPD), and Technology for Six Sigma (TFSS). An illustration of this front-end work is provided in Figure 1-1.

Clearly, several steps must be followed to determine customer needs before beginning the matrix work that is often associated with the QFD process. QFD is a flawed exercise if it does not acquire well-defined and validated customer voices.

As mentioned above, the QFD process includes constructing one or more matrices (sometimes called **Quality Tables**). The first of these matrices is called the **House of Quality** (HOQ), shown in Figure 1-2. It displays the customer’s wants and needs (the VOC) along the left, and the development team’s technical response for meeting those wants and needs along the top. The matrix consists of several sections or sub-matrices joined together in various ways, each containing information that is related to the others (see Figure 1-3). As I have often said when teaching various Six Sigma tools, “Some tools flag the gaps, and others fill them.” QFD is a method that flags gaps in knowledge, capability, and understanding as the design team works through the various QFD elements. It also keeps track of how key product and process design decisions relate to customer needs.




Figure I-1 Front End of the QFD Process




Figure I-2 The House of Quality

Each of the labeled sections (1 through 8) is a structured, systematic expression of a product- or process-development team's perspective on an aspect of the overall planning process for a new product, service, or process. The numbering suggests one logical sequence for filling in the matrix.

Section 1 contains a structured list of customer wants and needs. The structure is usually determined through qualitative market research. The data is presented in the form of a tree diagram (defined and explained in Chapter 3).

Section 2 contains relative-importance ratings as determined by sampling customers for their priorities.

Section 3 contains two main types of information:

- Quantitative market data, including the customer's satisfaction levels with the organization's and its competition's current offerings
- Strategic goals for the new product or service

Section 4 contains, in the organization's technical language, a high-level description of the product or service it plans to develop. Normally, this technical description is generated from the customer's wants and needs in Section 1.

Section 5 contains the development team's judgments of the strength of the relationship between each element of its technical response and each customer want or need.

Section 6, Technical Correlations, is half of a square matrix, split along its diagonal and rotated 45°. Its resemblance to the roof of a house led to the term House of Quality becoming the standard designation for the entire matrix structure. Section 6 contains the development team's assessments of the implementation interrelationships between elements of the technical characteristics.

Section 7 contains a comparison of product or service metrics between your current offerings and that of competitors.

Section 8 contains relative weighting of customer needs versus how well you are performing on the relevant product and service metrics.

Section 8 contains three types of information:

- The computed rank ordering of the technical responses, based on the rank ordering of customer wants and needs from Section 2 and the relationships in Section 5
- Comparative information on the competition's technical performance
- Technical-performance targets

QFD authorities differ in the terminology they associate with the various parts of the House of Quality. I have tried to be consistent throughout this book, but in day-to-day usage, most people use various terms for sections of the HOQ. I have tried to indicate common alternate terminology whenever I have introduced a new term. There is no reason to be concerned about the lack of standardization; it rarely causes confusion.

Beyond the House of Quality, QFD optionally involves constructing additional matrices to further plan and manage the detailed decisions that must be made throughout the product or service development process. In practice, many development teams don't use these additional matrices. They are missing a lot. The benefits that the House of Quality provides can be just as significant to the development process after the initial planning phase. I urge you to use Part V of this book to become familiar with the later stages of

QFD, and then, with that knowledge available to you, to make an informed decision about how much of QFD your development project needs.

Figure 1-3 illustrates one possible configuration of a collection of interrelated matrices. It also illustrates a standard QFD technique for carrying information from one matrix into another. In Figure 1-3 we start with the HOQ, in this instance labeled 1: Product Planning. We place the Whats on the left of the matrix. Whats is a term often used to denote benefits or objectives we want to achieve. Most commonly, the Whats are the customer needs, the VOC data, but the development team's own objectives could also be represented as Whats. As part of the QFD process, the development team prioritizes the Whats by making a series of judgments based in part on market-research data. Many different techniques for determining these priorities are described later in this book.

Next, the development team generates the Hows and places them along the top of Matrix 1. The Hows are any set of potential responses aimed at achieving the Whats. Most commonly, the Hows are technical measures of performance of the proposed product or service. The relating of the Whats to the Hows is critical, because assumptions can sneak in that are unwarranted. This is why the VOC work preceding the definition of Whats is so crucial!

Based on the weights assigned to the Whats and the amount of impact each How has on achieving each What, the Hows are given priorities or weights, written at the bottom of the HOQ diagram. These weights are a principal result of the HOQ process.

In this simplified view, the second matrix is labeled 2: Product Design. This second matrix could as easily be labeled Service Design; or, if you are developing a complex Product System, it could comprise a sequence of matrices for System Design, Subsystem Design, and finally Component Design. To link the HOQ to Matrix 2, the development team places all, or the most important, of the HOQ Hows on the left of Matrix 2, and the




Figure 1-3 Interrelated Matrices

priorities of those Hows on the right. These HOQ Hows now become the Whats of Matrix 2, their relative importance to the development team having been determined in the HOQ process.

To achieve the Matrix 2 Whats, the development team needs a new, more technical or more detailed set of Hows, which are put at the top of Matrix 2. As before, the team uses the weights of the Matrix 2 Whats, and estimates the degree of relationship between the Matrix 2 Hows and the Matrix 2 Whats, to arrive at weights or priorities for the Matrix 2 Hows.

To link Matrix 2 to Matrix 3, the Matrix 2 Hows are transferred to the left of Matrix 3, becoming the Matrix 3 Whats. The weights of the Matrix 2 Hows are transferred to the right side of Matrix 3, and new Matrix 3 Hows are generated.

Each matrix in the chain represents a more-specific or more-technical expression of the product or service. In the classical model for QFD,¹ which was designed for the development of hardware products, the relationship of Whats to Hows in each matrix is as shown in Figure 1-3.

While this model mirrors the process of designing and manufacturing a physical product, similar models exist for developing services, for designing processes, and for developing software products. They are all covered in other parts of this book.

Other multiple-matrix QFD schemes are considerably more elaborate than the three-matrix scheme illustrated in Figure 1-3.² Some QFD schemes involve as many as thirty matrices that use the VOC's priorities to plan multiple levels of Design Detail, Quality Improvement Plans, Process Planning, Manufacturing Equipment Planning, and various Value Engineering plans. Some QFD experts believe that the use of additional matrices is not optional, and that the process should not be called QFD unless a series of matrices is constructed. In this book, however, we take a more liberal view; each team must make decisions on how far to go, considering the costs of function deployment versus the value delivered. We take the position that QFD delivers many possible benefits at many levels, and should be implemented at a level of detail appropriate to the task at hand.

Depending on the benefits a development team needs or is willing to work for, it will construct just the initial House of Quality, a large collection of interrelated matrices, or something in between. Teams will further customize their matrices to solve the problems they need to solve. From our point of view, it's all QFD. Adapting the old adage "science is what scientists do," we believe that "QFD is what QFD practitioners do."

1. Don Clausing, *Total Quality Development* (New York: ASME Press, 1994).

2. Bob King, *Better Designs in Half the Time: Implementing QFD Quality Function Deployment in America* (Methuen, Massachusetts: GOAL/QPC, 1987).

Matrix	What	How
House of Quality	Voice of the Customer	Technical Performance Measures
Subsystem Design Matrix	Technical Performance Measures	Piece-Part Characteristics
Piece-Part Design Matrix	Piece-Part Characteristics	Process Parameters
Process Design Matrix	Process Parameters	Production Operations

Figure 1-4 Classical Model for QFD Matrices

As we see in Figure 1-4, QFD is a tool that enables us to develop project priorities at various levels in the development process, given a set of priorities at the highest level (customer needs). QFD is not only a prioritization tool; it is also a **deployment tool**. What we mean by “deployment” is that QFD helps us to start with the highest level of Whats, generally the Voice of the Customer, and to deploy, or translate, that voice into a new language that opens the way for appropriate action. Every developer is familiar with this translation process and probably performs the translation informally all the time. QFD helps make the translation process explicit and systematic.

Finally, QFD provides a repository for product planning information. The repository is based on the structure of the QFD matrices. The matrices allow for entering the Voice of the Customer (and, in subsequent matrices, other deployed What and How information) and all related quantitative information, the Voice of the Developer and all related quantitative information, and the relationships between these voices. This information represents a succinct summary of the key product planning data. To be sure, very detailed elaboration of this information cannot fit in the QFD matrices and must be stored elsewhere. Documenting the matrices provides a golden thread throughout the design process, tracing the design decisions and tradeoffs and potential alternatives for enhanced offerings. The matrices can be viewed as a top-level view or directory to all the rest of the information. In fact, QFD has sometimes been described as a “visible memory of the corporation.”³

There are many other views of QFD, and many will be explored elsewhere in this book. For now, it will be useful to keep in mind these main ideas: QFD provides a formal linkage between objectives (What) and response (How); it assists developers in developing or deploying the Hows based on the Whats; it provides a systematic method of setting priorities; and it provides a convenient repository of the information.

3. Quote attributed to Max Jurosek, Ford Motor Company, in *Enhanced Quality Function Deployment* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study, n.d.). Series of five instructional videotapes.

