

REPEATPROOF

QUALITY HISTORY INTELLIGENCE FOR MANUFACTURERS

SAMPLE CONTROLLED OUTPUT

CAPA Historical Evidence Pack

A worked example showing how related NCR, complaint and CAPA history can be surfaced, reviewed by a named person and returned to the existing QMS without transferring authority to the software.

Representative invented example – not a customer result.

CONTROLLED DEMONSTRATION

Representative CNC dimensional nonconformance

Illustrative records only. No customer outcome or compliance claim.

01 / PURPOSE AND STATUS

What this pack proves - and what it does not.

This public sample demonstrates the structure of a reviewed evidence handback. It does not demonstrate a customer outcome, a live QMS integration, regulatory compliance or an autonomous quality decision.

TARGET EVENT	HISTORY REVIEWED	SYSTEM OF RECORD
NCR-2026-017 CNC bore above the approved upper limit at final inspection.	5 records 3 included, 1 marked Investigate further and 1 excluded by the illustrative reviewer.	Customer QMS RepeatProof prepares evidence; the authorised quality process retains the official decision.

Controlled purpose

- + Retrieve potentially related NCR, complaint and CAPA history from an approved data boundary.
- + Explain why each record was surfaced and preserve direct source references.
- + Record whether evidence should be included, investigated further or excluded, with a reason.
- + Prepare a reviewable pack for attachment to the existing QMS record.

Mandatory human boundary	RepeatProof does not declare root cause, approve disposition, release product, verify corrective-action effectiveness or close CAPA. Those decisions remain with authorised customer personnel.
---------------------------------	---

Evidence status used in this sample

OBSERVED	CALCULATED	HUMAN DECISION	UNKNOWN
Source-linked Directly present in the representative event or historical record.	Reproducible Derived from disclosed dates, fields or retrieval logic.	Named and dated Include, Investigate further or Exclude evidence-reliance decision.	Visible gap Not inferred when the approved source does not contain it.

02 / CURRENT QUALITY EVENT

The observed problem, structured without assigning cause.

The event statement separates what was observed from possible causes. Missing fields remain visible so the investigation team can request evidence before reaching a conclusion.

Field	Illustrative value	Evidence status
Reference	NCR-2026-017	Observed
Product	Precision drive shaft, family DS-44	Observed
Process	CNC finish boring, machine M-14	Observed
Site	Midlands manufacturing site	Observed
Detection	Final inspection, 2 September 2026	Observed
Requirement	Bore diameter 25.000-25.050 mm	Observed
Actual condition	Five of 80 measured parts at 25.061-25.074 mm	Observed
Containment	Lot isolated; machine stopped; 100% check started	Observed
Root cause	Not established	Unknown

Problem statement draft

On 2 September 2026, final inspection identified five of 80 DS-44 drive shafts with bore diameters between 25.061 mm and 25.074 mm against an approved upper limit of 25.050 mm after CNC finish boring on machine M-14. The affected lot was isolated and the machine was stopped. Cause has not been established.

Evidence gaps requiring action

- + Confirm calibrated instrument ID, status and measurement-system suitability.
- + Reconcile the full affected-lot boundary and any earlier production exposure.
- + Obtain approved offset history, tool-change records and operator handover evidence.
- + Record the independent tests required before accepting occurrence or escape cause.

03 / HUMAN EVIDENCE-RELIANCE REGISTER

Every surfaced record receives a visible decision.

The register preserves all decisions. Excluded records are not erased; they remain visible as evidence of what was considered and why it was excluded.

How records were surfaced

RepeatProof compares only the approved source boundary, normalises product, process, failure and evidence fields, then explains the matches. The relationship score orders the review queue; it is not a probability, accuracy statement or proof of common cause.

Source	Type	Score	Decision	Illustrative rationale
NCR-2025-142	NCR	86/100	INCLUDE	Same product family, bore feature, machine group and measured oversize condition.
CA-2025-038	CAPA	78/100	INCLUDE	Previous offset-control action is directly relevant to the verification plan.
COM-2025-019	Complaint	63/100	INCLUDE	Customer-return evidence shows the same functional symptom and drawing feature.
NCR-2024-311	NCR	47/100	INVESTIGATE	Similar dimension but different machine and alloy; retain as context pending comparison.
NCR-2025-207	NCR	39/100	EXCLUDE	Surface-damage issue shares product text but not the feature, failure mode or process.

REVIEWER A. Quality Manager Illustrative named role; no real-person identity.	RECORDED 5 September 2026 Each new decision is appended rather than overwriting the prior record.	COMPLETION 5 of 5 Export remains blocked until every surfaced record is reviewed.
--	--	--

Review rule

Include adds the source to the investigation pack. Investigate further retains it with uncertainty visible. Exclude removes it from selected evidence while preserving the source and rationale in this register.

04 / SELECTED HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

Previous action and source evidence stay attached to the comparison.

Only records marked Include or Investigate further appear here. These details support the next investigation step; they are not transferred as the current cause.

