# Measurement of effectiveness spinning fiber machines using total productive maintenance method at textile manufacturing

## Edi Supriyadi<sup>1\*</sup>, Rully Nurdewanti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Industrial Engineering, Tangerang City, Banten Province, Indonesia \* Corresponding author: dosen00905@unpam.ac.id

## **ARTICLE INFO**

#### ABSTRACT

Article history Submission: 8<sup>th</sup> July 2023 Revised: 8<sup>th</sup> June 2024 Accepted: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2024

Keywords Machine Breakdown Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Textile Industry Six Big Losses

doi https://doi.org/10.22219/oe.2024.v16.i1.105 PT XYZ is a textile industry manufacturing company whose main products are Polymer Chips, Pre-Oriented Yarn (POY), Draw Twister Yarn (DTY), Bi Shrankage Yarn (BSY), and Polyester Staple Fiber (PSF) which are marketed domestically and internationally. There are still high breakdown problems, which can hamper the production process and result in a decrease in production capacity. The purpose of this study was to measure the Performance Effectiveness of Fiber Spinning Machines using the Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Method and to find the causes of the Six Big Losses that affect the Performance Effectiveness of Fiber Spinning Machines. The application of TPM in the manufacturing industry aims to extend machine life and maximize the effectiveness of machine performance. The results of measuring the Performance Effectiveness of Fiber Spinning Machines using the TPM Method obtained an Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) value of 87.85% and the cause of Six Big Losses that affect the effectiveness of the performance of Fiber Spinning Machines is Equipment Failure Losses, the most dominant factor is the Human Factor, namely lack of control, lack of understanding of Standard Operational Procedure (SOP), lack of thoroughness when cleaning spinnerets.





1. Introduction

PT XYZ is a textile industry manufacturing company that has been established since 1979. The main products produced from the production of PT XYZ are Polymer Chips, Pre-Oriented Yarn (POY), Draw Twister Yarn (DTY), Bi Shrankage Yarn (BSY), and Polyester Staple Fiber (PSF) which is marketed to cover the whole world, both domestic and foreign markets. One of the mainstay products for PT XYZ to market is Polyester Staple Fiber (PSF) which is produced at the Staple Fiber Department. Polyester Staple Fiber (PSF) is the main raw material used by the textile industry to produce Polyester Spun Yarn, which is widely used for clothing and household appliances. The Fiber Spinning Machine is the most important part of the overall production in the Staple Fiber Department because this machine is a critical unit where if there is damage to this machine it will stop the production process (Syafwiratama et al., 2017). The Fiber Spinning Machine itself is always in operation for 24 hours without stopping with a production capacity of 67 tons/day, where every month of production there are a few product defects during the production process. In carrying out the production process in the Staple Fiber Department, there are still high breakdown problems. This can hamper the production process which results in a decrease in production capacity (Haviana & Hernadewita, 2019).

In overcoming this, a comprehensive solution is needed so that companies can improve their maintenance concepts and systems, where the new concepts and systems are not only able to ensure that the equipment owned can produce High-Quality Products but can also measure the overall efficiency of the equipment and facilities provided (Harahap et al., 2021) owns and can identify problems and provide

ideas for production improvements and machine maintenance that must be done. Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) is a good method of maintaining production machines to be applied in the manufacturing industry (Hardono, 2020). The application of TPM in the manufacturing industry aims to extend machine life and maximize the effectiveness of machine performance. The effectiveness of machine performance can be measured using the Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) method (Indriawanti & Bernik, 2020). OEE measurement is based on three categories, namely Availability Rate, Performance Rate, and Quality Rate (Muhaemin & Nugraha, 2022).

The gap with other research which is almost the same as the object of this research is that there are not so many textile products around textiles (Kurnia, Tumanggor, et al., 2021). Research at spinning factories confirms that spinning machine performance can also be improved, namely with TPM, especially periodic maintenance (Sihombing & Sumartini, 2017). Apart from that, in the Weaving section of tape making, there has been an increase in the OEE value and a reduction in tape defects with Six Sigma. In the Knitting section, many researchers have also produced scientific work analyzing OEE and Six Sigma DMAIC values (Kurnia, Jaqin, & Manurung, 2022). Identifying all production machines with OEE values that must be known both before repair and after repair can help companies increase company profits (Kurnia, Jaqin, & Purba, 2022).