1.2 WHAT IS SIX SIGMA?

If you are familiar with this term and methodology, you may want to skip this section. Readers new to this business strategy—and it is a business process—will want to read this section carefully, keeping in mind that it is only an introduction.

Six Sigma can be read about and still greatly misunderstood. In 2006, a shareholder of Honeywell proposed an item to be voted upon at the annual shareholder meeting that Honeywell drop a related use of the term as misleading stockholders and the general public. There are many detailed and descriptive texts on the subject so we will attempt to be brief here, mostly for the benefit of any readers who are new to these topics. I will attempt to describe Six Sigma in terms of its three most widely applied and published interpretations, namely as a metric, a project methodology, and finally as a company initiative.

1.2.1 SIX SIGMA: THE METRIC

We will describe Six Sigma as a metric in a very brief manner here, as other sources contain more-detailed descriptions.^{4,5} When Six Sigma was developed at Motorola in the 1980s, products were measured in terms of quality by counting their defects. For brevity's sake, we will define a defect for our purposes as anything not meeting customer expectations or requirements. Suppose for example that a customer requires on-time deliveries, specified as “no sooner than two days before promise date nor later than 1 day after promise date.” Any delivery made to that customer outside of that range is unacceptable, considered to have a **delivery defect**. Other examples include **packing defects**, such as missing or incorrect items; **shipping defects**, such as arrival with damage or missing paperwork; and, of course, **product defects** in performance or appearance. All defects should be counted if they create customer dissatisfaction or add cost to the business for inspection and correction. However, not all defects are equal: Some have more impact on customer satisfaction and cost than do others. Sound business prioritization must take precedence over simple defect counting as if all were equal.

The goal of Six Sigma can be stated as simple as: “to define, measure, analyze, improve, and control the sources of variations that create defects in the eyes of customers and the business.” The count of defects is a key metric. In fact, Motorola production operations focused for a time almost exclusively on reducing defects by an order of

4. Stephen A. Zinkgraf, *Six Sigma: The First 90 Days* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 2006).

5. Ian Wedgwood, *Lean Sigma: A Practitioner's Guide* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 2006).

magnitude over a specified period of time. If we declare that any defective item has at least one defect, then we can (loosely) state that the yield of any ongoing process is equal to 1 minus the sum of the defects created in that process:

$$\text{Yield} = 1 - \Sigma(\text{defects})$$

We can also count opportunities to create defects in a process. This might be as simple as counting the number of major steps in the process or as complex as looking in-depth at the number of opportunities for errors, mistakes, and non-conformities in the entire process. Whatever method is used, it is prudent to standardize and not change it. For assembled products, one of the best and simplest methods I have seen is to count the number of components for a product and multiply the total by three. The logic of this method is that each component can (1) be purchased correctly or incorrectly, (2) be assembled correctly or incorrectly, and then (3) perform correctly or incorrectly. Each purchased subassembly counts as only one component.

To normalize across different products and processes, the sigma metric involves counting defects and opportunities for defects, and then calculating a Sigma Value. An interim step is to calculate the **Defects per Million Opportunities** (DPMO) as:

$$\text{DPMO} = \Sigma(\text{defects}) \div \Sigma(\text{opportunities}) \times 10^6$$

We use DPMO to arrive at the Sigma Value. The higher the Sigma Value, the higher the quality. The table in Figure 1-5 equates Yield, equivalent defects per million opportunities or DPMO, and the Sigma Value.

We can see that when yields are in the range of 60 percent to 95 percent, we need few other measures to view improvement. However, as we approach 95 percent, our yield measure becomes fairly insensitive and it makes sense to find a more sensitive metric — hence Motorola's use of defect counting. If we further need to compare across vastly different product and process complexities, it makes sense to normalize by opportunity counts. Ultimately, as there are fewer defects to count, it is more important to move away from counting flaws to continuous-scaled measures of performance that tie well to customer satisfaction and product value.

So how do different products and services compare on Sigma Values? Figure 1-6 illustrates DPMO levels in parts-per-million (PPM) versus the Sigma Value.

How is the Sigma Value calculated? In short, it is the number of standard deviations from the mean of an equivalent normal distribution from a specified limit having the same defect rate as the one reported as DPMO. If we assume a defect occurs when any output is beyond the specification limit, then the odds of a defect at a Sigma Value of 6 are approximately 1 in 1 billion. *However*, defect measurements made in the short term are not entirely correlated with results over the long term. Over time, if left unchecked,

99.99966% Yield → 3.4 DPMO → 6 Sigma
99.9767% Yield → 233 DPMO → 5 Sigma
99.379% Yield → 6210 DPMO → 4 Sigma
93.32% Yield → 66807 DPMO → 3 Sigma
69.1% Yield → 308,537 DPMO → 2 Sigma

Figure I-5 Yield, DPMO, and Sigma Values




Figure I-6 Sigma Value versus DPMO, Scaled in PPM

process quality degrades with shifts and drifts in the average output value, inflation of the Sigma Value, or both. A rule of thumb is needed to account for output shifts or degradation over time. Though this is somewhat controversial, George Box has commented that he is glad some accounting for long-term shift is being done.

The rule that is usually applied is that over time, the average change is 1.5 standard deviations. This shift arises originally from work done on tolerance stack-ups and shifts.^{6,7,8} The switch to universal acceptance of this amount of shift is often based on empirical experience and not a theoretical construct.⁹ I have personally seen long-term shifts of the mean over time between 0 and 4 Sigma, and my best recommendation is to

6. A. Bender, "Benderizing Tolerances—A Simple Practical Probability Method of Handling Tolerances for Limit Stack-Ups," *Graphic Science* (Dec. 1962).

7. H. Evans, "Statistical Tolerancing: The State of Art, Part III: Shifts and Drifts," *Journal of Quality Technology* 7:2 (April 1975): 72.

8. M.J. Harry and R. Stewart, *Six Sigma Mechanical Design Tolerancing* (Scottsdale, Ariz.: Motorola Government Electronics Group, 1988).

9. Davis Bothe, "Statistical Reason for the 1.5 Sigma Shift," *Quality Engineering* 14(3) (2002), 479–487.

aim for 1.5 Sigma. If we reduce our Six Sigma distance by this amount, we get a 4.5 Sigma distance to the upper specification, and the resulting odds of being out of specification rise to 3.4 defects per million items. This is the defect rate number most often touted in Six Sigma quality descriptions. See Figure 1-7 for an illustration of the shift between short-term and long-term performance.

So now we have a Six Sigma metric description, albeit in an oversimplified way for those who are experienced in the craft. This metric can be used in many ways, from counting simple defects to performing simple measurements of product or service output. Knowing these measurements is a key step in delivering quality as measured in the eyes of customers.

1.2.2 SIX SIGMA: THE PROJECT METHODOLOGY

Six Sigma is more than just a metric; it is a project methodology as well. Often QFD is utilized as one of the tools within a Six Sigma project methodology. I view the difference between a tool and a methodology as follows:

- a methodology comprises several steps to achieve an aim or purpose, using multiple tools
- a tool comprises a single function, or multiple functions that may be applied in several ways

When Six Sigma is viewed as a process-improvement methodology, it typically follows a five-phase approach. This approach is sequenced as Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, and Control (DMAIC). Every Six Sigma process-improvement project follows this sequence, although it may involve taking several loops back, as it is a discovery process in search of causes and controls.




Figure 1-7 The Shift from Short-Term to Long-Term Performance

Six Sigma earns its clout by completing business projects aimed at significant process problems. These problems are identified by an organization in two ways: either top down or bottom up. The bottom-up approach is to listen to customer complaints and/or list internal chronic problems. The top-down approach is to set aggressive business cost-reduction goals and then refine them to a manageable level. Projects are defined around these issues, and all follow the general phases DMAIC. For more on this “project-linked-to-business-goals” approach, see for example *Six Sigma: The First 90 Days* (2006) by Dr. Stephen Zinkgraf.¹⁰

Within each of the DMAIC phases, key tools are applied to solve the process problems encountered in the project. Project leaders are called either Black Belts or Green Belts in general. Black Belts usually lead the higher-value, higher-risk, higher-visibility, more-complex projects in an organization and receive extensive training in process-improvement tools and statistical analysis, along with some team-building and presentation training depending upon organizational needs. A Black Belt may be deployed in many different areas of the company to solve a process problem. Green Belts typically lead smaller projects, usually within their local areas of expertise, and receive less training. Industry body-of-knowledge standards exist for Black Belt practitioners; and these leaders typically receive four weeks of training spread out over four or five months. Green Belts typically receive nine or ten days of training in two or three sessions spread out over two or three months. Both types of training are excellent for developing your people into more valuable, more versatile company resources.

Much has been written on the tools topic, and an excellent practical text written by my colleague Dr. Ian Wedgwood is called *Lean Sigma: A Practitioner's Guide*.¹¹ This book is very straightforward regarding the tools involved in the methodology.

While consulting at Sylvania in 1998, I was challenged by some excellent engineers to explain how all the tools fit together. I started with a flipchart, and eventually put the major tools into a PowerPoint presentation that many have commented is helpful, so I will repeat it here as a series of figures.

