



4



4. Washer


c. Roughness washer in new condition

Comparison based on pictures of washers of 5 pc. Motors (V10561, new condition)


→ Due to not having seen rough surfaces on washers, agreed with JLR to point on low priority.

INFORMATION REDACTED
PURSUANT TO THE FREEDOM OF
INFORMATION ACT (FOIA), 5 U.S.C.
552(B)(6)


Sample 1




Sample 2




Sample 3



Sample 4



Sample 5



Conclusion:

No difference regarding roughness visually detectable on 5 washer surfaces in new condition.

Note:

Diameter washer: 3,75mm
Diameter shaft: 1,97mm

Methodology Step:-



Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes

5. Time to dry motor

5



a. Time to dry motor

- Take corroded latches from field
- 6 pc. (when available) apply tap water on bearing and pump it into motor by turning the shaft.
- 3 pc. storage for 1 week at high temperature and low humidity (80°C / ~10% rH)
- 3 pc. storage for 1 week at room temperature and uncontrolled humidity
- Visual inspection and function check with test box:
 - 1st with Short Circuit
 - 2nd with Open Circuit
- **Afterwards internal agreement about next steps, based on first results.**

b. Capillary action due to axial movement of shaft

- → Already confirmed, unwinding direction of motor moves shaft inwards the motor housing and generates pumping effect additionally to capillary effect



Methodology Step:-



Scope and Prioritise
Potential Causes

6. Washing tensesides shampoo

a. Can different tensesides be identified in residues of corrosion? ✓

→ To be clarified and detailed with laboratory (Würzburg).

Tenside not possible to identify (see Ishikawa point 4). Only identification of elements possible. For example Na, S und P.

Therefore it is not possible to determine the used washing product and washing habit of the customer.

6



Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)

Methodology Step:-



Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes

6

6. Washing tensides shampoo

- b. Are different tensides used in different markets, different countries, different carwashes, different concentrations, different water conditioning? → JLR ✓

Mail Sean Edwards:

JLR has no specification for world wide used washing tensides shampoos.

Test Procedure JLR: TPJLR.52.105

Exterior Trim Components: Resistance to Alkaline Car Wash Fluids

- 12,7g NaOH
- 2,31g Na3PO4
- 12H2O
- 0,165g NaCl
- 1000ml water

Brose Statement: Specific test which is critical for aluminium parts. This car wash fluid mixture do not represent world wide used washing products.

- c. Testing to be defined after clarification of a. and b.

Point closed. Due to 6a und 6b ✓



7

7. Fast latch function

- a. Use of KV function on doors. Correlation existing to KV-issue? → JLR
- Questionary prepared and provided to JLR, so far no feedback from dealer side.
- Additional questionnaire will be prepared for JLR owned vehicle users.

→ Questionary JLR updated with KV specific points as agreed with Ash Dhir, Sean Edwards and Steve Hinsley

→ **Wording will be updated, first proposal attached**

Door latch investigation - Affects L405 / L494 / L462 / L550 / X152 / X260 / X351 (after 14MY) / X760

Dear Colleagues

We are investigating the operation of door latches. If you ever have had an issue with your latch we would be grateful if you could complete the following questions.

Models we're reviewing are L405 / L494 / L462 / L550 / X152 / X260 / X351 (after 14MY) / X760.

**Required*

Vehicle registration *

What door latch has an issue? Judged when sitting in the vehicle *

- o RH Front
- o LH Front
- o RH Rear
- o LH Rear

What failure have you seen? *

- o Went open - Unable to open the door when pulling the handle (inside or outside handle)
- o Went close / latch - when closing the door it will bounce back (latch will not grab striker)
- o Went lock - Although you have pushed the lock button (Central lock / Double lock) the door can still be opened
- o Went unlock - Lock status LED remains lit despite input from master switch / remote & door won't open
- o Unable to activate / deactivate child lock - Although child lock has been switched off, it is not possible to open the rear door when pulling the inside handle
- o Went soft close (where fitted) - Door does latch but does not automatically pull shut. To close the door fully you have to slam it.

Went open issues, was this found operating?

- o Internal handle
- o External handle



Methodology Step:-

D M A I C R

Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes

7

For wont lock - Was the found operating....

- Remote
- Master lock switch (drivers door)
- Exterior handle (touch lock function / KV entry)
- All of the above

Is the fault all the time or intermittent? *

- All
- Intermittent

Other symptoms?

- Alarm sounding
- Door Ajar sign on dash

How often is the faulty door used?

- Regularly
- Once a day
- 3-4 times a week
- Rarely

How often do you open each door by handle (key-less) per week?

How often do you wash the car per month?

- 1 time
- 2-5 times
- 6-10 times
- 11-15 times
- 16 - 30 times



Methodology Step:-




Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes

8

8. After P068 campaign

- a. Function ok after flash on every door? →JLR
- b. Is data base of AWS reliable (conflict between load date and repair date)? →JLR
→ [23.10.2015](#)

Design proposal to stop leakage path



1. Elimination of edge in KV housing (contact area KV housing to lid), height will be increased
2. Add of sealing contour at KV housing, this will be pressed in KV lid to seal the contact surface



Timing for testing and serial introduction of KV housing and lid

		November	December	January	February	March	April
Issue	Action	46 47 48	49 50 51 52	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17			
height of contact geometry in housing will be increased by approx. 0,3 mm and thickness of lid reduced to get a planar contact surface	modification of KV housing and lid for better protection of pin	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA
height of contact geometry in housing will be increased by approx. 0,3 mm and thickness of lid reduced to get a planar contact surface	modification of KV housing and lid for better protection of pin	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA
height of contact geometry in housing will be increased by approx. 0,3 mm and thickness of lid reduced to get a planar contact surface	modification of KV housing and lid for better protection of pin	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA	sample built / assembly test / change management / SHEA



Methodology Step:-

D **M** **A** **I** **C** **R**

Testing KV housing change

Testing / Validation of new design

- Leakage Test with paint water
- Samples
 - Changed KV housing with sealing contour from tooling
 - Minimum / Nominal / Maximum compression between KV housing and lid




Methodology Step:-

D **M** **A** **I** **C** **R**


Testing KV housing change

Test results leakage test

Samples with sealing contour (height 0,3 mm) in KV housing and 3 tolerance spots



KV housing after testing



KV lid after testing

Main content of water will be stopped by sealing contour ✓


No water is running to KV motor ✓

Slight water traces found inside of the sealing contour ✗




Test results leakage test

Investigation of test samples



KV housing after testing



KV lid after testing

Sealing rib of KV housing is pressed into KV lid sufficiently in the area of the tolerance spots due to higher force during the riveting process. In the area between the tolerance spots the sealing contour is not pressed sufficiently into the KV lid.




Test results leakage test


Investigation of test samples

Two actions needed for robust design solution

1. Increase height of sealing contour at KV housing from 0,3mm to 0,5mm



2. Additional spots at lid to press sealing contour into lid





Test results leakage test

Samples with sealing contour (height 0,5 mm) in KV housing and 6 tolerance spots




Test procedure:

Fix a tube as water basin at the pin, storage of latches for 24h, check after 24h if water is visible behind the sealing contour




Test results leakage test

Samples with sealing contour (height 0,5 mm) in KV housing and 6 tolerance spots



KV housing after testing



KV lid after testing

Main content of water will be stopped by sealing contour ✓


No water is running to KV motor ✓

Slight water traces found inside of the sealing contour ✗



Test results leakage test

Investigation of test samples



Due to tolerances the sealing contour is not central. Depth of indentation not sufficient to seal complete area.


Methodology Step:-

D **M** **A** **I** **C** **R**

Testing KV housing change

Test results leakage test

Investigation of test samples



Tolerance spots of the KV lid not perpendicular to the sealing contour at the KV housing. Force transmission during riveting process not optimal (transverse) to press the sealing contour into the lid



Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)



Methodology Step:-

D **M** **A** **I** **C** **R**


Testing KV housing change

Test results leakage test

Design proposal



Optimized design of tolerance spots



Optimized design of sealing contour

Contour of tolerance spots modified

Diameter of sealing contour increased by 0,2mm



Methodology Step:- **D** **M** **A** **I** **C** **R**

Separation of 6-panel document on the 5th of October 2018 in three parts for better handling:

Slide 1-130 see file: 20170915_6Panel_Will_not_latch_excerpt slide 1-130

6-panel second extract: 20180906_6Panel_Will_not_latch_joint version_05102018

6-panel in progress: 20170915_6Panel_Will_not_latch_ROZ

Both documents were sent out on the 9th of October 2018

Methodology Step:-




Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes



Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)

FT RH CL PC KV
05.09.2013



Latch from Critical Concern List SALWR2TF3FA [REDACTED] // USA

L494 MY15 Open whilst driving

Software flash: 18-JAN-2016

Repair date: 16-JUL-2018

Customer: VEHICLE DRIVERS DOOR WILL NOT STAY CLOSED WHILE DRIVING

Tech: Scanned the vehicle for related DTCs none present. Removed drivers door panel for access and inspected the door latch door latchnot latching, latch internal fault. Replaced the latch, re assembled the door panel, re tested door operation normal.



Latch received with 1 winding left on the motorshaft



Front sinter bearing red corrosion, corrosion on housing visible, w/o grey sticker.

[KV motor operation open circuit](#)

→ 0,5winding left on the motor shaft after the 1st actuation, 0 winding on second attempt.

[KV motor operation short circuit](#)

→ nok KV function, 5 windings left on the motor shaft

[KV operation first short then open](#)

→ 5 windings left on the shaft after short, cord fully unwound on open



Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)

Methodology Step:-



Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes

Latch from Critical Concern List SALGS2EF7DA [REDACTED] // USA



L405 MY 13, w/o grey sticker

Software flash: based on AWS P068 not performed

Repair date: 21-AUG-2018, 64MIS, Ft RH in 59MIS.