The TPM is an approach to reduce and eliminate breakdowns that occur on machines innovatively in the maintenance process by optimizing the effectiveness of each piece of equipment and also carrying out maintenance carried out independently by the operator (Hairiyah et al., 2019)(Gianfranco et al., 2022). Based on the background and theoretical studies, the researcher tries to conduct research using the TPM Method to provide input on the problems encountered through the calculation of OEE and tries to uncover the root of the problem from the researcher's point of view.

#### 2. Methods

The primary data in this study came from sources that were directly observed to obtain actual data. The process observed was the breakdown data of the Fiber Spinning machine. The stages of observation and interviews were carried out with informants who were related to the object of the research problem, namely the process in the Staple Fiber department and the problems experienced during the process. Company documentation is used for research needs, while secondary data comes from literature studies with literature and research methods (Kurnia & Hardi Purba, 2021).

Research data collection was carried out by direct observation to obtain actual data to find out the problems and their causal factors so that researchers can easily map out the corrective steps taken. The steps for the data analysis method are divided into 4 (four) outlines as follows (Hairiyah et al., 2019).

Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) a.

Provides an overview of machine performance and accurate numbers to determine the level of effectiveness of the machine used (Wahid, 2020).

$$OEE(\%) = AxPxQx100\%$$

(1)

Information:

A = Availability (machine/equipment availability) B = Performance Effectiveness C = Quality

b. Availability

It is the ratio of operation time by eliminating equipment downtime to loading time (Atmaja et al., 2018).

| Loading Time = Running Time – Planned Downtime | (2) |
|--|-----|
| Operating Time = Loading Time – Down Time      | (3) |

Performance C.

Is a ratio that describes the ability of equipment to produce products (Firman et al., 2019).

$$Performance = \frac{Cycle\ Time}{Operating\ Time} \tag{4}$$

#### d. Quality

Is a ratio that describes the ability of the machine to produce products according to the specifications set (Kartika & Bakti, 2019).

 $Quality = Processed Amount - \frac{Defect Amount}{Processed Amount}$ (5)

The stages of the research starting from the formulation of the problem to the conclusion can be seen in Fig. 1.





### 3. Results and Discussion

Data Output is a good output product from the production process that occurs in the Spinning Fiber department (finished products), Data defects are product data that fails from the production process that occurs in the Spinning Fiber department (product defects), while the total production data is the total of all processes production that occurs in the Spinning Fiber department in the form of finished products and defects. The following is data on the number of outputs, defects, and total production of Fiber Spinning machines for the period January to December 2022 which are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1** Data on the number of outputs and production defects (2022)

| Month | Output (Tons) | Defect (Tons) | Total Production (Tons) |
|-------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|
|       |               |               |                         |

| Month  | Output (Tons) | Defect (Tons) | Total Production (Tons) |
|--------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Jan    | 1.239,04      | 10,97         | 1.250,02                |
| Feb    | 1.654,31      | 10,97         | 1.665,28                |
| Mar    | 1.818,87      | 25,85         | 1.844,72                |
| Apr    | 1.988,84      | 22,08         | 2.010,93                |
| May    | 1.972,55      | 19,67         | 1.992,22                |
| Jun    | 1.856,05      | 31,48         | 1.887,53                |
| Jul    | 1.965,61      | 21,9          | 1.987,51                |
| Aug    | 1.997,81      | 17,74         | 2.015,55                |
| Sep    | 1.919,28      | 27,56         | 1.946,85                |
| Oct    | 2.019,93      | 18,88         | 2.038,81                |
| Nov    | 1.918,18      | 22,16         | 1.940,34                |
| Dec    | 1.936,53      | 26,27         | 1.962,80                |
| Amount | 22.287,01     | 255,54        | 22.542,55               |