The first step is to begin with the end in mind. We seek potential causes of our primary process issue (Y) and the relationship of the causes to Y. The issues may be multiple but we look at them separately and consider each issue or defect as a process result or Y. This can be stated mathematically as:

10. Zinkgraf, *Six Sigma*.

11. Wedgwood, *Lean Sigma*.

$$Y = f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \dots, x_n)$$

Y can be a delivery time, a processing time, a product defect, a service error, an invoicing error or anything that we can explicitly state which can be measured. This $Y = f(x)$ transfer function is the ultimate objective in all good product development work. It is necessary to move forward in QFD as we can associate the Y with Whats and the Xs with Hows. These transfer functions are needed to fill in each QFD matrix. Regarding the equation, some of the tools in the roadmap work on the Y, some help find Xs, and some help establish the relationships to the Y. In the Define and Measure phases we are applying tools at some point that work on Y. These tools are: Measurement System Analysis (MSA), Process Control Charts, and Capability Analysis. MSA helps us determine how much error exists in measuring Y. Control Charts tell us if the Y is stable or predictable, and Capability Analysis helps determine the extent of variation in Y relative to a requirement established during the Define phase. Together these two are called an Initial Capability Assessment. So now our picture looks like Figure 1-8.

The next steps in the Measure and Analyze phases require identifying all the process Xs that are associated with this Y and then funneling them down to the potential few independent variables that truly influence Y. A Process Map is a tool to collect and




Figure 1-8 Begin with the End in Mind, $Y = f(x)$

identify these Xs, and a variant of a QFD matrix called the Cause and Effect matrix (C&E Matrix) combines the teams knowledge to “funnel” the larger list to known or observed influencers. A Failure Mode and Effects Analysis, or FMEA, helps establish how each independent X variable can be wrong, how severe is its impact, how often it occurs, and whether it can be detected. This helps make some “quick hits” to improving independent potential actors or Xs, and begins stabilizing the process. We now have a smaller number of variables, and we study these Xs passively (Multi-vari) to see if any have statistical correlation with actual variation observed in the Y variable, as shown in Figure 1-9.

In the Improve phase, we take the output of our funnel and begin Design Of Experiments (DOE) to establish true cause and effect relationships of $Y = f(x)$ on our reduced list of suspect independent variables. From there we identify the true actors causing the variability in Y and establish proper controls with a control plan (Figure 1-10).

Now we have the major tools of the Process Improvement Methodology in sequence and relationships to establishing our goal of $Y = f(x)$!




Figure 1-9 Finding and Funneling Down the Independent Variables




Figure 1-10 Establishing $Y = f(x)$, Finding the Key Xs, and Setting Proper Controls

Six Sigma applied to process problems has as its fundamental aim or goal to define the equation that describes where your desired output gets its dependency: i.e., $Y = f(x)$. So when applying the tools our goal is to develop this key equation. In addition to the Six Sigma Tools, Lean Manufacturing tools were integrated as part of the combining of two separate initiatives while I was at AlliedSignal, now Honeywell, thanks to Larry Bossidy's wisdom on initiatives. There are certainly many ways to combine these initiatives. As a set of tools, it makes sense to combine them with the phased approach of DMAIC. Early on at SBTI, I wrote the DMAIC tools for Six Sigma in the form of the M-A-I-C loop shown in Figure 1-11. We then integrated the Lean tools into these four phases, as seen in Figure 1-12. Following this "Lean Sigma Roadmap" of tools within the DMAIC phases, one can work a project towards a result with less variation in process output, process times, and process flow. Please recall the earlier comments in the methodology introduction that each individual tool may be applied in many ways. This is just one approach to showing how Lean tools and Six Sigma tools may be integrated into a unified methodology of MAIC.

1.2.3 SIX SIGMA: DEPLOYING AS AN INITIATIVE

To begin a Six Sigma initiative, top management or executive leaders must create the vision of what the initiative is to do for the company, customers, employees, and owners.




Figure I-11 Six Sigma Tools in the M-A-I-C Sequence




Figure I-12 Six Sigma and Lean Tools in the M-A-I-C Sequence

They need to foster acceptance with communication, involvement, and leading from the front of the deployment. They must set goals, timing, and financial expectations for the program if it is to be effective. These are often done in off-site meetings or executive

workshops. The previously cited work by Zinkgraf¹² provides more depth on these subjects. From these workshops, a deployment plan is developed for the Six Sigma initiative, and it is refined further by champions and sponsors of this effort. The refinement is around people, projects, and training timetables.

Refinement around people and projects means getting the right people on the bus, and then dropping them into the right project areas, armed with the right tools and training. To have great project work on significant business problems, a company needs sponsorship by the business ownership, management, or executive force, or all three depending upon the size of the organization. This requires initiative alignment with strategy, people, processes, business metrics, and customer needs. Alignment with customer needs, strategy, internal stakeholder needs, and business metrics is a great application of QFD and will be discussed further in Chapter 2.

The Black Belts or Green Belts need to know they have support and access to whatever is needed to conduct their project work. It is generally management's job to set expectations and then inspect for progress on tasks, measured against agreed-upon goals. Management must also support and coach the project leaders through the first few projects, and to do so must understand the basics of Six Sigma. People who fill this role in a Six Sigma initiative context are usually described and trained as either Champions or Sponsors. Champions or Sponsors identify the business areas and rough out the projects that are best linked to the business goals and needs. They also identify individuals for training as Green Belts and Black Belts. Green Belts and Black Belts take the projects to training and follow a Plan-Train-Apply-Review cycle through two, three, or four training sessions, depending upon the focus, level, and deployment plan within a company.

Due to the scope of a Six Sigma Initiative and the nature of this book, we will delve no further into the initiative topic. The previously cited work by Zinkgraf¹³ will provide more depth in this area.

I.3 HISTORY OF QFD AND SIX SIGMA

I.3.1 ORIGINS OF QFD

The people identified in this chronology have made special efforts in the best interests of U.S. industry. They could have kept QFD and Six Sigma as proprietary secrets, not to be

12. Zinkgraf, *Six Sigma*.

13. Zinkgraf, *Six Sigma*.

shared with the competition. Instead, they shared their experiences with others, including their competitors, and everyone has gained.

QFD became widely known in the United States through the efforts of Don Clausing, of Xerox and later MIT, and Bob King of GOAL/QPC. These two worked independently, and likely first came into contact in October 1985, when Clausing presented QFD at a GOAL/QPC conference in Massachusetts. By that time, both men had already made significant contributions toward promoting QFD.

The Japanese characters for QFD are:

- 品質 (hinshitsu), meaning “quality,” “features,” “attributes,” or “qualities”¹⁴
- 機能 (kino), meaning “function” or “mechanization”¹⁵
- 配置 (tenkai), meaning “deployment,” “diffusion,” “development,” or “evolution”

Any of the English words could have been chosen by early translators of Japanese articles. It’s little more than a matter of chance that QFD is not called Feature Mechanization Diffusion today. In the early days, when Lou Cohen explained QFD to audiences, he attempted to rename it Structured Planning, or Quality Feature Deployment, in the hope that people would be able to tell from its name what QFD was all about. For better or for worse, “Quality Function Deployment” has stuck in the United States, and no alternative name is likely to survive. None of the thirty-two possible combinations of English equivalents really denotes what QFD actually is. We must be content with a name for the process which is not that self-explanatory.

1.3.2 EARLY HISTORY OF QFD IN JAPAN

Yoji Akao¹⁶ cites the rapid growth of the Japanese automobile industry in the 1960s as a driving force behind the development of QFD. With all the new product-development drives in the Japanese auto industry, people there recognized the need for design quality and that existing QC process charts confirmed quality only after manufacturing had begun. Mr. Akao’s work with Kiyotaka Oshiumi of Bridgestone led to “Hinshitsu Tenkai” or “Quality Deployment,” which was taken to various companies with little public attention. The approach was later modified in 1972 at the Kobe Shipyards of Mitsubishi

14. www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/quality.

15. www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/function.

16. Yoji Akao, “QFD: Past, Present, and Future,” paper presented at the International Symposium on QFD (1997).

Heavy Industry to systematically relate customer needs to functions and the quality or substitute quality characteristics. The first book on the topic, *Quality Function Deployment* by Akao and Mizuno, was published by JUSE Press in 1978.¹⁷

I.3.3 HISTORY OF QFD IN THE USA

In 1983, the first article on QFD by Akao appeared in *Quality Progress* by ASQC,¹⁸ and from there things spread quickly. Don Clausing first learned about QFD in March 1984, during a two-week trip to Fuji-Xerox Corporation, a Xerox partner in Japan. Clausing, a Xerox employee at that time, had already become interested in the Robust Design methods of Dr. Genichi Taguchi, who was a consultant to Fuji-Xerox. While in Japan, Clausing met another consultant to Fuji-Xerox, a Dr. Makabe of the Tokyo Institute of Technology.

At an evening meeting, Dr. Makabe briefly showed Clausing a number of his papers on product reliability. “After fifteen minutes,” relates Clausing, “Dr. Makabe brushed the papers aside and said, ‘Now let me show you something *really* important!’ Makabe then explained QFD to me. I saw it as a fundamental tool that could provide cohesion and communication across functions during product development, and I became very excited about it.”

In the summer of that same year, Larry Sullivan of Ford Motor Company organized an internal company seminar. Clausing was invited to present QFD. Sullivan quickly grasped the importance of the QFD concept and began promoting it at Ford.