Customer: C/S DRIVER FRONT DOOR IS NOT LOCKING/LATCHING, ADVISE.

Tech: FOUND L/F DOOR LATCH FAILS TO LATCH. REPLACED LATCH. PERFORMED FUNCTION TEST. VEHICLE OPERATES AS DESIGNED.



Latch received with 5 windings left on the motor shaft.

Front sinter bearing red, corrosion on housing visible.

[KV motor operation open circuit](#)

→ NOK KV function, shaft is rotating, 5 windings left

[KV motor operation short circuit](#)

→ NOK KV function, shaft is rotating, 5 windings left

[KV operation first short then open](#)

→ NOK KV function, 5 windings short, 4 windings open

FT LH CL PC KV LB
17.04.2013

CPLA-21813-BD
C07385-101
FT LH CL PC KV LB
170413 0639 I
CER DTSEA



Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)

Methodology Step:-

D

M

A

I

C

R

Scope and Prioritise
Potential Causes

Latch from Critical Concern List SALWR2WF0EA [REDACTED] / USA

L494 MY 14, w/o grey sticker,


Inadvertent door opening whilst vehicle in motion & door will subsequently not latch.

Software flash: 17-JUN-2016, 27MIS

Repair date: 17-SEP-2018 - 55MIS,

Customer: CUSTOMER STATES THE LEFT FRONT DOOR WILL NOT CLOSE

Tech: CODE 2 TO BUILD LOYALTY TO THE BRAND 90% GOODWILL PER SERVICEDIRECTOR. will need to replace left front door latch assy vor latch. replaced left front door latch assy. tested ok.



Latch received with 4 windings left on the motor shaft.



Front sinter bearing grey - corroded, red corrosion on the housing visible.

[KV motor operation open circuit](#)

→ OK KV function, shaft is freely rotating, 0 windings left.

[KV motor operation short circuit](#)

→ NOK KV function, shaft is rotating, but 4 windings left.

[KV operation first short then open](#)

→ NOK KV function with short – 4 windings left,
→ OK KV function with open - 0 windings left.

FT LH CL PV KV LB
18.02.2014



Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)

Methodology Step:-

D

M

A

I

C

R

Scope and Prioritise Potential Causes

FT RH CL PC KV
08.09.2014



Latch from Critical Concern List SALWV2TF9EA [REDACTED]/USA

L405 MY 14, Inadvertent door opening in motion at 25 km/h

Software flash: 04-FEB-2016 – 13 MIS, W/O grey sticker

Repair date: 15-OCT-2018 – 17MIS

Customer: Claim not in AWS or IQM

Tech: Claim not in AWS or IQM



Latch received with 6 windings left on the motor shaft.



Front sinter bearing corroded and corrosion on the front side of motor found.

KV motor operation open circuit

→ OK KV function, shaft re wound on the first attempt, 0 windings left.

KV motor operation short circuit

→ NOK KV function, shaft is rotating, but 5 windings left.

KV operation first short then open

→ NOK KV function on short, OK KV function on open.





Problem Solving Evidence Reporting (6-Panel)

Methodology Step:-

D **M** **A** **I** **C** **R**

Scope and Prioritise
Potential Causes

Documentation of latch from Critical Concern List SALWV2TF9EA [REDACTED] /USA



Conclusion: leak path via KV rivet hole found, part prior grey sticker introduction.

**FT LH CL KV LB
18.9.2017**
Latch from Critical Concern list SALRRBBV4HA [REDACTED] // USA
L462 MY 17
Software flash: N/A - since SOP
Repair date: 31-DEC-2018, 13 MIS, previous repair in AWS: n/a
Customer: GUEST STATES LEFT REAR AND FRONT PASSENGER DOOR LATCHES ARE NOT LATCHING PROPERLY. CHECK ALL LATCHES
Tech: Door latch and adjustments. Tested door latches. Found LF not latching on the secondary and the LR and RR doors intermittently latching. Ordered failed LF door latch and adjusted both rear door latch strikers to make a better connection. Installed LF door latch and holds great now. PN LR078731


Latch received with 0 windings left on the motor shaft.

No corrosion on the KV motor visible
KV motor operation open circuit → OK KV function, 0 windings left, cord will fully unwound

KV motor operation short circuit → OK KV function, 0 windings left, cord will fully unwound


KV operation first short then open → OK KV function, 0 windings left, cord will fully unwound

L2CCA2BG5GG [REDACTED] - China



Wuppertal, 14.09.2017

SALGA2EF0GA [REDACTED] - Kuwait
Tear down documentation



Wuppertal, 14.09.2017

Voice of the customer - SALGA2EF0GA [REDACTED]



Email Matt Newman – 27.07.2017

Good Morning Oliver & Sela,

I have requested an entire latch module to be returned to you for detailed analysis from the MENA market. Unfortunately we have had another occurrence of a door failing to latch, but this vehicle is well outside the scope of P068 and also the exterior release handle was not jammed;

Owner returned to vehicle to dealer with a LHF door that was failing to latch. Vehicle build date is Fri 6 May 2016, therefore falls AFTER the introduction VIN for the latch with all modifications (Feb 2015) and after the introduction VIN for the RFA software fix (Dec 2015), therefore falls outside of the scope of the P068 recall action.

Immediately prior to the failure occurring the owner had unlocked the vehicle using the LHF door, therefore the assumption is that that door was unlocked using a KV actuation / KV unlock cycle. The state of the door (CL / DL) is unknown prior to this unlock event.

After opening the door the customer was then immediately unable to latch it securely.

The vehicle was returned to the dealer where the error state was still evident, with video evidence available (see attached). Neil Goulsbra attended the vehicle and the error state was still evident when he got there. The door shedder was removed and the interior release cable fed back through it to complete the release process, and the shedder was then disconnected and placed away from the vehicle.

The bolts holding the latch into the car were loosened a few turns, and the latch checked for the error state - it was still present. The bolts were then removed from the latch, and the error state was still present. During the manoeuvre to removed the latch from the door cavity, Neil was holding the interior release cable to balance the latch, and he felt a "click" come from the main latch body through the interior release cable. This click resulted in a re-setting of the latch mechanism and when the latch was completely free of the vehicle the failure mode was no longer present.

No further mechanical cycling of the latch has occurred other than a few cursory cycles to check for the error state being present or not.

General information - SALGA2EF0GA [REDACTED]

brose

Latch not in Critical Concern List SALGA2EF0GA [REDACTED] // KUW

FT LH DL PC KV LB
05.04.2016

Software flash: out of VIN range → repair date: **CW30 2017**




**Latch received completely unwound
– no leakage path visible**



**Sinter bearing shiny, no corrosion on
motor housing visible**

Visual inspection





Visual inspection




Visual inspection



- Latch received with all levers in home-position
- no sticky-behavior opening from outside
- Blue particle not present on latch or box anymore



Visual inspection



Visual inspection





Tear down of latch – cut off retention plate with KV housing



Tear down of latch – cut off retention plate with KV housing



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate




Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate dismantled from latch



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate dismantled from latch



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate disassembled

- Disassemble sub-assembly backplate with grease and abrasion



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate disassembled

- Disassemble sub-assembly backplate after cleaning




Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate disassembled

- Disassemble sub-assembly backplate after cleaning



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly striker guide and backplate with pawl and claw



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate with pawl and claw




Conclusion & next steps

- **Summary:**
- **“Clicking noise” described by Neil Goulsbra could not be replicated**
- **KV motor shaft easily rotatable by finger & KV lever not jammed**
- **No foreign particle between levers on outside transmission lever bushing detected**
- **No scratch marks or obvious deformation on the parts**

- **Next steps:**
- **Compare bushing and lever pictures to L2CCA2BG5GG [REDACTED] (China – KV transmission lever jammed in operated position)**
- **Dimensional analysis for single parts**

L2CCA2BG5GG [REDACTED] - China
Tear down documentation



Wuppertal, 18.08.2017

Visual inspection



- Latch received in jammed condition (not possible to latch)
- KV Transmission lever (zamak) jammed / KV plastic lever in home position




Tear down of latch – cut off retention plate with KV housing



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate



Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate





- after cutting off retention plate the failed condition is still present
- spring between O/S transmission lever and bushing


Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate dismantled from latch



During disconnecting the pawl pin from the backplate sub-assy the jammed condition dissolved




Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate dismantled from latch



Unjammed condition KV transmission lever

Measurement of gap between bushing and o/s transmission lever with one thickness gauge :

→ 0,7 mm


 Measurement area

Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate single parts **brose**



Abrasion of KV-transmission lever visible – residues on contact surfaces of neighbour parts as well

Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate single parts **brose**



Bushing height:
7 mm

Tear down of latch – sub-assembly backplate single parts **brose**




Height measurement in
area of abrasion:
→ 4,92 mm


Drawing specification:
5,20 mm -0,05 mm



Height o/s transmission
lever:
1,54 mm

 Measurement area


Root cause investigation Jammed subassy Backplate



Tolerance study – worst case

A-A

5:1




Tolerance study - worst case

Detail B

10:1



series

D01885-103



Tolerance study – tilted worst case



Detail F
10:1
worst case



- Tilting increases the gap from 0,5 mm to 0,59 mm
- Spring can not fully move between bushing and lever

Single Part 3D scan O/S transmission lever

Reference surface →





Conclusion:

- Thickness of the lever **ok**
- Rotating area of the lever **ok**
- Parts within specification **ok**

Single Part 3D scan Bushings O/S transmission



Reference surface →



Conclusion:

- Difference in the chamfer visible – see detailed results on page 39
- Step height on CN part higher than on KWT part – but both parts within specification **ok**

Single Part 3D scan Bushings O/S transmission - cut through




Conclusion:

- Difference in the chamfer visible – see detailed results on page 39



Single Part 3D scan

Bushing O/S transmission - Chamfer



brose

Kuwait	China
--------	-------



Measured with optical projection equipment:

X-direction: 0,70 mm – 0,77 mm (nok)
 Y-direction: 0,50 mm – 0,53 mm (nok)



Measured with optical projection equipment:

X-direction: 0,37 mm – 0,44 mm (nok – 0,04 mm out of spec)
 Y-direction: 0,23 mm – 0,35 mm (ok)

Conclusion:

- CN part (failure mode present) with borderline chamfer / KWT part (failure mode not present) with nok chamfer
- Supplier involvement to clarify quality situation



Single Part 3D scan I/S transmission lever



Conclusion:

- Thickness of the lever **ok**
- Scratch marks on lever not visible in scan comparison – nothing on this lever indicates why it was in contact with o/s transmission lever




Single Part 3D scan KV transmission lever



Conclusion:


- Wear out area of the lever too thin – 4,92 **nok**
- Other area of the lever too thin – 5,06 **nok**
- Supplier involvement to clarify quality situation

Part comparison from durability test KV transmission lever

Durability test from comparable production period (beginning of 2016)	Durability test from beginning of 2017
<p>LHF</p> 	<p>LHF</p> 
	<p>RHR</p> 
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Test result ok – no function failure- High measurement result done today → 4,93 mm on wear out area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Test result ok – no function failure- No wear out area


Single Part KV transmission lever

Current Production




brose

#	C01888	C01889
1	9,17	9,12
2	9,17	9,13
3	9,18	9,13
4	9,17	9,12
5	9,19	9,15
6	9,18	9,15
7	9,18	9,15
8	9,19	9,14
9	9,18	9,16
10	9,18	9,17
Min	9,17	9,12
Max	9,19	9,17
Average	9,18	9,14




Single Part KV transmission lever




Current Production



#	C01888	C01889
1	5,17	5,17
2	5,18	5,18
3	5,19	5,18
4	5,18	5,18
5	5,19	5,18
6	5,19	5,18
7	5,19	5,18
8	5,18	5,18
9	5,18	5,18
10	5,17	5,18
Min	5,17	5,17
Max	5,19	5,18
Average	5,18	5,18




Single Part 3D scan – Current Production I/S transmission lever double pull





Conclusion:
- Parts have no deviation

Single Part 3D scan – Current Production O/S transmission lever





brose

938820	938819
--------	--------




Conclusion:
- Parts have no deviation

Single Part 3D scan–Current Production Bushing



Conclusion:
 - Parts have no deviation

Single Part 3D scan–Current Production KV transmission lever



Conclusion:
- Parts have no deviation

Material analysis of KV transmission lever



Spec.	Current CZ 8/2017	Durability V10.627 No 6 LH	Durability V10.627 No 7 RH	Reference part PD as field part
Cavity	L1/L3/R2/R3	L2	R3	L1/L2/R3/R4
GD ZN Al 4 Cu1	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
Hardness HV1: 97	114-118	112-114	108-113	108-112
Density Min 6,4 g/cm ³	6,419-6,447	6,445	6,451	6,412-6,437
Porosity (no spec.)	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
Microstructure	homogeneous	homogeneous	homogeneous	homogeneous
Summary	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok

Conclusion:

- Material is ok. (COB Lab Report 5806)
- The abrasion is not based on a material failure


KV transmission lever – abrasion

Requalification latches 2017 (durability test)

No		5,2-0,05 Max	5,2-0,05 Min	Picture
1 LH		5,15	5,14	
2 LH		5,15	5,14	
3 LH		5,15	5,04	
4 RH		5,19	5,18	
5 RH		5,16	5,15	
6 RH		5,16	5,15	
7 RH		5,19	5,18	
8 RH		5,19	5,18	
9 RH		5,16	5,15	
Average LH		5,15	5,11	
Average RH		5,17	5,17	

Single part measurement - Current production

IBH-Innen: C36085/84



C36085-102	Linienform bis 0,3	Linienform bis 0,35		Rechtwinkligkeit 0,2
Datum	No. 10	No. 45_1	No.45_2	No. 46
10.1.2017 - 5.8.2017 n=70 average	0,160	0,006	-0,024	0,057

C36084-102	Linienform bis 0,3	Linienform bis 0,35		Rechtwinkligkeit 0,2
Datum	No. 10	No. 45_1	No.45_2	No. 46
10.1.2017 - 5.8.2017 n=70 average	0,185	0,011	-0,042	0,046


Conclusion:
Series production ok

Single part measurement - Current production

ABH-Innen: 738819/20



738819-104	Linienform bis 0,4	Linienform 0,35		4,5 +0,1 / -0,15	
Datum	No. 32	No. 76 (2 Punkte)		No. 79 (2 Punkte)	
3.10.2016- 9.8.2017 n = 68 average	0,158	-0,073	-0,090	4,515	4,531




738820-104	Linienform bis 0,4	Linienform 0,35		4,5 +0,1 / -0,15	
Datum	No. 32	No. 76 (2 Punkte)		No. 79 (2 Punkte)	
3.10.2016- 9.8.2017 n = 68 average	0,083	-0,010	-0,009	4,539	4,515

Conclusion:
Series production ok

KV transmission lever

Control plan content for height dimension

GENERAL CONTROL PLAN				Control plan nr: 17	Status:	xi For serial production Prototype Pre-Launch	Completion Date: 07/11/2013	Revision nr: 002	Core Team: F.Bertini, G.Sopetto		
PART NR:	C01888-104		DESCRIPTION:	LEVER LH		DRAWING: D01888-104			INDEX: 104		
process	machine	characteristic			methods						
		product	process	special characteristic classification	specification	measuring system	quantity	frequency	control method	registration	responsibility

thickness 5,15±5,20 (3)			According to "ciclo di collaudo" (mod. 004)	Caliper	1 complet shot	every 8 hours	random check	ciclo di collaudo (mod. 004)	Quality Dept.
----------------------------	--	---	---	---------	----------------	---------------	--------------	------------------------------	---------------

Next steps



No	Action	Start	End	Status
1	Bush chamfer check	17.08.2017	22.08.2017	done
2	3D scan of all subassy components - KV transmission lever - outside transmission lever - bushing O/S transmission lever - I/S transmission lever	17.08.2017	22.08.2017	done
3	material analysis of KV transmission lever from failed part Update: use comparable parts from other latches – parts from failed parts to be conserved for possible future testing (see slide 49)	30.08.2017	12.09.2017	done
4	comparison abrasion from durability test parts with failed part from the field – Update: further parts to be investigated - 5 field parts China arrived 29.08.2017 - Requalification parts 2017 (2 carsets) (done see slide50) - Warranty parts with failure mode pot. Sticky lever - PD Latch 2014 – 2016	17.08.2017	25.08.2017 08.09.2017 22.09.2017	In progress
5	Build up new latches with KV transmission lever from failed parts (switch it on – switch it off)	15.09.2017	20.10.2017	In progress
6	Single part measurements current production and supplier data for delivered parts	22.08.2017	tbd	Done

Next steps

No	Action	Start	End	Status
7	KV transmission lever Control plan content for height dimension	28.08.2017	05.09.2017	done
8	Process walk investigation - Check serial random inspection - Check changeover process traceability documents - Check NRFT documents - Check assembly line CV	28.08.2017	05.09.2017 15.09.2017	done
9	Design options: What pot. design solutions are available to reduce gap or avoid abrasion?	15.09.2017	22.09.2017	In progress