Availability Rate Data for Fiber Spinning Machines from January to December 2022, can be seen in Table 2. Next, the researchers carried out an analysis of the Six Big Losses, which is an analysis of the 6 biggest losses from spinning machines which often result in product defects or machine stops. Six Big Losses analysis is needed to analyze the types of defects that often occur over several periods (Sukma et al., 2022). The analysis can be seen in Table 2.

| Month | Machine<br>Work<br>Time<br>(Hours) | Planned<br>Downtime<br>(Hours) | Loading<br>Time<br>(Hours) | Breakdown<br>(Hours) | Setup<br>(Hours) | Downtime<br>(Hours) | Operating<br>Time<br>(Hours) | Availability<br>Rate (%) |
|-------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Jan   | 744                                | 33,47                          | 710,53                     | 54,97                | 4,42             | 59,39               | 651,15                       | 91,64%                   |
| Feb   | 720                                | 31,15                          | 688,85                     | 47,50                | 0                | 47,50               | 641,35                       | 93,10%                   |
| Mar   | 744                                | 29,17                          | 714,83                     | 45,73                | 0                | 45,73               | 669,10                       | 93,60%                   |
| Apr   | 720                                | 30,10                          | 689,90                     | 46,27                | 0                | 46,27               | 643,63                       | 93,29%                   |
| May   | 744                                | 28,70                          | 715,30                     | 44,82                | 0                | 44,82               | 670,48                       | 93,73%                   |
| Jun   | 744                                | 24,82                          | 719,18                     | 43,05                | 0                | 43,05               | 676,13                       | 94,01%                   |
| Jul   | 720                                | 16,02                          | 703,98                     | 29,87                | 0                | 29,87               | 674,12                       | 95,76%                   |
| Aug   | 744                                | 23,13                          | 720,87                     | 36,05                | 0                | 36,05               | 684,82                       | 95,00%                   |
| Sep   | 720                                | 26,33                          | 693,67                     | 40,60                | 0                | 40,60               | 653,07                       | 94,15%                   |
| Oct   | 744                                | 28,08                          | 715,92                     | 42,78                | 0                | 42,78               | 673,13                       | 94,02%                   |
| Nov   | 744                                | 33,35                          | 710,65                     | 52,30                | 0                | 52,30               | 658,35                       | 92,64%                   |
| Dec   | 696                                | 37,82                          | 658,18                     | 56,18                | 0                | 56,18               | 602,00                       | 91,46%                   |
|       |                                    |                                |                            | Average              |                  |                     |                              | 93,54%                   |

**Table 2** Availability rate calculation data (2022)

Before calculating the percentage of Performance Rate, it is necessary to know the Ideal Cycle Time value which is presented in Table 3.

| Table 3 Ideal | cycle time | calculation | data | (2022) |
|---------------|------------|-------------|------|--------|
|---------------|------------|-------------|------|--------|

| Month | Machine<br>work time<br>(Hours) | Total<br>delay<br>(Hours) | Loading<br>Time<br>(Hours) | Total<br>Production<br>(Tons) | Percentage<br>Hours<br>Worked (%) | Cycle<br>Time<br>(Hours) | ldeal Cycle<br>Time<br>(Hours) |
|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Jan   | 744                             | 97,27                     | 710,53                     | 1250,02                       | 86,93%                            | 0,57                     | 0,49                           |
| Feb   | 720                             | 78,65                     | 688,85                     | 1665,28                       | 89,08%                            | 0,41                     | 0,37                           |
| Mar   | 744                             | 74,90                     | 714,83                     | 1844,72                       | 89,93%                            | 0,39                     | 0,35                           |
| Apr   | 720                             | 76,37                     | 689,90                     | 2010,93                       | 89,39%                            | 0,34                     | 0,31                           |
| May   | 744                             | 73,52                     | 715,30                     | 1992,22                       | 90,12%                            | 0,36                     | 0,32                           |
| Jun   | 744                             | 67,87                     | 719,18                     | 1887,53                       | 90,88%                            | 0,38                     | 0,35                           |
| Jul   | 720                             | 45,88                     | 703,98                     | 1987,51                       | 93,63%                            | 0,35                     | 0,33                           |
| Aug   | 744                             | 59,18                     | 720,87                     | 2015,55                       | 92,05%                            | 0,36                     | 0,33                           |
| Sep   | 720                             | 66,93                     | 693,67                     | 1946,85                       | 90,70%                            | 0,36                     | 0,32                           |

