

TRAINING MODULE

OCP Master Generator

A document that generates no data of its own — on purpose

A working module for engineers with 1–2 years on the floor. By the end you will be able to read a Data Source Index correctly, and tell a real documentation gap apart from a station where a source was never supposed to exist.

Grounded in the quality-system traceability discipline underneath every AIAG-VDA control document hierarchy

What You Will Be Able to Do After This Module

1 Explain what an Operation Control Procedure (OCP) is, and why it's a downstream synthesis document, not a primary data source.

2 Name all eight upstream sources an OCP pulls from, and what each one contributes.

3 Read a Data Source Index correctly — tell a real gap apart from a source that was never supposed to exist for that station.

4 Explain why every OCP section states which document it was pulled from.

5 Recognize the two most common mistakes junior IEs make when they first assemble an OCP.

Downstream Synthesis, Not New Investigation

Every other tool in this series produces original findings. An OCP is different by design:

EVERY OTHER TOOL

Investigates something, produces a NEW finding — a root cause, a calculated risk, a diagnosis.

OCP MASTER

Investigates NOTHING. It PULLS what eight upstream documents already found, and assembles it into one operator-facing control document.

An OCP is only as good as the eight documents underneath it — which is exactly why it always shows its work, source by source.

Missing Data Stays Visible — It Never Gets Papered Over

Every one of the 8 inputs gets a ✓ or a — on page 1, per station. No section pretends to know something it doesn't:

WITHOUT THE INDEX

A section reads confidently even when its underlying source (say, PFMEA) was never actually completed for that station — the gap is invisible to the reader.

WITH THE INDEX

A — on the Data Source Index tells anyone reading this OCP exactly which upstream study still needs to happen — an honest to-do list, not a hidden hole.

Same honesty discipline as the Control Plan's “— Quality to define —” placeholder — a visible gap is safer than a confident-looking guess.

Every Claim Needs a Pointer Back to Its Source

Modern quality systems — IATF 16949, ISO 9001 — are built on traceability: an auditor should be able to follow any claim in a control document back to the study or record that produced it. An OCP that just states “failure mode: X” with no citation is a claim floating free of evidence. This tool states the source on every section, the same way the PFMEA and Control Plan modules already taught you to respect where a number actually came from.

A document nobody can trace is a document nobody should fully trust.

TRACE- ABILITY

Quality-System discipline

Eight Sources, Eight Different Contributions

Source	Contributes
1. Production Study Master	Station index, JM steps, CT / Takt
2. Analysis Output	ECRS observations, MTM RCA / CAPA
3. Process FMEA	Failure modes, S-O-D, Action Priority
4. 8D Tracker	Root cause + corrective action
5. SOP Bilateral	LH/RH method, defect recognition
6. Man Gantt MTM	MTM gap overlay (where process name matches)
7. MM Analysis	Man-Machine SMED/SYNC ideas
8. OPL (if already built)	Key-point summary text reuse

1

STEP 1

Read the Data Source Index

A — doesn't always mean a problem. Sometimes it correctly means “this source was never supposed to exist here.”

Learning to tell the two apart is the whole point of this slide.

STATION 4 — OUR RECURRING WORKED STATION

Source	Status	Reading
1. Production Study	✓	present
2. Analysis Output	✓	present
3. PFMEA	✓	present — AP=HIGH finding
4. 8D Tracker	✓	present — linked case
5. SOP Bilateral	✓	present
6. Man Gantt MTM	—	REAL GAP — worth chasing
7. MM Analysis	—	correctly absent — Stn 4 is pure Man, not Man-Machine
8. OPL	—	REAL GAP — not yet built

2

STEP 2

How One Section Gets Built

The Failure Mode section, cited directly — the same failure mode you've now seen through the PFMEA, Control Plan, and 8D modules.

This is the fourth time this exact finding has appeared — always traceable to the same original PFMEA row.