Warranty parts

Component measurement




No.	VIN	Build Date	Initial inspection result	Variante	KV-Transmission Lever			Bush			Subassembly Backplate			
					Height 5,2-0,05 at max.	Height 5,2-0,05 at min.	Inner Diameter 9,1	Chamfer -0,6 axial 2	Chamfer -0,4 radial 1	Diameter 9 -0,1	Height 6,9 +0,15	Height between bush to	Height between bush to bush max	Build on Line 1,2 3?
16-047	SALWA2VF5	12.09.2013	NTF	Rear LH	5,17	5,08	9,14	0,23	0,45	8,96	6,99	17,3	17,36	1
17-004	SALWR2EF6	18.10.2013	NTF	Rear LH	5,16	5,13	9,15	0,44	0,17	8,94	6,96	17,31	17,36	1
16-16	SALWV2EFX	12.05.2014	NTF	Front LH	5,21	5,18	9,14	0,15	0,11	8,94	6,99	17,21	17,25	1
6	SALGA2EF4	31.10.2014	NTF	Front LH	5,16	5,03	9,15	0,2	0,19	8,94	6,99	17,19	17,25	1
16-133	SALWA2VF2	25.11.2014	NTF	Front LH	5,16	5,03	9,15	0,25	0,18	8,94	6,97	17,18	17,22	2
16-024	SALWA2VFX	30.03.2015	NTF	Front LH	5,15	5,12	9,15	0,32	0,21	8,93	7,00	17,37	17,41	3
16-226	SALGA2DF8	12.08.2015	NTF	Rear LH	5,12	5,08	9,16	0,28	0,27	8,93	6,99	17,25	17,27	3
16-188	SALGA2DF8	24.09.2015	NTF	Front LH	5,15	4,98	9,16	0,49	0,52	8,94	7,02	17,38	17,41	3
17-49	SALWV2EF3	06.04.2016	NTF	Front LH	5,15	5,04	9,17	0,62	0,86	8,95	6,95	17,18	17,21	3
16-223	SALWA2VF7	13.12.2012	NTF	Front RH	5,18	5,08	9,15	0,3	0,21	8,96	6,94	17,2	17,25	1
17-64	SALGA2EF6	18.02.2013	NTF	Rear RH	5,17	5,12	9,16	0,28	0,18	8,95	6,95	17,11	17,14	1
17-062	SALGA2DF8	20.12.2013	NTF	Rear RH	5,16	5,17	9,16	0,19	0,16	8,94	6,94	17,21	17,27	1
16-064	SALGA2EF5	13.05.2014	NTF	Rear RH	5,16	5,15	9,16	0,21	0,33	8,94	6,99	17,36	17,48	2
16-061	SALGA2DF8	11.09.2014	NTF	Rear RH	5,15	5,11	9,17	0,32	0,28	8,93	6,97	17,18	17,22	2
16-009	SALWV2TFX	05.11.2014	NTF	Rear RH	5,19	5,17	9,16	0,14	0,12	8,93	6,98	17,21	17,23	2
16-68	SALWA2EF2	06.01.2015	NTF	Front RH	5,20	5,17	9,17	0,3	0,28	8,94	6,99	17,29	17,32	1
16-046	SALGA2DFX	20.01.2015	NTF	Front RH	5,19	5,17	9,16	0,23	0,15	8,93	7,00	17,31	17,33	2
16-063	SALWA2VF1	10.02.2015	NTF	Front RH	5,16	5,13	9,17	0,21	0,14	8,94	6,98	17,29	17,32	1
16-229	SALGA2DF8	11.08.2015	NTF	Rear RH	5,17	5,10	9,11	0,24	0,15	8,93	6,98	17,29	17,3	3
16-225	SALWA2EF6	19.08.2015	NTF	Rear RH	5,18	5,15	9,13	0,26	0,18	8,96	6,94	17,27	17,3	3
16-086	SALGA2DF5	22.09.2015	NTF	Rear RH	5,17	5,15	9,12	0,45	0,67	8,94	7,00	17,42	17,46	3
16-095	SALGA2DF5	26.11.2015	NTF	Rear RH	5,19	5,15	9,13	0,3	0,17	8,93	7,01	17,36	17,48	3
16-222	SALGA2DF0	15.12.2015	NTF	Rear RH	5,18	5,16	9,12	0,33	0,28	8,93	7,00	17,27	17,34	3
17-063	SALGA2DF3	18.05.2016	NTF	Rear RH	5,19	5,16	9,13	0,57	0,89	8,94	6,94	17,2	17,24	2

-> nok chamfer (red) detected in field parts (NTF)


Warranty parts

Component measurement chamfer

Example: 16-16



Example: 17-49



Risk evaluation Bush -chamfer

- Measured components from field parts with NTF
- Bush / chamfer
 - Clarification with logistics for relevant production dates 9/15-5/16
 - Supplier is informed
Needs shipping notes from Brose


Brose 6.10.17

Risk evaluation KV-Transmission Lever

- Transmission Lever max. nok
 - 8/2015 - 4/2016

VIN	Build Date	Variant	Height 5,2-0,05 at max.	Height 5,2-0,05 at min.	Bemerkung	Befund
			KV-Tr- Lever max	KV-Tr- Lever n		
SALWA2VF7E	13.12.2012	Front RH	5,18	5,08	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2EF6D	18.02.2013	Rear RH	5,17	5,12	Feldteile WUP	
SALGS2EF5E	22.05.2013	Front LH	5,17	5,01	Feldteile WUP	
SALWA2VF5E	12.09.2013	Rear LH	5,17	5,08	Feldteile WUP	
SALWR2EF6E	18.10.2013	Rear LH	5,16	5,13	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2EF7E	18.12.2013	Rear RH	5,16	5,15	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF8E	20.12.2013	Rear RH	5,16	5,17	Feldteile WUP	
SALWV2EFXE	12.05.2014	Front LH	5,21	5,18	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2EF5E	13.05.2014	Rear RH	5,16	5,15	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF8F	11.09.2014	Rear RH	5,15	5,11	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2EF4F	31.10.2014	Front LH	5,16	5,03	Feldteile WUP	
SALWV2TFXF	05.11.2014	Rear RH	5,19	5,17	Feldteile WUP	
SALWA2VF2F	25.11.2014	Front LH	5,16	5,03	Feldteile WUP	
SALWA2EF2F	06.01.2015	Front RH	5,20	5,17	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DFXF	20.01.2015	Front RH	5,19	5,17	Feldteile WUP	
SALWA2VF1F	10.02.2015	Front RH	5,16	5,13	Feldteile WUP	
SALWA2VFXF	30.03.2015	Front LH	5,15	5,12	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF8G	11.08.2015	Rear RH	5,17	5,10	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF8G	12.08.2015	Rear LH	5,12	5,08	Feldteile WUP	
SALWA2EF6G	19.08.2015	Rear RH	5,18	5,15	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF5G	22.09.2015	Rear RH	5,17	5,15	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF8G	24.09.2015	Front LH	5,15	4,98	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF5G	26.11.2015	Rear RH	5,19	5,15	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF0G	15.12.2015	Rear RH	5,18	5,16	Feldteile WUP	
L2CCA2B95G	18.01.2016	Front LH	5,06	4,92	China Feldteil	sticky behaviour
SALWA2VF1G	07.03.2016	Front LH	5,04	4,95	China Feldteil	sticky behaviour
SALGA3VF8G	30.03.2016	Front LH	5,05	4,95	China Feldteil	sticky behaviour
SALGA2EF0G	05.04.2016	Front LH	5,07	4,95	Kuweit Feldteil	sticky behaviour
SALWV2EF3G	06.04.2016	Front LH	5,15	5,04	Feldteile WUP	
SALGA2DF3G	18.05.2016	Rear RH	5,19	5,16	Feldteile WUP	
n/a	03.01.2017	Front RH	5,16	5,15	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	04.01.2017	Rear LH	5,15	5,14	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	04.01.2017	Rear RH	5,16	5,15	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	04.01.2017	Rear RH	5,16	5,15	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	04.01.2017	Rear RH	5,19	5,18	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	04.04.2017	Rear RH	5,19	5,18	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	11.04.2017	Rear LH	5,15	5,14	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	12.04.2017	Front LH	5,15	5,04	Requali-Test 2017	
n/a	12.04.2017	Front RH	5,19	5,18	Requali-Test 2017	

Abrasion KV-Lever Ishikawa



Remark:
4.3 added

Reproduce failure mode

Test procedure

Test:	Reproduce failure mode "sticky KV-transmission lever"		
Latches with:	KV-Transmission lever from field parts approx 5mm (Spec. 5,2 -0,05)		
	Bush with champfer similar to field part - 0,5 (Spec. -0.4) and -0,7 (Spec. -0.6)		
	Rest: current series components		
Variant:	LH latches		
Amount:	2		
	2	total series parts for comarison	
Procedure:	7.6.5 Temperature cycling		
	ORL operation at RT 2.500 cycles on rapid device		
	Wet-Dust Application after 2.500 cycles		
	ORL operation at RT 2.500 cycles on rapid device		
	Salt spray test 24h after 5.000 cycles with mounted watercaps		
	ORL operation at 38°C/ 95% humidity 5.00 cycles on Durability test rig		
	(overnight (> 8h) storage at 38°C/ 95% humidity with latch closed and CL engaged on Durability test rig		
	After 8h storage opening the latches via KV		
	Function check, consisting of:		
	- Latch opened after KV?		
	- Pawl latches again?		
	- KV transmission lever free rotating?		
	- KV transmission lever back to home position?		
	- O/S transmission lever release free rotating?		
	- O/S transmission lever release back to home position?		
	- Latch opens via KV without O/S release pull?		
	- Test: Intermittent unlock issue successful?		
Timing			
	Procedure	22.09.2017	done
	Test duration	approx 3 weeks	
	Test end	20.10.2017	

Design options

Component	What to change?	Expected Effect	pot. Negative effect	Status	Process
1 Bush	Reduce chamfer	Axial force of spring (wedge effect) will be reduced	process limits due cold-forming turned part	Request to supplier (cold-forming process): - Process technically possible? - Possible amount of rejects in chamfer reduction without change in process? 05.10.2017: Still under investigation with Supplier regarding feasibility --> Timing: 20.10.2017	- increased test effort - sorting and scrapping
2 Bush	Step height -tolerance reduction	Axial force of spring (wedge effect) will be reduced	process limits due cold-forming turned part	- Process technically not possible - Request to supplier whether a smaller tolerance would be possible with increased inspection effort. 05.10.2017: Still under investigation with Supplier regarding feasibility --> Timing: 20.10.2017	
3 KV-Transmission-Lever	Material properties increase e.g. MIM / Zamak ZP 2	less/no abrasion		- ZP 2 has slightly better strength properties. - MIM = Prio 2 (new process, new tools, new validation) 05.10.2017: Improved material specification see next page feasibility and dimensional behavior has to be evaluated. --> First result expected 20.10.2017	Comparison tests with parts made of ZP 5 and ZP 2
4 KV-Transmission-Lever	Change bearing dimension (ring)	reduce tilting; increase contact area	higher friction due to bigger diameter	Work out a concept: -> what is possible new spring calculate, design change at lever 05.10.2017: No new update - Less priority	
5 spring	square cross-section	less/no entrance into gap	assembly problems / lifetime performance	Spring with similar torque with wire 0.85x0.85 possible. (Spring behavior can not be estimated) 05.10.2017: Will be evaluated together with design solution 6 + 8	Request to supplier: - Sample preparation Brose: - validation
6 forced resetting of outside transmission lever	connection between the o/s transmission lever and o/s release lever	to support resetting of KV-ler and o/s transmission lever		Design idea 05.10.2017: See next page. Prototype assembled. Possible Idea - reduce winding of outside transmission lever spring. Based on the investigation results of Point 8 might be considered additionally.	Request to supplier: - Sample preparation Brose: - validation
7 spring	coating of spring	bigger diameter to avoid entrance		05.10.2017: After internal discussion with commodity expertes, idea rejected due to feasibility and durability	
8 Additional part	downhold of spring	No gap entrance		Work out a concept: -> what is possible new spring calculate, design a bush 05.10.2017: Will be evaluated together with design solution 5 + 6	