| Month | Machine<br>work time<br>(Hours) | Total<br>delay<br>(Hours) | Loading<br>Time<br>(Hours) | Total<br>Production<br>(Tons) | Percentage<br>Hours<br>Worked (%) | Cycle<br>Time<br>(Hours) | ldeal Cycle<br>Time<br>(Hours) |
|-------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Oct   | 744                             | 70,87                     | 715,92                     | 2038,81                       | 90,47%                            | 0,35                     | 0,32                           |
| Nov   | 744                             | 85,65                     | 710,65                     | 1940,34                       | 88,49%                            | 0,37                     | 0,32                           |
| Dec   | 672                             | 94,00                     | 658,18                     | 1962,80                       | 86,01%                            | 0,34                     | 0,29                           |

Data on the percentage value of the Performance Rate of Fiber Spinning machines for the period January to December 2022 can be seen in Table 4.

| Month | Ideal Cycle<br>Time (Hours) | Total Production<br>(Tons) | Operating<br>Time<br>(Hours) | Performance<br>Rate (%) |
|-------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Jan   | 0,49                        | 1250,02                    | 651,15                       | 94,07%                  |
| Feb   | 0,37                        | 1665,28                    | 641,35                       | 95,67%                  |
| Mar   | 0,35                        | 1844,72                    | 669,10                       | 96,08%                  |
| Apr   | 0,31                        | 2010,93                    | 643,63                       | 95,82%                  |
| May   | 0,32                        | 1992,22                    | 670,48                       | 96,14%                  |
| Jun   | 0,35                        | 1887,53                    | 676,13                       | 96,66%                  |
| Jul   | 0,33                        | 1987,51                    | 674,12                       | 97,78%                  |
| Aug   | 0,33                        | 2015,55                    | 684,82                       | 96,89%                  |
| Sep   | 0,32                        | 1946,85                    | 653,07                       | 96,34%                  |
| Oct   | 0,32                        | 2038,81                    | 673,13                       | 96,23%                  |
| Nov   | 0,32                        | 1940,34                    | 658,35                       | 95,52%                  |
| Dec   | 0,29                        | 1962,80                    | 602,00                       | 94,04%                  |
|       |                             | Average                    |                              | 95,94%                  |

**Table 4** Performance rate calculation data

The results of the Quality Rate calculation for the Spinning Fiber machine for the period January to December 2022 can be seen in Table 5.

| Month | Output (Tons) | Defect<br>(Tons) | Total Production<br>(Tons) | Quality Rate<br>(%) |
|-------|---------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Jan   | 1239,04       | 10,97            | 1250,02                    | 98,24%              |
| Feb   | 1654,31       | 10,97            | 1665,28                    | 98,68%              |
| Mar   | 1818,87       | 25,85            | 1844,72                    | 97,20%              |
| Apr   | 1988,84       | 22,08            | 2010,93                    | 97,80%              |
| May   | 1972,55       | 19,67            | 1992,22                    | 98,03%              |
| Jun   | 1856,05       | 31,48            | 1887,53                    | 96,66%              |
| Jul   | 1965,61       | 21,90            | 1987,51                    | 97,80%              |
| Aug   | 1997,81       | 17,74            | 2015,55                    | 98,24%              |
| Sep   | 1919,28       | 27,56            | 1946,85                    | 97,17%              |
| Oct   | 2019,93       | 18,88            | 2038,81                    | 98,15%              |
| Nov   | 1918,18       | 22,16            | 1940,34                    | 97,72%              |
| Dec   | 1936,53       | 26,27            | 1962,80                    | 97,32%              |
|       | Α             | verage           |                            | 97,75%              |

**Table 5** Quality rate calculation data (2022)

The following is the result of calculating the Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) value of Fiber Spinning machines for the January to December 2022 production period.