Clausing continued to promote QFD, Taguchi’s methods, and Stuart Pugh’s concept-selection process at conferences and seminars. When Clausing joined the faculty at MIT, he developed a semester-length graduate course that unified these methods along with other concepts into a system for product development that eventually became called “Total Quality Development.” Many of his students, already senior managers and engineers at large U.S. companies, returned to their jobs and spread his concepts to their coworkers.

In June 1987, Bernie Avishai, associate editor of *Harvard Business Review*, asked Don Clausing to write an article on QFD. Clausing felt that the paper should be given a marketing perspective, and he invited John Hauser to coauthor it. Hauser had become intrigued with QFD after learning about it from a visit to Ford. The article, published in

17. Shigeru Mizuno and Yoji Akao, eds., *Quality Function Deployment: A Company-wide Quality Approach* (Tokyo: JUSE Press, 1978).

18. Masao Kogure and Yoji Akao, “Quality Function Deployment and CWQC in Japan,” *Quality Progress* 16, no. 10 (1983): 25.

the May–June 1988 issue of the *Harvard Business Review*, has become one of the publication's most frequently requested reprints. That article probably increased QFD's popularity in the United States more than any other single publication or event.

Larry Sullivan founded the Ford Supplier Institute. This was a Ford Motor Company organization aimed at helping Ford's suppliers improve the quality of the components they developed for Ford. Sullivan and others at Ford gained a detailed understanding of QFD by working with Dr. Shigeru Mizuno and Mr. Akashi Fukahara from Japan. Eventually Ford came to require its suppliers to use QFD as part of their development process, and the Ford Supplier Institute provided training in QFD (along with other topics) to these suppliers.

The Ford Supplier Institute eventually became an independent nonprofit organization, the American Supplier Institute (ASI). ASI has become a major training and consulting organization for QFD. It has trained thousands of people in the subject.

Bob King, founder and executive director of GOAL/QPC, first learned of QFD from Henry Klein of Black and Decker. Klein had attended a presentation on QFD given by Yoji Akao and others in Chicago in November 1983. The following month, Klein attended a GOAL/QPC course on another TQM topic, where he told King about this presentation and about QFD. King began offering courses on QFD starting in March 1984. In the summer of that year, King learned more details about QFD from a copy of a 1978 book by Akao and Mizuno, *Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment*. In the fall of 1984, King began offering a three-day course on QFD, based on the understanding of the tool he had gained from the Akao and Mizuno book. In November 1985, King traveled to Japan and met with Akao to “ask him all the questions he couldn't answer.” Akao provided King with his course notes on QFD, and he gave GOAL/QPC permission to translate the notes and use them in his GOAL/QPC courses.

Based on these notes, GOAL/QPC offered its first five-day course on QFD in February 1986. Lou Cohen attended that course and learned about QFD there for the first time.

At the invitation of Bob King, Akao came to Massachusetts and conducted a workshop on QFD in Japanese with simultaneous translation into English. Akao conducted a second workshop in June 1986, also under the auspices of GOAL/QPC. For this second workshop, GOAL/QPC translated a series of papers on QFD, including several case studies. This translation was later published in book form.¹⁹ Eventually this collection of QFD papers became what remains the standard advanced book on QFD.

In 1987, GOAL/QPC published the first full-length book on QFD in the United States: *Better Designs in Half the Time*, by Bob King.²⁰ In this book, King described QFD as a

19. Yoji Akao, *Quality Function Deployment: Integrating Customer Requirements into Product Design*, trans. by Glenn H. Mazur and Japan Business Consultants, Ltd. (Cambridge, Mass.: Productivity Press, 1990).

20. King, *Better Designs*.

“matrix of matrices” (see Chapter 18). King relates that in June 1990, Cha Nakui, a student of Akao’s and later an employee in Akao’s consulting company, “comes to work for GOAL/QPC and corrects flow of QFD charts.” Among Nakui’s contributions to our understanding of QFD is his explanation of the Voice of the Customer Table (see Chapter 5).

I first saw QFD while at AlliedSignal, now Honeywell, circa 1990. Early examples at that time included Toyota Motors’ QFD processes. At the same time, Value Engineering was being taught at AlliedSignal, along with Robust Design methods from the American Supplier Institute. John Fox’s seminal work, *Quality Through Design: Key to Successful Product Delivery*, was published in 1993, and included aspects of Design Process Flow, QFD, Design for Manufacture, and Critical Parameter Management, among many other methods. This work is one of the earliest to set the stage for Design for Six Sigma (DFSS) and QFD.

Other important early publications in the United States include

- “Quality Function Deployment and CWQC in Japan,” by Professors Masao Kogure and Yoji Akao, Tamagawa University, published in *Quality Progress* magazine, October 1983
- “Quality Function Deployment,” by Larry Sullivan, published in *Quality Progress* magazine, June 1986
- Articles on QFD by Bob King and Lou Cohen in the spring and summer 1988 editions of the *National Productivity Review*
- A series of articles on QFD in the June 1988 issue of *Quality Progress* magazine
- A course manual on QFD to supplement ASI’s three-day QFD course
- *Annual Proceedings* of QFD symposia held in Novi, Michigan, starting in 1989

QFD software packages first became available in the United States around 1989. The most widely known package was developed by International TechneGroup Incorporated. Some organizations heavily committed to QFD, such as Ford Motor Company, have developed their own QFD software packages.

Early adapters of QFD in the United States included Ford Motor Company, Digital Equipment Corporation, Procter and Gamble, and 3M Corporation. Many other companies have used QFD, and the tool continues to grow in popularity. More than fifty papers were presented at the Sixth Symposium on Quality Function Deployment in 1994. Only a few of these papers were not case studies. The majority of companies using QFD are reluctant to present their case studies publicly, since they don’t want to reveal their strategic product planning. Therefore, it is likely that the fifty papers presented at the QFD Symposium represent just the tip of the iceberg in terms of QFD implementation.

Figure 1-13 identifies many key events in the development of QFD, both in Japan and the United States. In some cases, where exact dates are not known, approximate months or years have been provided.

Date	Source	Event
1966	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i> , Marsh, Moran, Nakui, Hoffherr	Japanese industry begins to formalize QFD concepts developed by Yoji Akao
1966	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Bridgestone's Kurume factory introduces the listing of processing assurance items: "Quality Characteristics"
1969	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Katsuyoshi Ishihara introduces QFD at Matsushita
1972	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Yoji Akao introduces QFD quality tables at Kobe Shipyards
1978	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Dr. Shigeru Mizuno and Dr. Yoji Akao publish <i>Deployment of the Quality Function</i> (Japanese book on QFD)
1980	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Kayaba wins Deming prize with special recognition for using Furukawa's QFD approach for bottleneck engineering
1983	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Cambridge Corporation of Tokyo, under Masaaki Imai, introduces QFD in Chicago along with Akao, Furukawa, and Kogure
10/83	<i>Quality Progress</i> magazine	"Quality Function Deployment and CWQC in Japan," by Professors Masao Kogure and Yoji Akao, Tamagawa University
11/83	Bob King	Akao and others introduce QFD at a U.S. workshop in Chicago, Illinois
3/84	Don Clausing	Professor Makabe of Tokyo Institute of Technology explains QFD to Don Clausing
3/84	Bob King	Bob King begins offering a one-day course on QFD
7/17/84	Don Clausing	Don Clausing presents QFD to a Ford internal seminar organized by Larry Sullivan
1985	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	Larry Sullivan and John McHugh set up a QFD project involving Ford Body and Assembly and its suppliers
10/30/85	Don Clausing	Don Clausing presents QFD at GOAL/QPC's annual conference
11/85	Bob King	King meets with Akao in Japan. Akao gives GOAL/QPC permission to translate his classroom notes and use them in GOAL/QPC's training
1/27/86	Don Clausing	Don Clausing presents QFD to Ford's Quality Strategy Committee #2, chaired by Bill Scollard of Ford
2/86	<i>Facilitating and Training in Quality Function Deployment</i>	GOAL/QPC introduces Akao's materials in its five-day QFD course (the author attended this course in February 1986)

Figure I-13 History of QFD in the United States²¹

21. Stephen A. Zinkgraf, personal communication, Autumn 2008.

6/86	Don Clausing	Larry Sullivan sponsors Dr. Mizuno who gives a three-day seminar on QFD
6/86	<i>Quality Progress</i> magazine	"Quality Function Deployment" by Larry Sullivan
10/86	Don Clausing	Larry Sullivan launches QFD at Ford
6/87	Don Clausing	Bernie Avishai, associate editor of <i>Harvard Business Review</i> , asks Don Clausing to write an article on QFD. Don invites John Hauser to co-author it. It is published in May–June 1988
1989 - present	ASI, GOAL/QPC	Sponsorship of QFD Symposia at Novi, Michigan
2/6/91	Don Clausing	Don Clausing and Stuart Pugh present "Enhanced Quality Function Deployment" at the Design and Productivity International Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii
1993	John Fox	Publication of <i>Quality Through Design</i> , a book linking QFD to the pre- and post-design aspects around QFD, including Kano's Model, Design for Manufacture, Value Engineering, Reliability Growth, Critical Parameter Management, Failure Mode and Effects Analysis, Taguchi Methods, and Statistical Process Control
1995	Steve Zinkgraf	Steve Zinkgraf utilizes a QFD matrix in setting up the Cause & Effect Prioritization Matrix later used by many in the Six Sigma community when comparing multiple process inputs to multiple process outputs

Figure I-13 Continued

I.3.4 HISTORY OF QFD WITH SIX SIGMA

Dr. Stephen Zinkgraf²² observes that at Motorola in the late 1980s, QFD's use was frequently at the front end of designing new products. The focus was initially on two-way matrices, until Fernando Reyes used QFD in a very innovative fashion—to develop the strategic plan for manufacturing automotive electronic applications based on customer requirements.