Design Idea material properties Point 3



Properties	Current Material [ZP 5]	Other possible Material [ZP 2]
Tensile strength	331 MPa	397 MPa
Shear strength	262 MPa	317 MPa
Compressive strength	600 MPa	641 MPa
Hardness (Brinell)	114	130

Abrasion test for direct comparison under investigation by central laboratory

Design Idea forced resetting Point 6

brose

- Prepared prototype sample
 - Welded wall onto serial outside transmission lever
- Solution creates forced resetting of outside transmission lever
- See Video for the behavior of the lever – part build up without o/s transmission lever spring and without KV transmission lever spring



[Video](#)

O/S release chain interactions





Current

New (forced resetting)


Modification of O/S transmission lever generates linkage also in resetting direction

Operated O/S release lever




After resetting in case of jammed O/S transmission lever







Lever can stay in jammed position



Lever is forced to move back in home position





O/S release chain interactions with forced resetting

Ser. No		1	2	3	4
	Part	O/S release lever	O/S transmission lever	Coupling lever	KV transmission lever
1	O/S release lever		++ modification	++	-
2	O/S transmission lever			-	S
3	Coupling lever				+
4	KV transmission lever				


- ++ = Connection in both directions
- + = Connection only in operation direction
- s = Interaction by spring support / bearing
- = No direct connection

Mini-Tab Investigation



Conclusion: No influence of TIS for abrasion or gap


Mini-Tab Investigation



Based on current investigation, diameter KV transmission lever differences has no influence to abrasion


→ This has to be confirmed with more data

Mini-Tab Investigation



*Based on few available data: bigger axial chamfer leads to more abrasion
→ This has to be confirmed with more data*

Mini-Tab Investigation



*Based on few available data: bigger radial chamfer leads to more abrasion
→ This has to be confirmed with more data*

Affective production period




- Deliveries from 30. May 2016 onwards → OK
- Deliveries before May 2016 → still under investigation

Mini-Tab Investigation




KV-Transmission Lever Height - Requalification 2013-2016 Left Hand




Feldvariable: Date

KV-Transmission Lever Height - Requalification 2013-2016 Left Hand Normal




Requalification 1/year at supplier, 2016 different

brose



DoE Status 06.04.2018

Unilatch High end



DoE Planning



DOE Planning						
Target:	Evaluation of latch production before Mai 2016					
Response:	1	2				
	KV-Transmission Lever jammed	Abrasion of KV-Transmission Lever				
	Attributive Status: yes / no	variable (mm)				
Test procedure:	see procedure					
Latch variant	FT LH and RR RH					
Influence factors	Description	Effect	Specification	Level 1	Level 2	Remark
1	KV-Transmission Lever Height	Height below 5,15 will cause gap.	5,2 -0,05	5,2	5,05	Level 1: max Tolerance Level 2: min from measured field parts
3	Bush Champfer -0,6	Allows that the spring gets into the gap and causes an axial force.	-0,6 axial	-0,3	-0,9	Level 1: average current production Level 2: max from measured field parts
3	Bush Champfer -0,4	allows that the spring gets into the gap and causes an axial force.	-0,4 radial	-0,2	-0,8	Level 1: average current production Level 2: max from measured field parts
4	Bush Step height	Designed freeplay, part of the gap	6,9 +0,15	6,9	7,05	Level 1: min Tolerance Level 2: max Tolerance

DoE Procedure




Latches with:	acc DOE Level (4 factors, 2 Level)					
Variant:	FT LH and RR RH					
Amount:	8 + 8	16				
Equipment	Durability test rack (4 latches)					
	Climatic chamber					
Procedure:	Operating by	Cycles	Conditions	Spec:	Check	Loop
Preperation						
	ORL + KV open, close	2500	5°C	Latches on test-rack	Jammed condition detect via pawl microswitch	1
	Climate change					
	ORL + KV open, close	2500	60°C / 95% rH	Latches on test-rack	Jammed condition detect via pawl microswitch	
	no	> 8h (overnight) storage	60°C / 95% rH latch closed and CL engaged	Latches on test-rack		
	ORL + KV	1	60°C / 95% rH latch closed and CL engaged	Latches on test-rack	Function check	
			Salt spray test 24h with mounted watercaps	Salt test chamber	Function check	Extended Step
			Drying 4h RT Humidity 60°-95% over night (12h) Drying 4h RT	Latches on test-rack	Function check	Extended Step


DoE

Response Criteria: Gap home position



Position of KV-transmission lever after passing test procedure



Home position
No Gap



Home position
With Gap



Critical Gap > 7,7mm

DoE Plan + Results



Position 1 + 2
DoE – Results
after extended
procedure
(5000cycles +
corrosion)

Position3 + 4
Pre-Test Results
after test
(35000cycles +
corrosion)

StdRfol	DlaufRf	ZtrlPu	Blöcke	KV-Tr-Lever Height	Bush Chamfer0,6	Bush Chamfer0,4	Bush Step Height	Gap home position 1	Gap home position 2	Gap home position 3	Gap home position 4
2	1	1	1	5,20	-0,9	-0,8	6,90	3	*	*	*
1	2	1	1	5,05	-0,9	-0,8	6,90	3	4	*	*
15	3	1	1	5,05	-0,3	-0,2	7,05	0	3	*	*
8	4	1	1	5,20	-0,3	-0,2	6,90	3	*	8	0
12	5	1	1	5,20	-0,3	-0,8	7,05	2	*	*	*
11	6	1	1	5,05	-0,3	-0,8	7,05	0	*	*	*
4	7	1	1	5,20	-0,3	-0,8	6,90	5	2	*	*
13	8	1	1	5,05	-0,9	-0,2	7,05	0	2	*	*
9	9	1	1	5,05	-0,9	-0,8	7,05	4	4	0	3
10	10	1	1	5,20	-0,9	-0,8	7,05	2	*		
3	11	1	1	5,05	-0,3	-0,8	6,90	0	*		
7	12	1	1	5,05	-0,3	-0,2	6,90	0	3		
16	13	1	1	5,20	-0,3	-0,2	7,05	0	*		
5	14	1	1	5,05	-0,9	-0,2	6,90	4	0		
6	15	1	1	5,20	-0,9	-0,2	6,90	4	2		
14	16	1	1	5,20	-0,9	-0,2	7,05	0			

Pre-Test Results: 1 Latch failed (8mm)

DoE Results: No latch failed with extended procedure

DoE

Model for Result average gap home position 1-2

Residuendiagramme für Gap home position average1-2 5t


Faktorielle Regression: Gap home pos vs. KV-Tr-Lever ; Bush Chamfer; Bush Chamfer; ...

Varianzanalyse

Quelle	DF	Kor SS	Kor MS	F-Wert	p-Wert
Modell	6	18,9375	3,1563	2,89	0,074
Linear	4	10,9375	2,7344	2,51	0,116
KV-Tr-Lever Height	1	0,5625	0,5625	0,52	0,491
Bush Chamfer0,6	1	3,0625	3,0625	2,81	0,128
Bush Chamfer0,4	1	2,2500	2,2500	2,06	0,185
Bush Step Height	1	5,0625	5,0625	4,64	0,060
2-Faktor-Wechselwirkungen	2	8,0000	4,0000	3,67	0,068
KV-Tr-Lever Height*Bush Chamfer0,6	1	4,0000	4,0000	3,67	0,088
KV-Tr-Lever Height*Bush Step Height	1	4,0000	4,0000	3,67	0,088
Fehler	9	9,8125	1,0903		
Gesamt	15	28,7500			

Zusammenfassung des Modells

S	R-Qd	R-Qd(kor)	R-Qd(prog)
1,04416	65,87%	43,12%	0,00%



R-Qd: 65,87% < 80%

-> DoE factors not completely explaining the result.

-> Additional factor(s) to consider.

2-factor interference in model (p-value > 0,05 but contribution is relevant)

DoE

Model for Result average Gap home position 1-4

Faktorielle Regression: Gap home pos vs. KV-Tr-Lever ; Bush Chamfer; Bush Chamfer; ...

Varianzanalyse

Quelle	DF	Kor SS	Kor MS	F-Wert	p-Wert
Modell	6	18,492	3,0820	3,29	0,053
Linear	4	11,616	2,9041	3,10	0,073
KV-Tr-Lever Height	1	1,511	1,5109	1,61	0,236
Bush Chamfer0,6	1	1,615	1,6150	1,72	0,222
Bush Chamfer0,4	1	1,042	1,0421	1,11	0,319
Bush Step Height	1	7,448	7,4484	7,95	0,020
2-Faktor-Wechselwirkungen	2	6,876	3,4379	3,67	0,068
KV-Tr-Lever Height*Bush Chamfer0,6	1	3,438	3,4379	3,67	0,088
KV-Tr-Lever Height*Bush Step Height	1	3,438	3,4379	3,67	0,088
Fehler	9	8,431	0,9368		
Gesamt	15	26,923			

Zusammenfassung des Modells


S	R-Qd	R-Qd(kor)	R-Qd(prog)
0,967872	68,69%	47,81%	1,03%

R-Qd: 68.69% < 80%

-> DoE factors not completely explaining the result.