**Table 6** Calculation of Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) in 2022

| Month | Availability<br>Rate (%) | Performance<br>Rate (%) | Quality<br>Rate<br>(%) | Overall Equipment<br>Effectiveness (%) |
|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Jan   | 91,64%                   | 94,07%                  | 98,24%                 | 84,69%                                 |
| Feb   | 93,10%                   | 95,67%                  | 98,68%                 | 87,90%                                 |
| Mar   | 93,60%                   | 96,08%                  | 97,20%                 | 87,41%                                 |
| Apr   | 93,29%                   | 95,82%                  | 97,80%                 | 87,43%                                 |
| May   | 93,73%                   | 96,14%                  | 98,03%                 | 88,34%                                 |
| Jun   | 94,01%                   | 96,66%                  | 96,66%                 | 87,85%                                 |
| Jul   | 95,76%                   | 97,78%                  | 97,80%                 | 91,56%                                 |
| Aug   | 95,00%                   | 96,89%                  | 98,24%                 | 90,43%                                 |
| Sep   | 94,15%                   | 96,34%                  | 97,17%                 | 88,14%                                 |
| Oct   | 94,02%                   | 96,23%                  | 98,15%                 | 88,80%                                 |
| Nov   | 92,64%                   | 95,52%                  | 97,72%                 | 86,47%                                 |
| Dec   | 91,46%                   | 94,27%                  | 97,32%                 | 83,92%                                 |
|       | Av                       | 87,74%                  |                        |  |

Based on the results of calculating the percentage of Six Big Losses from the Fiber Spinning machine, it can be seen that the loss factors that most influence the effectiveness of the performance of the Fiber Spinning machine are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Percentage of Six Big Losses Factors

| Six Big Losses                   | Value  | Percentage | Cumulative |
|----------------------------------|--------|------------|------------|
| Equipment Failure Losses         | 0,0641 | 56,67%     | 56,67%     |
| Reduced Speed Losses             | 0,0379 | 33,50%     | 90,17%     |
| Defects in Process Losses        | 0,0101 | 8,93%      | 99,10%     |
| Setup and Adjustment Losses      | 0,0005 | 0,46%      | 99,56%     |
| Idling and Minor Stoppage Losses | 0,0005 | 0,44%      | 100,00%    |
| Reduced Yield Losses             | 0      | 0,00%      | 100,00%    |

Next, carry out a Fishbone diagram analysis which functions to analyze the root causes of the main causes of the problem (Sjarifudin & Kurnia, 2022). The cause and effect diagram analysis of Six Big Losses on a Fiber Spinning machine can be seen in Figure 2.



Fig. 2 Cause and effect diagrams

After analyzing the main causes, the next step is to carry out a corrective action plan using the 5W+1H method (Kurnia, Jaqin, et al., 2021). The action plan for fixing the problem using 5W+1H can be seen in Table 8.