In 1995, Zinkgraf was leading Six Sigma Deployment at the AlliedSignal Engineered Materials Sector, and was putting together the Six Sigma operations roadmap. He concluded that Six Sigma should be based on understanding the interaction between process inputs (Xs) and process outputs (Ys). Since the Ys were to reflect satisfying customer needs, it seemed that a two-way matrix mapping the process inputs generated by the process map focused on inputs and outputs to process requirements. It fit perfectly into the final roadmap. The process map generated the inputs to the Cause & Effect matrix. The C&E Matrix focused the FMEA on only the important inputs, thereby shortening and focusing the FMEA process. The roadmap—including the process map, the C&E

22. Zinkgraf, personal communication.




Figure I-14 A Historical Flow Map of QFD and Six Sigma Tools from 1997

Matrix, and the FMEA—opened the door to the Analysis phase of MAIC. The C&E Matrix, when done properly, yielded a process focus that really hadn't existed before, outside of the archaic fishbone diagram. The C&E Matrix is essentially the result of quantitative generation of multiple fishbone diagrams quickly. The limitation of the fishbone diagram had been that it was not focused on process inputs and allowed analysis of only one output at a time. With multiple outputs, it was not possible to aggregate the results into a single plan of action.

In 1998, I gave a talk entitled "QFD with a Six Sigma Twist" at an Annual Black Belt conference. In this talk, I commented that the QFD applications I had seen previously needed more of a VOC emphasis on the front end with FMEA, as well as some sampling strategies to better detail what they really needed. I also commented that more-detailed data and analysis on the linkages between matrices could be obtained with process maps and other Six Sigma tools, to enable users to truly understand the

$Y = f(x)$ relationships implied when connecting Hows to Whats. Additionally, I commented on the “How wells”—that true process capabilities needed to be determined in scoring what was possible. I received positive feedback on turning what was then some large variation of QFD application into a flow map that could be followed. That flow map is illustrated in Figure 1-14.

1.4 WHAT IS QFD BEING USED FOR TODAY?

As with any versatile tool, the applications of QFD are limited only by one’s imagination. The original intent of QFD was to provide product developers with a systematic method for “deploying” the Voice of the Customer into product design. The requirement to evaluate potential responses against needs is universal, however, and in the United States a wide range of applications sprang up quite rapidly.

Following are some typical QFD applications that do not fit the model of product development.

- Course design: Whats are needs of students for acquiring skills or knowledge in a certain area; Hows are course modules, course teaching style elements. Curriculum design is a natural extension of this application and has also been done using QFD²³
- Internal corporate service group strategy: Whats are business needs of individual members of service group’s client groups; Hows are elements of the service group’s initiatives
- Business group five-year product strategy: Whats are generic needs of the business group’s customers; Hows are product offerings planned for the next five years
- Development of an improved telephone response service for an electric utility company: ²⁴ Whats are the needs of the customer; Hows are critical measures of performance of the telephone answering center

23. Mahesh Krishnan and Ali A. Houshmand, “QFD In Academia: Addressing Customer Requirements in the Design of Engineering Curricula,” presented at the Fifth Symposium on Quality Function Deployment (Novi, Mich., June 1993).

24. Amy Tessler, Norm Wada, and Bob Klein, “QFD at PG&E: Applying Quality Function Deployment to the Residential Services of Pacific Gas & Electric Company,” presented at the Fifth Symposium on Quality Function Deployment (Novi, Mich., June 1993).

In my experience, those who become enthusiastic about QFD are generally very creative in conceiving new applications. Those who dislike the “matrix” approach to planning are generally very creative in producing reasons why QFD doesn’t work.

Of course, QFD itself does not “work.” Just as we cannot say that hammers “don’t work,” so also we cannot say that problem-solving tools such as QFD “don’t work.” A more accurate statement would be: “I can’t work it.” This book is intended to raise your confidence that, when it comes to QFD, you can say, “I can make it work for me.”

I.4.1 QFD USES WITHIN SIX SIGMA METHODS

Any place there are voices to be heard, analyzed, and driven into development activities, QFD can be utilized. In general, there are four broad categories of voices in the Six Sigma community that may be linked to development activities involving QFD:

- 1. Voice of the Customer (VOC): the voices of those who buy or receive the output of a process, clearly an important voice in product and process development
- 2. Voice of the Business (VOB): the voices of funding and sponsoring managers for marketing and development activities
- 3. Voice of the Employee (VOE): the voices of those employees who work in your company and/or develop new products, services, and technologies
- 4. Voice of the Market (VOM): the voices of trendsetting lead-user or early-adopter market segments, or market-defining volume purchasers

Figure 1-15 illustrates how four different Six Sigma methodologies interact with these four broad voice categories. Design for Six Sigma (DFSS) employs both VOC and VOB, so that products are designed to meet and exceed customer and business requirements.

Six Sigma Process Design (SSPD) requires VOC and employee voices (VOE), so that any new process meets both customer needs and the needs of the users of the new or re-designed process. Marketing for Six Sigma (MFSS) needs the business requirements and




Figure I-15 Six Sigma Methodologies and Four Voice Categories

the market requirements to succeed in planning new product and market-segment launches. Finally, Technology for Six Sigma (TFSS) requires the technologist's voices on technology capabilities coupled with market requirements in order to certify and release new technologies to the product designers.

I.5 DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- Who is your customer? Try writing down your answer.
- Think about your current development process for products, services, courses, strategies, or anything else. Do you know your customers' needs? How do you know them? What form do you use to represent those needs?
- What does your first formulation of Hows look like? What form does it take? How do you generate your Hows?
- How do you determine the relationship of your Hows to your customers' needs?
- How many levels of Hows do you have in your development process? Write down a brief description of each of these levels and show these to your colleagues. Notice how long it takes to get agreement.
- Besides your development process, where else in your daily work might QFD apply? Define the Whats and Hows for those additional applications.

Index

Information in figures is denoted by f.

A

absolute importance, 144–146
abstraction, 86, 175
acceptable objective, 178
accounting, double, 163
acquisition, growth through, 35
Affinity Diagram, 81–87, 90, 109, 335–336
aggressive objective, 178
agreement, 350–351
AHP. *see* Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)
Akao, Yoji, 20, 22
Akao Matrix of Matrices
 Four-Phase Model *vs.*, 358–359
 overview of, 363–366
allocation, of time, 350
American Supplier Institute (ASI), 22, 359
Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), 269–271
Apple, 65–66, 68
ASI. *see* American Supplier Institute (ASI)
ASI Model

Design Deployment in, 360–362
HOQ in, 360
manufacturing planning in, 362
overview of, 358–359
production planning in, 362–363
assumed quality, 48

B

Bacon, David, 97
Baldrige criteria, 373, 374
barriers, organizational, 253–255
benchmarking, 118
 defined, 213
 functionality, 214–215
 importance of, 211
 performance measures and, 213–214
 priorities in, 211–212
 questions in, 212
benefit, 130
binary entry, in matrix, 91
Black and Decker, 22
Black Belts, 14, 19
Bossidy, Larry, 17, 33

C

Capability Analysis, 15

case study

solar power, 392–420

urban coffeehouse, 420–434

categorization, of voice of customer, 126–137

Cause and Effect matrix, 16, 25–26

CDOC. *see* Concept, Design, Optimization,
Capability (CDOC)