-> Additional factor(s) to consider.

2-factor interference in model (p-value > 0,05 but contribution is relevant)





DoE

Graphical evaluation

Result average gap home position 1-4

Result average gap home position 1-2




Conclusion: Residual Charts sufficient




Histogram : shape with two „peaks“ at ends

DoE Effects diagram

Result average gap home position 1-4




Result average gap home position 1-2




DoE

Maximum optimisation graph

Result average gap home position 1-4




Result average gap home position 1-2




- Both models are showing the same potential maximum gap position of approx 3,6 mm. Less than critical gap 7,7mm
- Maximum of 3,6 mm less than measured single value (5 or 8mm) shows that additional factor is to contribute. (see R-Qd value approx 65% < 80%)

DoE Potential additional factor - Spring

Unilatch Highend/ 937670-106



Unilatch Highend/ 937670-105



DoE Summary



- DoE factors do not fully explain the response variation. (R-Qd < 80%)
- DoE factors within the tested levels are not causing a gap to home position of KV-transmission lever higher than critical. (max 3,6mm < critical 7,7mm)
- Field failure:
3 corrective actions (bush chamfer, KV-transmission lever height, spring design (index 105 load abuse change) are in place since production date 6/2016. No failure occurred after PD 6/2016.
- Next step: Parking of DoE activities, observation of field.



Exterior Door Open Unexpectedly Whilst In Motion

NHTSA Review 15 November 2017

Problem Description



Problem Definition:

Post-P068 software flash failures reported where the customer verbatim indicates that one or more of the doors on their vehicle has opened whilst the vehicle was in motion. Issue affects mainly the MENA region in terms of incidence rate however a few reports have also been observed elsewhere in the world. P068 software dealt with the KV actuator in the latch being placed into a short circuit condition immediately following de-energising the KV motor. The P068 software flash eliminated the short circuit condition for the first 900ms following de-energising the motor, allowing the KV lever to return to its home position without any resistance from the motor. The latch was updated with a stronger KV return spring (August 2015), grease applied to the sinter bearing (Dec 2015), and a patch to resolve the leak path to the sinter bearing (Feb 2016). The grease has since been deleted as the leak path is no longer an issue therefore the sinter bearing is no longer compromised (July 2016). With all these fixes in place by definition it cannot be the KV actuator fault that is causing the latch to be held in a released condition. Therefore the fault must lie elsewhere in the system.


Issue First Discovered:

From the Critical Concerns identified the issue first appeared in the USA 2 days after P068 was launched. From the analysis conducted it appears that the exterior release handle was the cause of the failure on this vehicle.

Vehicle Specs/Markets Affected:

Failure mode can affect any vehicle as per the below chart. However, Markets affected are ARE (26), GBR (3), USA (3), CAN (2), KWT (2), and CHN (1). Historically it is only high handle vehicles (L405 and L494) that exhibit this error state as the tendency is deploy the handle downwards. No verbatim indicating failure mode exists on any other vehicle lines, despite the reinforcement being common.

R/1000 Normalisation By Market



- Data from the vehicle population post production cut-off date (Mar 2015 onwards)
- Markets in descending order of sold vehicles in service
- Minimal R/1000 values everywhere except ARE and KWT
- However, other markets that have reported an occurrence are not identical climatic conditions to either ARE or KWT

Similar Markets

Power and Sample Size Analysis



Minimum market sample size of ~500 cars for a 90% confidence of seeing the defect

Hot markets with similar climatic conditions isolated from ROW
 Volumes shown are combined L405 and L494

Any market with a volume >500 vehicles should see the failure

Markets such as ZAF, AUS, SAU, QAT, MAR are all very similar climatic and environmental conditions to ARE and KWT

No failures reported in these markets

Country Sold	Combined		
	Build	Report	R/1000
USA - UNITED STATES	69860	3	0.042943
CHN - CHINA	44369	1	0.022538
ITA - ITALY	8074		
ARE - UNITED ARAB EMIRIATES	6518	29	4.449218
AUS - AUSTRALIA	6285		
KOR - KOREA, REP OF (South)	4107		
ESP - SPAIN	3109		
SAU - SAUDI ARABIA	2936		
GIB - GIBRALTAR	2799		
ZAF - SOUTH AFRICA	2283		
TUR - TURKEY	1543		
KWT - KUWAIT	1518	2	1.317523
BRA - BRAZIL	1317		
QAT - QATAR	1251		
MAR - MOROCCO	931		
PRT - PORTUGAL	680		
GRC - GREECE	554		
BGR - BULGARIA	455		
MEX - MEXICO	437		
OMN - OMAN	417		
CHL - CHILE	285		
LBN - LEBANON	281		
IRQ - IRAQ	265		


Market Specifics

Speculation on Localisation



- Why only in the ARE and KWT Markets?
- Market demographic of owners
- Relative affluence of these markets compared globally
- Particularly strong local feedback networks within a relatively small community, accelerating awareness of potential issues
- Specific climatic conditions
 - > Dust
 - > Heat
 - > Humidity
 - > Solar Load

Timeline



Problem Investigation/Verification




Problem Investigation/Verification: Visit to vehicle in Dubai August 2016. Customer reported a door opening post P068, vehicle held for investigation. Vehicle tested by JLR UK Engineer in market and unable to fault the latch. Open circuit condition evident on the vehicle, therefore P068 flash was a success. Vehicle in workshop, ambient temp circa 25°C. Unable to jam the handle in the workshop. Placed vehicle onto roof, high solar load, ambient temp 48°C. Soaked vehicle for two hours, and then able to jam three of the four handles on the vehicle on the first attempt.



Root Cause Hypothesis



Exterior release handle jammed in the actuated position due to diametrically opposing contact points, increasing friction to the point where the counter balance spring cannot return the handle to rest position.



Please add attachments to support the root cause here:

Critical Concern Analysis




Failures Since Production Fixes



LATCH OK	LATCH AND RFA OK
2017	2017
2018	2018
2019	2019
2020	2020
2021	2021
2022	2022
2023	2023
2024	2024
2025	2025
2026	2026
2027	2027
2028	2028
2029	2029
2030	2030


OUTSIDE OF P068 RECALL POPULATION

Considering the timeline, the parts we examine on this slide are outside of the recall population, therefore the latch is the latest level, but there is a population of vehicles without the RFA fix, and a subsequent population with both the latest latch and the latest RFA



Country Sold	Sold/Unsold Sold	Grand Total
ITA - ITALY	5048	5048
AUS - AUSTRALIA	3585	3585
ARE - UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	3238	3238
GIB - GIBRALTAR	2361	2361
ESP - SPAIN	2122	2122
SAU - SAUDI ARABIA	1606	1606
TUR - TURKEY	981	981
MAR - MOROCCO	568	568
KWT - KUWAIT	560	560
GRC - GREECE	309	309
MEX - MEXICO	192	192
JOR - JORDAN	191	191
QAT - QATAR	158	158
LBN - LEBANON	143	143
CYP - CYPRUS	131	131
OMN - OMAN	121	121
MLT - MALTA	105	105
BHR - BAHRAIN	105	105
CRI - COSTA RICA	100	100
IND - INDIA	98	98
IRQ - IRAQ	57	57
TUN - TUNISIA	54	54
EGY - EGYPT	49	49
MKD - MACEDONIA	43	43
CIV - COTE D'IVOIRE	28	28
SEN - SENEGAL	21	21
ARG - ARGENTINA	16	16
KEN - KENYA	13	13
PAK - PAKISTAN	10	10
LKA - SRI LANKA	7	7
NGA - NIGERIA	6	6
GHA - GHANA	5	5
BRN - BRUNEI DARUSSALAM	5	5
TZA - TANZANIA	2	2
ECU - ECUADOR	1	1
Grand Total	22039	22039

Normalised Data



- Once the data was normalised, an order of magnitude can be seen on front doors pre/post P068
- The same cannot be said of the rear doors, where the improvement has not been as significant


	Before		After	
	Failures	Pre-P068 R/1000	Failures	Post P068 R/1000
Front LH	67	0.251	8.000	0.024
Front RH	76	0.284	10.000	0.029
Rear LH	21	0.079	6.000	0.018
Rear RH	33	0.123	16.000	0.047

Root Cause Analysis

Ishikawa / Cause and Effect



PSCC D7u Exterior Handle Operation



Root Cause Analysis Measurement Methodology




Steel cable attached to the vehicle exterior release handle

Cable then runs around a pulley that can be varied in height relative to the door

The variance in height allows for angle adjustments from 45° to 60°

Force gauge used to measure force – force applied directly downwards

Resolution of actual force = $F \sin \theta$



Root Cause Analysis Operational Definition



Measurements indicate jamming is hard to achieve at under 200N


Beginning at 200N, operate the rig and release

Check for jammed handle condition

If handle doesn't jam, repeat operation with additional 10N increments

Repeat until handle jams

Record the result of the lowest force required to jam the handle



Root Cause Analysis





Test Plan (KLT and Wear Out)



- Perform three temperature tests – ambient (20°C), high ambient (50°C), and high ambient + high solar load (80°C)
- Conduct 21,000 cycle durability with slight lateral loading condition
- Repeat the baseline tests at the three temperature ranges
- Conduct a further 21,000 cycle durability with slight lateral loading
- Repeat the baseline tests one final time
- *The results will tell us if the likelihood of failure increases or decreases with time and customer use*
- *NB; Glass Transition Temperature (T_g) of PA66 GF30 (handle chassis material) is 80°C – POM (handle strap material) is always used above the T_g as this is -50°C to -30 °C*

Root Cause Analysis

KLT Results - Ambient







0 Cycles 21k Cycles 42k Cycles

0 Cycles 21k Cycles 42k Cycles

Root Cause Analysis

KLT Results - 50°C







0 Cycles 21k Cycles 42k Cycles

0 Cycles 21k Cycles 42k Cycles

Root Cause Analysis

KLT Results - 80°C



0 Cycles 21k Cycles 42k Cycles

0 Cycles 21k Cycles 42k Cycles



Root Cause Analysis

KLT Results – Part Comparison



Root Cause Analysis

Material Behaviour Characteristics



PA66 GF30 is hygroscopic. In taking water on the part swells. Coupled with thermal expansion / contraction this may give rise to significant dimensional differences.