| Factor      | Problem   | What   |                          | Why  | When   |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Man         | Less skilled, less<br>control, and less<br>thorough   | Improved way of<br>working and<br>communication  |                          | It is necessary<br>to increase<br>work<br>productivity and<br>product quality    | Conduct new<br>employee training<br>and skill up every<br>6 months   |
| Machine     | The spinneret holes<br>are enlarged and the<br>polymer heater is<br>problematic                       | Evaluating and<br>determining spinne<br>service life and<br>handling of machin<br>more towards<br>predictive maintena                      | ret<br>es is<br>ance     | Machine repair<br>to support the<br>production<br>process                        | Weekly, monthly,<br>and yearly<br>evaluation of<br>machine life  |
| Material    | The polymer is dirty<br>and there is foreign<br>material in the<br>polymer                            | Frequent cleaning of<br>the PTA tub should be<br>carried out   |                          | Prevention of<br>poor product<br>quality   | Checking raw<br>materials and<br>cleaning PTA<br>storage tanks for<br>quality<br>improvement   |
| Method      | The cleaning pump<br>and oil hoses are not<br>on schedule and it's<br>too late to replace<br>the pack | Improvement of wo<br>methods, directed<br>communication, reg<br>replacement of par<br>and increased<br>supervision of pack<br>installation | ork<br>gular<br>ts,      | Increasing<br>production<br>capacity and<br>quality<br>according to<br>standards | Perform pack<br>changes, pump<br>cleaning, and oil<br>hoses when<br>engine damage  |
| Environment | Heat production room temperature  | Air circulation in the spinning process  | e                        | Provides<br>comfort for<br>employees at<br>work                                  | January 2022 and so on   |
| Man         | Less skilled, less<br>control, and less<br>thorough<br>The spinneret                                  | HRD, Maint, and Production   | Empl<br>Mana             | oyees and agement  | Perform work<br>communication and<br>supervision<br>Provide direction  |
| Machine     | holes are enlarged<br>and the polymer<br>heater is<br>problematic                                     | Maint and<br>Production  | Main                     | tenance  | according to<br>maintenance and<br>supervision<br>procedures   |
| Material    | The polymer is<br>dirty and there is<br>foreign material in<br>the polymer                            | Polymer  | Logis<br>Quali           | tics and<br>ty Control   | Quality Control is<br>more thorough in the<br>inspection of raw<br>materials   |
| Method      | Cleaning pump<br>and oil hose were<br>not on schedule,<br>and it was too late<br>to replace the pack  | Maint and<br>Production  | Maint<br>Prode<br>Supe   | t and<br>uction<br>rvisor  | Improve supervision<br>in carrying out<br>machine maintenance<br>and perform timely<br>replacement of parts<br>according to schedule |
| Environment | Heat production room temperature  | Production   | Produ<br>Mana<br>Utiliti | uction<br>ager and<br>es   | Adding a blower in<br>the spinning process<br>area   |

 Table 8 5W+1H corrective action plan

In principle, this research was carried out because, before 2022, machine productivity will decline drastically to 80% for the OEE value. Meanwhile, the company's target, namely increasing the OEE value to 85%, is a shared responsibility. Therefore, during 2022, the research team will carry out analysis, identify problems, and make improvements, to increase the OEE value to more than 85%. After carrying out the Six Big Losses analysis, there were equipment failure losses of 56.67% of the

total problems. Therefore, the research team looked for the cause of the problem using the Fishbone diagram method. After finding the root of the problem, the next step is to take corrective action for the 5 main causal factors. After processing the data resulting from the improvements, the average OEE value during 2022 increased by 87.74%. So the company benefits in terms of increased productivity due to a significant increase in OEE value.

The comparison of results with other research related to the application of TPM to increase the OEE value in spinning factories that produce staples or filaments produced by spinning machines. Achieving OEE by identifying six major losses that occurred, resulted in an average OEE value for ring frame machines of 79.96%. This effectiveness value is quite low because the standard OEE value for world-class companies is ideally 85%. The biggest factor influencing the low OEE value is the level of performance with the percentage of six major loss factors reducing the speed of loss by 17.303% of all lost time. The proposed corrective action is the implementation of autonomous maintenance, providing training for operators and maintenance maintenance as well as operator supervision (Martomo & Laksono, 2018). TPM strategies can lead to improvements in availability, performance, and quality, the three main factors that contribute to OEE can be achieved by implementing the proposed strategies (Subha Shree et al., 2015). Increasing the OEE value can be done by analyzing large losses by looking for the main causes with the Ishikawa diagram. Corrective action is carried out using Root Cause Analysis of the main causes of production losses (Musyoki et al., 2019).

In theory, the implications of this research can be used as a reference for other researchers who wish to research the application of OEE in the textile industry, especially in spinning factories. The implications of this research can be practically applied in spinning factories in terms of increasing the OEE value of spinning machines by analyzing the Six Big Losses and corrective actions by implementing TPM on the machine. So the application of this OEE method can increase machine efficiency, reduce production waste caused by machines, and increase company profits.