CDOC roadmap, 371–372

CDOV roadmap, 371

CE. *see* Concurrent Engineering (CE)

cells, in matrix, 91

central tendency bias, 145

challenges

to organizations, 32–34

product development, 38–43

Champions, 19

characteristics, product, 47

chart, QFD estimator, 282–284

classification, of customer needs, 338–343

class libraries, 384

Clausing, Don, 20, 21, 40, 232

Clausing Four-Phase Model

Design Deployment in, 360–362

HOQ in, 360

manufacturing planning in, 362

overview of, 358–359

production planning in, 362–363

clock speed, 310

coffeehouse case study, 420–434

Cognition Cockpit (software), 183, 185f

Cohen, Lou, 20

columns, in matrix, 91

communication

cross-functional, 230–232

of customer needs, 40–41

QDF as tool for, 43–44

responsibility and, 206–207

comparison with competition, 219

competition, 36, 49, 219

Competitive Benchmarking and Target
Setting, 118

Competitive Satisfaction Performance,
154–158

competitive technical benchmarking, 118

defined, 213

functionality, 214–215

importance of, 211

performance measures and, 213–214

priorities in, 211–212

questions in, 212

complaints, customer, 58, 125–126

complexity, in function trees, 183

computer aids, 298–299

Concept, Design, Optimization, Capability
(CDOC), 61

Concept Development, 57

concept selection, 209–210, 232–239

conceptualization, 392

concrete data, 320–323

Concurrent Engineering (CE), 44–47

conference room interviews, 313–314

consensus processes, 350–353

contextual analysis, 233

contextual inquiries, 305–306, 320, 325–332

contradiction matrix, 209

contributions, of SQCs, 198

control, 392

Control Charts, 15

control phase, 417–420

corporate expectations, 116

Correlations, network, 207–208, 208f

cost(s)

decreasing, 35–36

market pricing and, 33

Cost Deployment, 381–382

countermeasures, 241

CPM. *see* Critical Parameter Management (CPM)

critical functions, 430–432

Critical Parameter Management (CPM), 97–98, 110, 183–184, 358

Critical to Quality elements (CTQs), 423–425

Cronin, David, 183

cross-functional communication, 230–232

CTQs. *see* Critical to Quality elements (CTQs)

culture, context and, 326

Cumulative Normalized Raw Weight, 168–169

customer, deciding on, 266–276

customer attribute refinement, 177

customer complaints, 58, 125–126

customer data analysis, 335–336

customer expectations, 36, 116

customer groups, multiple, 272–276

customer needs, 38–39, 40–41, 47, 129–130, 338–343, 401–408

Customer Needs and Benefits step, 114–115

 categorization in, 126–137

 functions in, 131–132

 needs structuring in, 137, 137f–139f

 reliability requirements in, 132–133

 Substitute Quality Characteristics in, 130–131

 target values in, 133–137

 visiting customer in, 123–125

 voice of customer in, 121–122

Customer Needs/Benefits Matrix, 284–285

Customer Satisfaction Performance, 151–154, 192–193, 339–340

customer voice, 4, 57

D

data quantification, 337–338

data scrubbing, 82–83

datum concept, 106

decision-making

 informed, 279

 tools, 80

decreasing costs, 35–36

defects, in Six Sigma, 10–11

Defects per Million Opportunities (DPMO), 11, 12f

defect testing, 41–42

Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve and Control (DMAIC), 13–14, 17

defining measurements, 180–181

definitions, importance of, 266–267

delighters, 49, 50–51, 52, 218

delivery defect, 10

dependency, 17

deployment

 defining measures and, 176

 in QFD, 3–4

 Six Sigma, 17–19

 tool, 9

design data, 323–324

Design Deployment, 360

Design Failure Mode Effects and Analysis (DFMEA), 102–103, 110

Design for Six Sigma (DFSS), 56–63, 357–358, 392

Design of Experiments (DOE), 16, 103–104, 110–111

Design Scorecard, 63, 98–100, 110

design specification structuring, 234–235

desired quality, 49–50

detailed description, for VOC, 306–307

determination

 of objectives, 265–266

 of relationships, 349

development cycle, 36, 36f, 231

DFMEA. *see* Design Failure Mode Effects and Analysis (DFMEA)

DFSS. *see* Design for Six Sigma (DFSS)

diagrams

affinity, 81–87, 90, 109

matrix, 91–92, 110

tree, 87–90, 110

difference, improvement, 161

Digital Equipment Corporation, 23

Digital Hub Strategy (Apple), 68

direction of goodness, 178

dissatisfiers, 52

DMADV roadmap, 370

DMAIC. *see* Define, Measure, Analyze,
Improve and Control (DMAIC)

DMEDI roadmap, 370

DOE. *see* Design of Experiments (DOE)

“double accounting,” 163

DPMO. *see* Defects per Million Opportunities
(DPMO)

driver, SQC, 208

E

effort prioritization, 39

end users, 375

engineering

driven environments, 246–247

in marketing-driven environments, 247

robust, 242

Enhanced QFD (EQFD), 232–239

environment

contextual inquiry, 328

interview, 318

QFD in DFSS, 369–372

TRIZ, 386

EQFD. *see* Enhanced QFD (EQFD)

estimator chart, QFD, 282–284

evaluation, of customer needs, 401–408

event sequencing, 345–349

exciting quality, 50

existing customers, 390

expectations

corporate, 116

customer, 36, 116

expected needs, 340

experience, shared, 323

experiments, design of, 103–104, 110–111

expert voices, 70

external ideas, 81

F

facilitator, role of, 350–351

facilities, 297–300

failure mode, 102–103

Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA),
16, 25–26, 241

failures, process, 63–64

families of products, 374

Fault Tree Analysis, 241

feasibility

financial, 414–417

technical, 408–414

Fight ’Em approach, 254

financial feasibility optimization, 414–417

Fitness to Standard, 48–49

Fitness to Use, 49–50

flexibility, 65, 72

flip-chart pads, 299

FMEA. *see* Failure Mode and Effects Analysis
(FMEA)

focus, 316–317

focus group interviews, 312–313, 333–334

Ford Motor Company, 21, 23

Ford Supplier Institute, 22

Four-Phase Model

Design Deployment in, 360–362

HOQ in, 360

manufacturing planning in, 362

overview of, 358–359

production planning in, 362–363

Fox, John, 97
 Fuji-Xerox Corporation, 21
 Fukahara, Akashi, 22
 function(s)
 defined, 3
 in House of Quality, 131–132
 product, 181–184
 trees, 182–183
 functionality, benchmarking, 214–215
 functional support, 264
 future gaps, 212

G

Gage Repeatability and Reproducibility
 Studies, 101
 gaps, future, 212
 Gate Processes, 43
 gigaflops, 310
 goal, of Six Sigma, 10–11
 Goal and Improvement Ratio, 158–162
 GOAL/QPC, 22–23
 goodness, direction of, 178
 grade, satisfaction, 151
 graphical user interface (GUI) mockups, 330
 Green Belts, 14, 19
 Griffin, Abbie, 333
 group processes, 350–353
 groups, customer, 272–276
 group think, 212
 growth, of revenue, 33
 GUI. *see* graphical user interface (GUI)

H

hardware mockups, 331
 Hauser, John, 21, 333
 Hedonic Index, 145
 Heid, Jim, 68
 hidden needs, 51, 341–342
 high-impact needs, 341

history, of QFD, 21–25, 24f–25f
 HOQ. *see* House of Quality (HOQ)
 House of Quality (HOQ), 4–6, 5f, 58, 97.
 see also Planning Matrix
 in Clausing model, 360
 concept selection and, 209–210
 Customer Needs and Benefits step in,
 114–115
 categorization in, 126–137
 functions in, 131–132
 needs structuring in, 137, 137f–139f
 reliability requirements in, 132–133
 Substitute Quality Characteristics in,
 130–131
 target values in, 133–137
 visiting customer in, 123–125
 voice of customer in, 121–122
 in EQFD, 235
 event sequencing for, 345–349
 fifth step, 118
 first step of, 114–115
 fourth step in, 117–118
 functions in, 131–132
 importance of, 113
 master, 376–377
 needs structuring in, 137, 137f–139f
 performance goals in, 158–162
 Planning Matrix and, 115–116
 benefits of, 142–145
 Competitive Satisfaction Performance in,
 154–158
 Cumulative Normalized Raw Weight
 column in, 168–169
 Customer Satisfaction Performance in,
 151–154
 Goal column in, 158–162
 Importance to Customer column in,
 144–150
 Normalized Raw Weight column in,
 166–168

- questions in, 144
 - Raw Weight column in, 164–166
 - Sales Point column in, 162–164
 - reliability requirements in, 132–133
 - responsibility and, 206–207
 - second step in, 115–116
 - seventh step in, 118
 - sixth step in, 118
 - stepwise refinement in, 116–117
 - Substitute Quality Characteristics in, 90, 130–131
 - contributions of, 198
 - Correlations Network in, 207–208, 208f
 - defined, 173
 - defining measurements and, 180–181
 - direction of goodness and, 178
 - drivers in, 208
 - expectations and, 116
 - function trees in, 182–183
 - generation of, 348
 - generic formulations for, 174
 - in House of Quality, 130–131
 - impact values in, 196–197
 - many-to-many relationships in, 200–201
 - mathematical modeling with, 219–223
 - negative impacts, 198–200
 - Performance Measurements and, 176–181
 - priorities of, 197–198
 - process steps in, 186–188
 - product descriptions and, 174–176
 - product functions and, 181–184
 - Product Requirements and, 174
 - product subsystems and, 184–186
 - target values in, 133–137
 - Technical Correlations in, 119
 - analysis of, 204
 - communication and, 206–207
 - conflicts with, 204–205
 - contents of, 204
 - determination of, 349
 - meaning of, 203–206
 - in planning phase, 288
 - responsibility and, 206–207
 - third step in, 116–117
 - transcriber, 352–353
 - voice of customer in, 121–122
 - Voice of Customer Table in, 127–129
 - Hows, 7, 7f, 175
 - Huber, 56
- I**
- ideality, law of, 71–72
 - ideation step, 106, 106f
 - identification, of possible customers, 267
 - IDOV roadmap, 371
 - impact
 - amount of, 192–196
 - judging, of performance measures, 194–195
 - in matrix relationships, 95
 - negative, 198–200
 - in planning phase, 287–288
 - symbols, 193, 193f
 - values, 196–197
 - Importance to Customer, 144–150
 - Improvement and Goal Ratio, 158–162
 - Improvement Difference, 161
 - improvement opportunities, 394–397
 - increasing revenues, 34–35
 - inferring importance, 339
 - influence, beyond organizational barriers, 253–255
 - information repository, 9
 - informed decision-making, 279
 - inherent value, 34
 - Initial Capability Assessment, 15, 15f
 - initiative, Six Sigma deployment as, 17–19
 - input, defect testing as, 42

internal ideas, 81
 interviews
 conference room, 313–314
 customer, 124–125
 environment for, 318
 focus group, 312–313
 focus group vs. one-on-one, 333–334
 focus in, 316–317
 inquiries vs., 326–327
 introduction in, 328
 number of, 332–333
 observation in, 329
 one-on-one, 313–332, 333–334
 participant selection, 318
 planning, 317–319, 327–328
 summarization in, 329
 telephone, 319–320
 introduction, in interview, 328