NCR-2025-142 - INCLUDE

Final inspection bore oversize on DS-44 shaft

Previous containment: isolated lot and stopped M-12. Verified historical cause: offset entry not independently confirmed after insert change. Previous action: second-person offset check. Evidence: IR-2025-142, offset history OH-771, tool-change record TC-884.

CA-2025-038 - INCLUDE

CAPA for repeated CNC offset-control escape

Previous containment: 100% bore verification. Verified historical cause: traveller did not require retained offset confirmation. Corrective action: controlled offset-capture step added. Effectiveness evidence: three planned monthly reviews; latest result must be checked in the QMS.

COM-2025-019 - INCLUDE

Customer complaint for assembly leakage

Previous containment: returned units assessed and affected stock screened. Historical evidence links the functional symptom to the same bore feature. Corrective action and effectiveness remain source-bound and require review before use.

NCR-2024-311 - INVESTIGATE FURTHER

Oversize bore on a different alloy and machine

The dimension and failure family are similar, but equipment, material and inspection method differ. Retain as contextual evidence only until those differences are tested.

Important limitation

The representative records above demonstrate presentation and decision controls. They do not establish retrieval precision on a customer's data or a measured business outcome.

05 / INVESTIGATION PREPARATION

Evidence requests and testable hypotheses - never hidden conclusions.

The pack turns reviewed history into an accountable work list. The quality team selects methods, owners and acceptance criteria under its controlled process.

Priority	Action	Expected evidence	Owner
High	Confirm measurement validity and instrument status.	Calibration, MSA status and remeasurement record.	Quality engineer
High	Reconstruct offset and tool-change sequence for M-14.	Machine log, offset history, traveller and timestamped change record.	Manufacturing engineer
High	Define occurrence and escape tests independently.	Approved test plan with acceptance criteria.	Investigation lead
Medium	Compare the four selected historical records.	Feature, machine, material, operator, timing and evidence matrix.	Quality investigator
Medium	Verify exposure and containment effectiveness.	Lot genealogy, inspection completion and disposition status.	Quality manager

Testable hypotheses for consideration

- + The current event may involve an unverified offset change. Test against the M-14 offset and tool-change sequence.
- + The escape may involve incomplete final-inspection coverage. Test the sampling plan, measurement record and reaction plan.
- + The historical corrective action may not have transferred to M-14. Verify applicability, implementation and effectiveness before drawing a conclusion.

Decision boundary

These are investigation prompts generated from the selected evidence. The authorised investigation team must accept, change or reject them and must establish root cause independently.

06 / QMS HANDBACK

A controlled output designed to return to the system of record.

RepeatProof does not become the authority for CAPA. The reviewed pack, source references and decision history are exported for attachment or transcription under the customer's approved QMS process.

Handback item	Included in this sample	Customer control
Target-event statement	Observed facts and visible unknowns	Verify against the official NCR.
Source review register	All five decisions and rationales	Confirm named reviewer authority.
Selected evidence	Included and Investigate further records	Open and verify original QMS sources.
Investigation plan	Evidence requests and hypotheses	Approve owners, tests and due dates.
Audit metadata	Run, version, source snapshot and export date	Retain under document-control rules.

EXPORT FORMAT HTML or JSON Printable evidence pack plus machine-readable decision record.	WRITE ACCESS Not required The first proof can begin from an approved historical export.	RETENTION Agreed in scope Customer-approved boundary, role access and deletion timing.
--	--	---

Before attachment	Open the original sources, confirm the named reviewer and approval boundary, apply the customer's document-control identifier, then attach or transcribe the pack according to the approved QMS procedure.
--------------------------	--

07 / LIMITATIONS AND APPROVAL

The evidence is useful only when its limits remain visible.

This final page is intentionally explicit: it prevents an illustrative output from being mistaken for a customer result, a compliance conclusion or an authorised quality decision.

Known limitations

- + All event content, names, references, counts and review decisions in this pack are invented representative data.
- + No real customer dataset, user session, time saving, quality outcome or return on investment is represented.
- + Retrieval performance depends on usable fields, source quality, terminology and the agreed data boundary.
- + A high relationship score does not prove recurrence, common cause or corrective-action effectiveness.
- + The customer must verify original records and retain all regulated decisions in the authorised QMS.

Illustrative preparation review

Status: REVIEW REQUIRED

A real output would require the named reviewer to confirm the sources, relevance decisions, boundaries and intended QMS handback. This public sample carries no operative approval.

PREPARED BY	EVIDENCE CLASS	NEXT REAL GATE
RepeatProof sample generator Versioned public demonstration material.	Representative demonstration Never to be described as customer evidence.	External task testing Observed completion with 8-12 independent quality professionals.

RepeatProof quality history intelligence supports accountable review. Your QMS remains authoritative and your people retain every quality decision.

Questions: hello@repeatproof.com | Security and data enquiries: security@repeatproof.com