### 4. Conclusion

Based on the research that has been carried out to determine the OEE value for Spinning Fiber machines at PT XYZ using the TPM method during the period January to December 2022, the following conclusions can be drawn, Measuring the Performance Effectiveness of Spinning Fiber machines with using the TPM method, the OEE value is 87.85%. This value indicates that the average OEE of Fiber Spinning machines is effective, with an OEE value above  $\geq$  85% which is an international standard. The cause of the Six Big Loss that affect the effectiveness of the performance of the Fiber Spinning machine is Equipment Failure Losses, the most dominant factor is the Human Factor, namely lack of control, lack of understanding of SOPs, lack of thoroughness when cleaning spinnerets.

### References

- Atmaja, L. T., Supriyadi, E., & Utaminingsih, S. (2018). Analisis Efektivitas Mesin Pressing Ph-1400 Dengan Metode Overall Equipment Effectiveness (Oee) Di Pt. Surya Siam Keramik. *Teknologi : Jurnal Ilmiah Dan Teknologi*, 1(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.32493/teknologi.v1i1.1415
- Firman, F., Thabrani, G., & Violeta, V. P. (2019). Analisis peningkatan kinerja pemeliharaan mesin dengan Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) pada mesin boiler pabrik kelapa sawit PT. Perkebunan Nusantara VI unit usaha Rimbo Dua Tebo-Jambi. *Jurnal Kajian Manajemen Bisnis*, 8(2), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.24036/jkmb.10885100
- Gianfranco, J., Taufik, M. I., Hariadi, F., & Fauzi, M. (2022). Pengukuran Total Productive Maintenance (Tpm) Menggunakan Metode Overall Equipment Effectiveness (Oee) Pada Mesin Reaktor Produksi. *Jurnal Lebesgue : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Matematika, Matematika Dan Statistika, 3*(1), 160–172. https://doi.org/10.46306/lb.v3i1.109
- Hairiyah, N., Rizki, R., & Wijaya, R. A. (2019). Analisis Total Productive Maintenance (Tpm) Pada Stasiun Kernel Crushing Plant (Kcp) Di Pt. X. Jurnal Teknologi Pertanian Andalas, 23(1), 103. https://doi.org/10.25077/jtpa.23.1.103-110.2019