J

Japan, QFD in, 20–21
 Japanese Union of Scientists and Engineers
 (JUSE), 80
 Join ‘Em approach, 254
 judgment, matrix size and, 289

K

Kano, Norikai, 47, 104
 Kano’s model, 104–105, 111
 Kawakita, Jiro, 86
 key customers, 267–272
 key defect testing, 41–42
 King, Bob, 20, 22–23
 KJ method, 85–87
 Klein, Robert, 22, 338
 Klein grid, 342

L

languages, product description, 174–176
 latent expectations, 50–51, 105

law of dynamization, 72
 law of flexibility, 72
 law of ideality, 71–72
 leading questions, 314–315
Lean Sigma: A Practitioner’s Guide
 (Wedgwood), 14
 learning, customer needs, 39
 Leon-Rovira, Noel, 209
 Less the Better metric, 179
 libraries, class, 384
 Likert scale, 145
 linking matrices, 7–8
 lists, matrices vs., 191
 location, 297
 logical time sequence, 58
 long-cycle activities, observation of, 329
 low-hanging fruit, 161
 low-impact needs, 341

M

MAIC loop, 17, 18f
 maintainers, 375
 managed activity, QFD as, 296
 management support, 264
 manager, QFD, 261–262
 manufacturing, 251
 Manufacturing Planning, 362
 many-to-many relationships, 200–201
 mapping
 customer needs, 39
 process, 107–108, 111
 markers, 300
 marketing
 driven organizations, 250
 in engineering-driven environments,
 246–247
 Marketing for Six Sigma (MFSS), 67–69, 247
 market pricing, 33
 market segments, multiple, 374–375
 market shifts, 33, 36–38

masking tape, 299–300
 master HOQ, 376–377
 matching, to objectives, 379–381
 materials, 297–300
 mathematical modeling, 219–223
 matrices, 4–8, 5f, 7f, 91–92
 matrix reduction, 289
 matrix size, 289–293
 measure(s)
 performance, 187
 units of, 177–178
 measurements, defining, 180–181
 Measurement System Analysis (MSA), 15,
 100–102, 110, 180
 mechanical tools, 79–80
 methodology, Six Sigma project, 13–17
 metric(s)
 appropriateness of, 135
 defining, 180–181
 in DFSS initiative timeline, 60–61
 Six Sigma as, 10–13
 MFSS. *see* Marketing for Six Sigma (MFSS)
 midcourse changes, 37–38
 Mizuno, Shigeru, 22
 mockups, 330–331
 ModelF, 47–52
 modeling, mathematical, 219–223
 modules, 361
 More the Better metric, 178
 motivation, 254
 Motorola, 25
 MSA. *see* Measurement System Analysis
 (MSA)
 multiple market segments, 374–375

N

Nakui, Cha, 23
 needs
 customer, 38–39, 40–41, 47, 129–130,
 338–343, 401–408

 expected, 340
 hidden, 51, 341–342
 high-impact, 341
 low-impact, 341
 unstated, 124–125
 needs structuring, 137, 137f–139f, 285
 negative impacts, 198–200
 new customers, 390
 New Product Development (NPD) process,
 61, 370
 New Product Review, 43
 noise variables, 108
 nonnumeric targets, 223–225
 Normalized Raw Weight, 166–168
 NPD. *see* New Product Development (NPD)
 process
 numerical targets, 219–223

O

objective determination, 265–266
 objective matching, 379–381
 object-oriented analysis, 384
 objects, 361
 observation, in contextual inquiry, 329
 one-on-one interviews, 313–332, 333–334
 open-ended questions, 314–316, 327
 opinion, differences of, 351–352
 opportunities, improvement, 394–397
 optimization, 392
 Ordinal Importance, 149–150
 organization, development and, 230–231
 organizational barriers, 253–255
 organizational challenges, 32–34
 organizational planning, 378–381
 organizational schema, 378–379
 organizational support, 264–265
 Oshiumi, Kiyotaka, 20
 output dependency, 17
 ownership, 279

P

- packing defects, 10
- paper mockups, 330–331
- parameter management, 97–98, 110
- Pareto diagrams, 347
- Part Deployment, 360
- partnership, 326
- PDPC. *see* Process Decision Program Chart (PDPC)
- people
 - context and, 325–326
 - as process variable, 64
- performance goals, 158–162
- performance level, 151
- Performance Measurements, 176–181
- performance measures, 187
- performance-race market drivers, 311
- Perry, Randy, 97
- phases, of QFD, 260
- Planning Matrix, 115–116, 285–287, 347–348
 - benefits of, 142–145
 - Competitive Satisfaction Performance in, 154–158
 - Cumulative Normalized Raw Weight column in, 168–169
 - Customer Satisfaction Performance in, 151–154
 - Goal column in, 158–162
 - Importance to Customer column in, 144–150
 - Normalized Raw Weight column in, 166–168
 - questions in, 144
 - Raw Weight column in, 164–166
 - Sales Point column in, 162–164
- planning phase
 - computer aids in, 298–299
 - Customer Needs/Benefits Matrix in, 284–285
 - deciding on customer in, 266–276
 - estimator chart in, 282–284
 - facilities in, 297–300
 - identification of key customers in, 267–272
 - identification of possible customers in, 267
 - impacts in, 287–288
 - importance of, 263–264
 - location in, 297
 - materials in, 299–300
 - multiple key customer groups in, 272–276
 - objective determination in, 265–266
 - organizational support in, 264–265
 - Planning Matrix in, 285–287
 - product scope in, 278
 - Relative Raw Weight in, 289–293
 - room in, 297–298
 - schedule creation in, 281–296
 - SQCs in, 287
 - subteams in, 293–296
 - team in, 279–281
 - Technical Correlations in, 288
 - time horizon in, 277–278
- possible customers, 267
- Post-It Notes, 300
- preparation, for customer, 123–125
- Preplanning Matrix, 115–116
- primary abstraction, 86
- priorities
 - of customer groups, 274
 - development of, 9
 - of SQCs, 197–198
- Prioritization Matrix, 93–97, 117, 268–269, 271–272
- proactive mode, 334–335
- process challenges, 392–393
- Process Control Charts, 15
- Process Decision Program Chart (PDPC), 241
- process design
 - Six Sigma, 63–67
 - variables in, 64–65
- process failures, 63–64

process functions, 181–184, 430–432
 process improvement, 56–57
 process mapping, 107–108, 111
 process planning, 362
 process problems, 14
 process steps, 186–188
 Procter and Gamble, 23
 product characteristics, 47
 product defects, 10
 product descriptions, 174–176
 product development challenges, 38–43,
 44–47
 product development cycle, 36, 36f
 product families, 374
 product functions, 181–184
 production operations planning, 362–363
 production planning, 362–363
 product planning, strategic, 374–377
 Product Requirements, 174
 product scope, in planning phase, 278
 product subsystems, 184–186
 project leaders, 14
 project methodology, Six Sigma, 13–17
 prototyping, 329–332
 Pugh, Stuart, 21, 106, 174, 232, 234–235
 Pugh concept selection, 106–107, 111
 Pugh Concept Selection process, 191
 Pugh Matrix, 106, 106f
 pushpins, 299–300