Study commissioned on various temperature and humidity levels with measurements being taken across the run channel in the handle chassis, and across the POM runner on the handle strap inner

Root Cause Analysis

Material Behaviour Characteristics



Initial conditions										
	I1	I2	I3	w		I1	I2	I3	w	
A1	17.79	16.30	19.85	140.90	C1	18.55	17.48	16.82	271.60	
	17.71	16.25	19.88	141.10		18.41	17.50	16.81	271.60	
	17.81	16.33	19.84	140.80		18.49	17.49	16.84	271.50	
	17.76	16.30	19.84	140.80		18.49	17.50	16.83	271.60	
	17.70	16.28	19.82	140.90		18.43	17.50	16.81	271.60	
Average	17.75	16.29	19.85	140.90	Average	18.47	17.49	16.82	271.58	
A2	17.69	16.30	19.94	123.90	C2	18.46	17.44	16.79	264.60	
	17.72	16.30	19.95	124.10		18.49	17.45	16.85	264.60	
	17.69	16.31	19.94	124.00		18.47	17.46	16.84	264.70	
	17.73	16.29	19.94	124.10		18.47	17.47	16.80	264.70	
	17.71	16.28	19.96	123.80		18.46	17.47	16.80	264.70	
Average	17.71	16.30	19.95	123.98	Average	18.47	17.46	16.82	264.66	
A3	17.65	16.31	19.95	123.50	C3	18.53	17.50	16.85	264.80	
	17.64	16.27	19.86	123.30		18.47	17.48	16.82	264.80	
	17.66	16.28	19.88	123.30		18.46	17.50	16.85	265.20	
	17.68	16.28	19.89	123.50		18.51	17.50	16.84	264.90	
	17.65	16.26	19.86	123.60		18.48	17.49	16.81	264.90	
Average	17.66	16.28	19.89	123.44	Average	18.49	17.49	16.83	264.92	

A baseline series of measurements was taken and this is used as the “control” sample. The parts were then stored at various temperatures and humidity, then measured.

The maximum deviation from the control sample was 0.57% growth

	I1	I2	I3	w		I1	I2	I3	w	Time Checked
A1	50 deg - 12% humidity				C1	50 deg - 12% humidity				09/08/2017 15:40
	17.74	16.33	19.96	140.80		18.56	17.51	16.81	271.30	
%	99.92	100.23	100.57	99.93	%	100.47	100.09	99.93	99.90	
A1	50 deg - 100% humidity				C1	50 deg - 100% humidity				10/08/2017 07:30
	17.81	16.38	19.91	141.50		18.58	17.51	16.86	272.60	
%	100.32	100.54	100.32	100.43	%	100.57	100.09	100.23	100.38	
A2	50 deg - 100% humidity									10/08/2017 07:30
	17.69	16.26	19.92							
%	99.90	99.78	99.87							

Root Cause Analysis


Material Behaviour Characteristics




A Length 1



A Length 3



A Length 2



Root Cause Analysis

Material Behaviour Characteristics




C Length 1



C Length 3





C Length 2




Handle Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity





PA6 is hygroscopic, Acetal is not
Control sample is reference (0)
Graph is % deviation from control
All dimensions are external
Maximum deviation is 0.7%
Part has tendency to grow with both
heat and humidity




Chassis Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity



PA6 is hygroscopic
Control sample is reference (0)
Graph is % deviation from control
All dimensions are internal
Maximum deviation is 1.64% - possible outlier. Next max 0.91%
Despite measures being internal, data indicates that the dimensions also grow with heat and humidity



Measurement Study 2



Effect of Heat and Humidity



- Previous study did not have the “resolution” required
- Study also had some outliers that were considered to be skewing the data
- New study commissioned using optical scanning equipment
- 10-off handles and 10-off chassis tested
- Test process as follows:
 - 5% relative humidity, soak for 6 hours at 20°c, measure, then repeat at 40°c, 60°c, and 80°c
 - 50% relative humidity, soak for 6 hours at 20°c, measure, then repeat at 40°c, 60°c, and 80°c
 - 95% relative humidity, soak for 6 hours at 20°c, measure, then repeat at 40°c, 60°c, and 80°c

Handle Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity






Handle Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity



Handle Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity



- Boxplots indicate that there is a trend for the handle to grow with temperature
- First boxplot (20 degrees) in both charts doesn't fit with the pattern
- From 40 degrees there is a steady and consistent growth
- The fact that 20 degrees doesn't fit is most likely because the POM sleeve has a minimum size – PA6 isn't being directly measured



Handle Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity



Handle Measurement



Effect of Heat and Humidity



- As previous smooth rate of change observed, steady increase in size with temperature
- PA6 being directly measured, no POM sleeve
- Material behaves as expected


Chassis Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity





Chassis Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity



Chassis Measurement


Effect of Heat and Humidity



- As previous smooth rate of change observed, steady increase in size with temperature
- PA6 being directly measured, no POM sleeve
- Material behaves as expected
- → As handle strap width increases, so does aperture in chassis in which it sits


Chassis Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity





Chassis Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity



Chassis Measurement

Effect of Heat and Humidity




- Very unusual data set at 20 degrees 5% - lack of equilibrium in the plastic before measurements were taken
- 6 hours initial soak not long enough to stabilise
- Soak time after humidity changes increased to compensate (24-48 hours)
- Not much movement in running channel width despite temperature and humidity changes
- → Running channel is stable through testing to date

Optical Measurements Displacement and Rotation




Door and handle kinematics



Optical Measurements Displacement and Rotation




High speed Image surface tracking




Optical Measurements Displacement and Rotation



Handle stick position




Optical Measurements Displacement and Rotation



- Optical measurement techniques and high speed camera work give more insight
- Using latest CAD models there is clearly no jam where the handle used to stick on the leading edge of the chassis
- The jam at the rear is mitigated by the additional rib running backwards through the chassis
- Using the latest level parts we are unable to recreate the jam
- UNABLE TO DEVELOP RELIABLE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM


Failures by Month

Efficacy of Handle Mod Feb 2017



Failures by Month

Efficacy of Handle Mod Feb 2017



MSA Update

Testing performed CW37



-
- Multiple regression (DOE with existing data) has been done based on 273 existing tests. The following factors have been included:
 - Operator applying load (2 operators)
 - Angle of load application (45, 47.5, 50, 55 and 60 degrees to horizontal)
 - Temperature (20, 40 and 80 degrees C)
 - Cycles performed in key life test (0, 21000 and 42000)
 - 2 handles
 - This enables us to analyse sensitivity of load to jam the handle to these factors and also make an assessment of the existing measurement system.

MSA Update

Testing performed CW37




- Additional factors not included in original runs:
- Effect of heat and humidity in combination not included in main experiment. A separate experiment measuring a part at ambient, in dry heat and humid heat shows weight gain in humid heat and weight loss in dry heat compared to ambient. This indicates water absorption should be investigated further in subsequent experiments.
- Dust not included in original experiment. Need to do a small experiment to determine if this is significant and review customer data to apply right type of dust.
- No direct consideration of design variables (except using 2 different latches) – only external noise factors included in existing experiments.

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam




- Chinese complaint of door unable to close
- Latch received at Brose
- KV lever in home position with no winds on the motor spindle
- KV transmission lever out of home position
- Pawl unable to lock claw and latch unable to be closed
- CT scan shows jammed spring on main rotational bush



Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



CAD image showing joint stack and how it should look
Careful teardown of the clutch left the jammed condition present until the pawl pin was removed
Error state present in the image above – spring clearly jammed between main bush and outside release chain transmission lever

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Tearing down the clutch mechanism revealed significant abrasion
The abrasion has left residues over the outside release chain transmission lever
and the KV transmission lever
The KV transmission lever is the part that has suffered from this abrasive contact

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Abrasion area clearly visible on the KV transmission lever

Part measured after cleaning all residue and grease


Height returned 4.92mm

Specification 5.20 +/- 0.05mm

Part is considerably undersized in this area following use

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam




Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam







Detail F
10:1
worst case




Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



KV Transmission Lever

Abraded, worn area of the lever is out of spec at 4.92mm




Other areas of the lever are also out of spec at 5.06mm

Supplier is engaged to resolve OOS conditions

Clutch Mechanism



KV Transmission Lever Jam





Durability test from comparable production period (beginning of 2016)	Durability test from beginning of 2017
<p>LHF</p> 	<p>LHF</p> 
	<p>RHR</p> 
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Test result ok – no function failure- High measurement result done today → 4,93 mm on wear out area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Test result ok – no function failure- No wear out area

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Current Production Conformance



Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



No		5,2-0,05 Max	5,2-0,05 Min	Picture
1 LH		5,15	5,14	
2 LH		5,15	5,14	
3 LH		5,15	5,04	
4 RH		5,19	5,18	
5 RH		5,16	5,15	
6 RH		5,16	5,15	
7 RH		5,19	5,18	
8 RH		5,19	5,18	
9 RH		5,16	5,15	
Average LH		5,15	5,11	
Average RH		5,17	5,17	