- Harahap, U. N., Eddy, E., & Nasution, C. (2021). Analisis peningkatan produktivitas kerja mesin dengan menggunakan metode Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) di PT. Casa Woodworking Industry. *Jurnal VORTEKS*, *2*(2), 110–114. https://doi.org/10.54123/vorteks.v2i2.88
- Hardono, J. (2020). Analisa Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Menggunakan Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) Pada Mesin CNC Milling. *Jurnal Teknik*, *9*(2), 105–115. https://doi.org/10.31000/jt.v9i2.3689
- Haviana, E., & Hernadewita, H. (2019). Productivity improvement in the rubber production process using the value stream mapping method to eliminate waste. *Operations Excellence: Journal of Applied Industrial Engineering*, *11*(2), 119. https://doi.org/10.22441/oe.v11.2.2019.023
- Indriawanti, V., & Bernik, M. (2020). Analisis Penerapan Total Productive Maintanance (TPM) dengan Menggunakan Metode Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) pada Mesin Printing. Jurnal Teknik Industri, 10(1), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.25105/jti.v10i1.8388
- Kartika, H., & Bakti, C. S. (2019). Analisa Produktivitas Sistem Perawatan Mesin Dengan Metode Overall Equipment Effectiveness (Oee) Di Pt.Ymn. Jurnal Ilmu Teknik Dan Komputer, 3(1), 31. https://doi.org/10.22441/jitkom.2020.v3.i1.004
- Kurnia, H., & Hardi Purba, H. (2021). A Systematic Literature Review of Lean Six Sigma in Various Industries. *Journal of Engineering and Management in Industrial System*, 9(2), 19–30. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jemis.2021.009.002.3
- Kurnia, H., Jaqin, C., & Manurung, H. (2022). Implementation of the DMAIC Approach for Quality Improvement in the Elastic Tape Industry. *J@ti Undip: Jurnal Teknik Industri*, *17*(1), 40–51. https://doi.org/10.14710/jati.17.1.40-51
- Kurnia, H., Jaqin, C., & Purba, H. H. (2022). The PDCA Approach with OEE Methods for Increasing Productivity in the Garment Industry. *Jurnal Ilmiah Teknik Industri : Jurnal Keilmuan Teknik Dan Manajemen Industri, 10*(1), 57–68. https://doi.org/10.24912/jitiuntar.v10i1.15430
- Kurnia, H., Jaqin, C., Purba, H. H., & Setiawan, I. (2021). Implementation of Six Sigma in the DMAIC Approach for Quality Improvement in the Knitting Socks Industry. *Tekstilvemuhendis*, 28(124), 269–278. https://doi.org/10.7216/1300759920212812403
- Kurnia, H., Tumanggor, O. S. P., & Jaqin, C. (2021). Lean Six Sigma: Literature Review and Implementation for Textile and Textile Product (TTP) Industries. *3rd Mercu Buana Conference on Industrial Engineering-MBCIE 2021*, 1–11.
- Martomo, Z. I., & Laksono, P. W. (2018). Analysis of Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Implementation Using Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) and Six Big Losses: A Case Study. *The 3rd International Conference on Industrial, Mechanical, Electrical, and Chemical Engineering*, 2(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5024085
- Muhaemin, G., & Nugraha, A. E. (2022). Penerapan Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Pada Perawatan Mesin Cutter di PT. XYZ. Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan, 8(9), 205–219. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6645451
- Musyoki, J. K., Muchiri, P. N., & Keraita, J. N. (2019). Improvement of Ring Frame Spindle Utilization in Cotton Short Staple Spinning: A Case Study of a Cotton Spinning Mill. *IOSR Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering (IOSR-JMCE) e-ISSN*, 16(1), 58–65. https://doi.org/10.9790/1684-1601035865
- Sihombing, M. I. S., & Sumartini, S. (2017). Effect of Raw Material Quality Control and Production Process Quality Control on the Quantity of Defective Products and Its Impact on Quality Costs (Cost of Quality). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Dan Bisnis*. https://doi.org/10.17509/jimb.v8i2.12665
- Sjarifudin, D., & Kurnia, H. (2022). The PDCA Approach with Seven Quality Tools for Quality Improvement Men's Formal Jackets in Indonesia Garment Industry. *Jurnal Sistem Teknik Industri* (*JSTI*), *24*(2), 159–176. https://doi.org/10.32734/jsti.v24i2.7711
- Subha Shree, M., Vijaya Ganesa Velan, M., Padmakumar, M., & Sudharsanan, T. (2015). Overall equipment effectiveness (OEE) analysis and improvement in a spinning unit. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, *10*(55), 3791–3796. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4032186

- Sukma, D. I., Prabowo, H. A., Setiawan, I., Kurnia, H., & Maulana, I. (2022). Implementation of Total Productive Maintenance to Improve Overall Equipment Effectiveness of Linear Accelerator Synergy Platform Cancer Therapy. *International Journal of Engineering, Transactions A: Basics*, 35(7), 1246–1256. https://doi.org/10.5829/ije.2022.35.07a.04
- Syafwiratama, O., Hamsal, M., & Purba, H. H. (2017). Reducing the nonconforming products by using the Six Sigma method: A case study of a polyester shortcut fiber manufacturing in Indonesia. *Management Science Letters*, 7(3), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2016.12.001
- Wahid, A. (2020). Penerapan Total Productive Maintenance (TPM) Produksi Dengan Metode Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE) Pada Proses Produksi Botol (PT. XY Pandaan Pasuruan). *Jurnal Teknologi Dan Manajemen Industri, 6*(1), 12–16. https://doi.org/10.36040/jtmi.v6i1.2624