OCP SECTION: FAILURE MODE / RISK

“Component missing or double-loaded at the station” — AP=HIGH, Severity=8

SOURCE: Process_FMEA_<timestamp>.xlsx, row 14

OCP SECTION: CORRECTIVE ACTION

“Pre-kit connectors by size, plus kitting-review checklist item added to EC process”

SOURCE: 8D_Tracker_<timestamp>.xlsx, case 8D-004, D5

Every section carries its own citation line — an auditor never has to take the OCP's word for anything; they can walk straight to the source document.

“Where Process Name Matches” — Not Guaranteed

Source 6, Man Gantt MTM, only overlays when it can genuinely match — it never forces a connection that isn't real:

MATCH FOUND

Gantt sheet's process name 'Fastener Insertion' matches OCP Station 4's process name exactly — MTM gap data overlays cleanly.

NO MATCH

Gantt sheet uses 'Connector Assy' for a similar-sounding process — not an exact match, so NO overlay is forced. Shows as — on the Index, correctly.

This is the honest choice: forcing a fuzzy “close enough” match would risk attaching the **WRONG** MTM data to a station. A visible — is safer than a confident, wrong overlay.

Key Points Reused, Never Re-Written

If OPL_OCP/OPL_Stn4.xlsx already exists, its key-point summary text is pulled in exactly as written — the same discipline as the SOP module's verbatim-sourcing rule and the Lean VA module's verbatim kaizen citation.

If it doesn't exist yet, the Data Source Index simply shows — for OPL, and the OCP proceeds without it — no fabricated key-point text ever fills the gap.

You've now seen this exact pattern — real source or an honest blank, never a fabricated middle ground — in SOP Master, Control Plan, and Lean VA. It's not a coincidence; it's a consistent design principle across this entire suite.

If an OCP Section Looks Thin, Check the Index First

1

Is the Failure Mode / Risk section missing entirely? → Check whether Source 3 (PFMEA) shows ✓ for that station.

2

Is there no Corrective Action listed for a known issue? → Check Source 4 (8D Tracker) — the 8D case may not exist yet.

3

Is the MTM gap overlay missing on a station you know has MTM data? → Check the process-name match — it may be a naming mismatch, not missing data.

4

Is a Man-Machine idea section empty on a pure Man station? → That's likely CORRECT, not a gap — MM Analysis was never supposed to exist there.

Five Mistakes That Give Junior IEs Away



Treating every — on the Data Source Index as a documentation failure — some are correctly absent for that station's type.



Presenting an OCP section without checking its citation — an OCP claim with no traceable source is exactly what this tool exists to prevent.



Forcing a fuzzy MTM Gantt match instead of accepting an honest — when the process names don't genuinely align.



Rewriting an OPL's key-point text into the OCP instead of citing it verbatim.



Assuming an OCP finding is independently verified just because it appears in the OCP — it's only as solid as the upstream source cited beneath it.

What generate_ocp_master.py Does For You

One OCP per station, fully cited, plus a coverage summary across the whole line.

- 1 OCP_<Station>_<Process>.xlsx** Every section pulled from its real upstream source, with the citation stated — one file per station.
- 2 Data Source Index, page 1** ✓ / — for all 8 inputs, per station — gaps visible, not hidden, the Slide 4 principle applied automatically.
- 3 OCP_Source_Coverage_Summary.xlsx** Whole-line view of which sources are complete and which still need upstream work — a real to-do list, not guesswork.
- 4 Handles fuzzy-match sources honestly** MTM Gantt overlay and OPL reuse only apply when a real match exists — never forced.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Recap — Say This Back In Your Own Words

- An OCP investigates nothing new — it synthesizes what 8 upstream documents already found, with citations.
- A — on the Data Source Index isn't automatically a problem — learn to tell a real gap from a correctly-absent source.
- Every section states its source, so any claim in the OCP is traceable back to the study that produced it.
- Fuzzy matches (MTM Gantt, OPL reuse) only apply when genuinely warranted — an honest — beats a forced, wrong connection.

TALK IT THROUGH — 3 QUESTIONS FOR YOUR NEXT LINE WALK

1. Pull up a real OCP on your line — can you trace every section back to its stated source document?
2. Find a — on a Data Source Index — is it a real gap worth chasing, or correctly absent for that station's type?
3. Has anyone on your team ever treated an OCP finding as independently verified without checking its citation?