Q

QFD. *see* Quality Function Deployment
 (QFD)
 qualitative data
 gathering, 309–334
 quantitative *vs.*, 308–309
 quality, defined, 3
 Quality Function Deployment (QFD)
 as communications tool, 43–44

concept selection and, 232–239
 Concurrent Engineering in, 44–47
 costs decrease in, 35–36
 cross-functional communication and,
 230–232
 defined, 3–9
 deployment in, 3–4
 Design for Six Sigma and, 56–63
 in DFSS environments, 369–372
 in engineering-driven organizations,
 248–250
 estimator chart, 282–284
 Four-Phase Model of, 358–359
 Design Deployment in, 360–362
 HOQ in, 360
 manufacturing planning in, 362
 front end of process in, 5f
 function in, 3
 history of, 21–25, 24f–25f
 Japan, 20–21
 as managed activity, 296
 manager, 261–262
 manufacturing and, 251
 in marketing-driven organizations, 250
 marketing for Six Sigma and, 67–69
 matrices in, 4–8
 Matrix of Matrices model of
 Four-Phase model *vs.*, 358–359
 overview of, 363–366
 object-oriented analysis and, 384
 organizational challenges and, 32–34
 as organizer, 230–231
 origins of, 19–20
 as phased activity, 260
 planning phase in
 computer aids in, 298–299
 Customer Needs/Benefits Matrix in,
 284–285
 deciding on customer in, 266–276

estimator chart in, 282–284
 facilities in, 297–300
 identification of key customers in,
 267–272
 identification of possible customers in,
 267
 impacts in, 287–288
 importance of, 263–264
 location in, 297
 materials in, 299–300
 multiple key customer groups in,
 272–276
 objective determination in, 265–266
 organizational support in, 264–265
 Planning Matrix in, 285–287
 product scope in, 278
 Relative Raw Weight in, 289–293
 room in, 297–298
 schedule creation in, 281–296
 SQCs in, 287
 subteams in, 293–296
 team in, 279–281
 Technical Correlations in, 288
 time horizon in, 277–278
 production planning in, 362–363
 quality in, 3
 revenue increase and, 34–35
 sale and, 251–252
 scope of, 4
 for service industry, 384–385
 shortcuts in, 288–296
 Six Sigma history with, 25–27
 Six Sigma process design and, 63–67
 software packages, 23
 structured analysis and, 383–384
 success in, 4, 259
 suspicion of, 247
 technology for Six Sigma and, 69–74
 as time consuming, 42–43

time for, 282–288
 TRIZ environments and, 386
 underutilization of, 357
 uses of, 27–29
 Quality Tables, 4–8, 5f, 7f
 quantification
 of data, 337–338
 of needs, 285–287
 quantitative data, vs. qualitative, 308–309
 quaternary abstraction, 86
 questions, open-ended, 314–316, 327

R

ratio-scale importance, 147–149
 Raw Weight, 164–166, 289–293
 reactive mode, 334–335
 realistic consensus, 352
 recommenders, 375
 recorder, role of, 352
 refinement
 of customer attributes, 177
 stepwise, 116–117
 regular customers, 390
 relationship determination, 349
 Relationship Digraph, 207–208, 208f
 relationships
 many-to-many, 200–201
 in matrices, 93–95
 relative importance, 147–149
 Relative Raw Weight, 289–293
 reliability requirements, 132–133
 repository, information, 9
 requirements, product, 174
 Requirements Phase, 43
 residential solar power case study, 392–420
 responsibility, 206–207
 revenue growth, 33, 34–35
 risk assessment, development of, 39
 roadmaps, DFSS, 369–370

Robust Engineering, 242
robustness
 of product or service, 240–242
 of technology, 71
role
 of facilitator, 350–351
 of QFD manager, 261–262
 of recorder, 352
 of transcriber, 352–353
room, 297–298
rows, in matrix, 91

S

Saaty, Thomas L., 270
sales, 251–252
Sales Point, 162–164
Samsung, 56
satisfiers, 49–50, 52
schedule
 creation of, 281–296
 time horizon and, 277–278
schema, organizational, 378–379
scope, product, 278
scripts, service, 331
scrubbing data, 82–83
secondary abstraction, 86
segmenting, 343
sequencing, of events, 345–349
service
 challenges, 392–393
 design, 392
 QFD and, 252–253
service capabilities, 40
service industry, 384–385
service scripts, 331
Seven Management and Planning Tools,
 80–81
shared experience, 323
shifts, market, 33, 36–38
Shindo, Hisazaku, 383
shortcuts, QFD, 288–296
short-cycle activities, observation of, 329
Sigma distance, 12–13
Sigma Value, 11–12, 12f
6 M's, 64–65
Six Sigma
 Black Belts in, 14
 Champions, 19
 defects addressed in, 10
 deployment of, 17–19
 design for, 56–63, 357–358, 392
 goal of, 10–11
 Green Belts in, 14
 history of QFD with, 25–27
 leaders in, 14
 marketing for, 67–69
 as metric, 10–13
 overview of, 10
 process design, 63–67
 project methodology, 13–17
 Sigma value in, 11–12
 Sponsors, 19
 technology for, 69–74
size, matrix, 289–293
software
 CPM, 183–184
 development, 382–383
 packages, 23
 product requirement language for, 175
solar power case study, 392–420
solution independence, 131
Sponsors, 19
SQCs. *see* Substitute Quality Characteristics
 (SQCs)
stage setting, 327
standard concept, 106
Static/Dynamic analysis, 117
static/dynamic status analysis, 233–234

stepwise refinement, 116–117
 strategic product planning, 374–377
 structured analysis, 383–384
 structuring, of design specifications, 234–235
 Substitute Quality Characteristics (SQC), 90
 analysis, 423–425
 contributions of, 198
 Correlations Network, 207–208, 208f
 Critical Parameter Management in,
 183–184
 defined, 173
 defining measurements and, 180–181
 as dial, 192–193
 direction of goodness and, 178
 drivers in, 208
 expectations and, 116
 function trees in, 182–183
 generation of, 348
 generic formulations for, 174
 in House of Quality, 130–131
 impact values in, 196–197
 judging impacts of, 195–196
 many-to-many relationships in, 200–201
 mathematical modeling with, 219–223
 negative impacts, 198–200
 Performance Measurements and, 176–181
 in planning phase, 287
 priorities of, 197–198
 process steps in, 186–188
 product descriptions and, 174–176
 product functions and, 181–184
 Product Requirements and, 174
 product subsystems and, 184–186
 Relationships section and, 192
 subsystem analysis, 239
 subsystems, product, 184–186
 subteams, 293–296
 Sullivan, Larry, 21, 22
 summarization, in contextual inquiry, 329

summary data, concrete data vs., 320–323
 supply chain, 40
 supply chain development, 71
 support, organizational, 264–265
 suspicion, of QFD, 247
 Sylvania, 56
 symbols, impact, 193, 193f

T

Taguchi, Genichi, 21, 242
 target
 context of, 217
 importance of, 217
 mathematical modeling with, 219–223
 nonnumeric, 223–225
 numerical, 219–223
 setting, 118
 values, 133–137
 Target is Best metric, 179
 team, in planning phase, 279–281
 technical benchmarking
 defined, 213
 functionality, 214–215
 importance of, 211
 performance measures and, 213–214
 priorities in, 211–212
 questions in, 212
 Technical Correlations, 119
 analysis of, 204
 communication and, 206–207
 conflicts with, 204–205
 contents of, 204
 determination of, 349
 meaning of, 203–206
 in planning phase, 288
 responsibility and, 206–207
 technical feasibility, 408–414
 Technical Response, 90, 119
 technical support, 264–265

Technology for Six Sigma (TFSS), 68–74
 telephone interviews, 319–320
 terminology differences, 6
 tertiary abstraction, 86
 TFSS. *see* Technology for Six Sigma (TFSS)
 thick-nibbed markers, 300
 3M Corporation, 23
 time, for QFD, 282–288
 time allocation, 350
 time horizon, 277–278
 timelines, unpredictable, 58
 time sequence, 58
 tools
 as concept, 79–80
 Seven Management and Planning, 80–81
 Top Level Performance Measurements,
 176–181
Total Product Design (Pugh), 234–235
 Total Quality Management (TQM), 358,
 373–374
 total system analysis, 239
 TQM. *see* Total Quality Management (TQM)
 TQM problem solving, 86
 transcriber, 352–353
 Tree Diagram, 87–90, 110
 trees, function, 182–183
 TRIZ contradiction matrix, 209
 TRIZ environments, 386
 tunability, 71
 Tyco, 56
 typewriter, 323–324

U

uncertainty, 231
 underutilization, of QFD, 357
 Underwriters Laboratories, 163
 unexpected quality, 50
 units of measure, 177–178
 unpredictable timelines, 58
 unstated needs, 124–125

urban coffeehouse case study, 420–434
 urgency, 351

V

value(s)
 context and, 326
 inherent, 34
 value appropriateness, 135–137
 value creation, defined, 32
 value delivery
 defined, 32
 improvement, 58
 value management, defined, 32
 verbatims, 82
 violent agreement, 350
 visit, customer, 123–125
 VOCALYST, 336–337, 375
 Voice of Business (VOB), 28, 57, 68, 391,
 393–394
 Voice of Customer Table (VOCT), 127–129
 for master HOQ, 376–377
 Voice of Customer (VOC), 4, 9, 28, 57, 121
 categorization of, 126–137
 contextual inquiries and, 305–306, 325–332
 detailed description in, 306–307
 from existing customers, 390
 in Focus Groups, 277–278
 gathering, 123
 minimum information for, 391
 from new customers, 390
 number of customers in, 391
 obtaining feedback for, 390
 overview, 304–307
 from regular customers, 390
 segmenting and, 343
 start-up, 425–429
 steps for, 389–391
 VOCALYST for, 336–337
 Voice of Business and, 393–394
 Voice of Developer (VOD), 121

Voice of Employee (VOE), 28
Voice of Market (VOM), 28, 67, 68
Voice of Technology (VOT), 70

W

Warfield, John, 207
Wedgwood, Ian, 14, 97
Weighted Average Performance score, 152
Whats, 7, 7f, 175
WV method, 86

X

Xerox, 20

Z

Zinkgraf, Stephen, 14, 19, 25
Z scores, 63