Parts returned where the customer alleges the door opened were investigated

Parts that have exhibited no failure on the bench have been stripped down

No observable deterioration of the KV transmission lever is evident

All parts conform to specification

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Test:	Reproduce failure mode "sticky KV-transmission lever"		
Latches with:	KV-Transmission lever from field parts approx 5mm (Spec. 5,2 -0,05)		
	Bush with chamfer similar to field part - 0,5 (Spec. -0.4) and -0,7 (Spec. -0.6)		
	Rest: current series components		
Variant:	LH latches		
Amount:	2		
	2	total series parts for comarison	
Procedure:	Testing within specification limit did not lead to any failed function in validation/requalification test		
	Test procedure needs to be definded with conditions out of specification		
Potential criteria:	Number of needed cycles according MTF of field parts = 10% of spec. cycles		
	Wet-Dust application directly to critical KV-lever area to provoke abrasion		
	Salt spray application earlier in test sequence		
	Temperature / humidity		
	We need extra storage time simulate real conditions in usage		
Timing			
	Procedure	22.09.2017	
	Test duration	approx. 30% of total life cycle testing (approx 3 weeks)	
	Test start	tbd	

Reproduce failure mode;

Specification for test currently being written (due 22/09/2017)

Addition of wet dust to provoke abrasion


Salt spray conditioning

Test anticipated start date 29/09/2017

Test termination 20/10/2017

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Abrasion was never evident during DV / KLT testing

Ishikawa under development to understand why the abrasion occurs

Ishikawa will form a direct input into the test method being developed and also sample selection for testing subjects

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Spec.	Current CZ 8/2017	Durability V10.627 No 6 LH	Durability V10.627 No 7 RH	Reference part PD as field part
Cavity	L1/L3/R2/R3	L2	R3	L1/L2/R3/R4
GD ZN Al 4 Cu1	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
Hardness HV1: 97	114-118	112-114	108-113	108-112
Density Min 6,4 g/cm ³	6,419-6,447	6,445	6,451	6,412-6,437
Porosity (no spec.)	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
Microstructure	homogeneous	homogeneous	homogeneous	homogeneous
Summary	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok

Conclusion:

- Material is ok. (COB Lab Report 5806)
- The abrasion is not based on a material failure

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Component	What to change?	Expected Effect	pot. Negative effect	Status	Process
1 Bush	Reduce chamfer	Axial force of spring (wedge effect) will be reduced	process limits due cold-forming turned part	Request to supplier (cold-forming process): - Process technically possible? - Possible amount of rejects in chamfer reduction without change in process? 05.10.2017: Still under investigation with Supplier regarding feasibility -> Timing: 20.10.2017	- increased test effort - sorting and scrapping
2 Bush	Step height -tolerance reduction	Axial force of spring (wedge effect) will be reduced	process limits due cold-forming turned part	- Process technically not possible - Request to supplier whether a smaller tolerance would be possible with increased inspection effort. 05.10.2017: Still under investigation with Supplier regarding feasibility -> Timing: 20.10.2017	
3 KV-Transmission-Lever	Material properties increase e.g. MIM / Zamak ZP 2	less/no abrasion		- ZP 2 has slightly better strength properties. - MIM = Prio 2 (new process, new tools, new validation) 05.10.2017: Improved material specification see next page feasibility and dimensional behavior has to be evaluated. -> First result expected 20.10.2017	Comparison tests with parts made of ZP 5 and ZP 2
4 KV-Transmission-Lever	Change bearing dimension (ring)	reduce tilting; increase contact area	higher friction due to bigger diameter	Work out a concept: -> what is possible new spring calculate, design change at lever 05.10.2017: No new update - Less priority	
5 spring	square cross-section	less/no entrance into gap	assembly problems / lifetime performance	Spring with similar torque with wire 0.85x0.85 possible (Spring behavior can not be estimated) 05.10.2017: Will be evaluated together with design solution 6 + 8	Request to supplier: - Sample preparation Brose: - validation
6 forced resetting of outside transmission lever	connection between the o/s transmission lever and o/s release lever	to support resetting of KV-ler and o/s transmission lever		Design idea 05.10.2017: See next page. Prototype assembled. Possible Idea - reduce winding of outside transmission lever spring. Based on the investigation results of Point 8 might be considered additionally.	Request to supplier: - Sample preparation Brose: - validation
7 spring	coating of spring	bigger diameter to avoid entrance		05.10.2017: After internal discussion with commodity experts, idea rejected due to feasibility and durability	
8 Additional part	downhold of spring	No gap entrance		Work out a concept: -> what is possible new spring calculate, design a bush 05.10.2017: Will be evaluated together with design solution 5 + 6	

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam



Design Idea material properties Point 3

Properties	Current Material [ZP 5]	Other possible Material [ZP 2]
Tensile strength	331 MPa	397 MPa
Shear strength	262 MPa	317 MPa
Compressive strength	600 MPa	641 MPa
Hardness (Brinell)	114	130

Abrasion test for direct comparison under investigation by central laboratory

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam





Current

New (forced resetting)




Modification of O/S transmission lever generates linkage also in resetting direction

Operated O/S release lever




After resetting in case of jammed O/S transmission lever

Lever can stay in jammed position




Lever is forced to move back in home position



Clutch Mechanism


KV Transmission Lever Jam



*Based on few available data: bigger radial chamfer leads to more abrasion
→ This has to be confirmed with more data*

Clutch Mechanism

KV Transmission Lever Jam




*Based on few available data: bigger axial chamfer leads to more abrasion
→ This has to be confirmed with more data*

Amalgamated Timeline (Explained) Failures, Fixes, and Populations



Graphical representation of failures, x-axis is production month and legend represents the month it was reported



Numerical representation of failures, formatted as per the graph above – production date forms the x-component

	2013					2014					2015					2016					2017	
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Jan	Feb
2014 Reports	2	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3									
2015 Reports	5	3	3	1	2	6	3	5	10	8	3	2	8	5	7	3	1	1	2	1	9	5
2016 Reports	2	2				1	3	2	3	7	4	1	6	2	1	2	5	1	4	5	4	4
2017 Reports	1	1				1	1	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	1	2						
Grand Total	9	7	4	1	2	9	7	9	15	18	8	4	18	9	12	5	4	9	3	1	13	11
"Old" pedigree latch																						
Handle ears modified																						
Stronger KV return spring																						
Greased sinter bearing																						
Leak path into latch closed																						
New software in RFA (production)																						
Modified handle chassis																						
Modified OS transmission lever																						
P068 Recall Population																						
Latch good																						
Latch and RFA Good (production)																						
Handle Binding small abuse load																						
Handle Binding large abuse load																						
Handle no longer binds (production)																						
Sticking KV Clutch																						

All modifications performed to date aligned to timeline above, with reason for the modification on the right and issue it was / is addressing

Populations of the three major issues: short circuit, handle binding and sticking KV clutch, displayed by risk level and aligned to timeline


Next Steps in Investigation



- From PSCC
 - > Brose (supplier) DFMEA deep dive for any other possible failure modes not yet revealed
 - > Investigate key characteristics on parts which affect KV Transmission Lever Jam condition
 - > Brose Supplier parts quality over time – assurances all parts are delivered to spec. – dimensions and critical characteristics, material etc.
 - > Tier 2 (to Brose) manufacturing change history including controls and reasons for changes.
- To be reviewed with Brose and JLR PSCC on 28 November 2017

PSCC 23.01.2018

Unilatch KV-Transmission Lever



JLR Whitley, 23.01.2018

PSCC 23.01.2018

Risk evaluation – Timing presented to PSCC 12.12.2017

No	Chapter	Task	Start	End
1	Abrasion test	Target: Abrasion rate on KV-Transmission lever	30.11.2017	15.12.2017
2	Disassembly of field parts	Target: Bush and KV-Transmission lever from PD before 5/2016 Re-use of components to build test samples	11.12.2017	15.12.2017
3	Field latch components	Target: Dimension results from Bush and KV Transmission lever from PD before 5/2016 Availability of components for (old) design index before 5/2017	15.12.2017	05.01.2018
4	DOE components	Target: Prepare samples acc. DOE Plan	05.12.2017	12.01.2018
5	DOE samples build	Target: Latches acc. design Index before Mai 2016	15.01.2018	18.01.2018
6	Pre-Testing	Target: Procedure for DOE is feasible to detect the failure mode (3 times) Most critical (No5) and uncritical (No16) combination from DOE-Plan.	19.01.2018	31.01.2018
7	DOE	Target: Evidence for contribution of nok chamfer/height	31.01.2018	23.02.2018
8	Result	Target: Interpretation of DOE output	01.02.2018	24.02.2018

PSCC 23.01.2018

Risk evaluation – Timing update



No	Chapter	Task	Start	End	
1	Abrasion test	Target: Abrasion rate on KV-Transmission lever	30.11.2017	26.01.2018	80% Done
2	Disassembly of field parts	Target: Bush and KV-Transmission lever from PD before 5/2016 Re-use of components to build test samples	11.12.2017	17.01.2018	Done
3	Field latch components	Target: Dimension results from Bush and KV Transmission lever from PD before 5/2016 Availability of components for (old) design index before 5/2017	15.12.2017	19.01.2018	Done
4	DOE components	Target: Prepare samples acc. DOE Plan	05.12.2017	18.01.2018	Done
5	DOE samples build	Target: Latches acc. design Index before Mai 2016	19.01.2018	19.01.2018	Done
6	Pre-Testing	Target: Procedure for DOE is feasible to detect the failure mode (3 times) Most critical (No5) and uncritical (No16) combination from DOE-Plan.	22.01.2018	31.01.2018	
7	DOE	Target: Evidence for contribution of nok chamfer/height	31.01.2018	23.02.2018	
8	Result	Target: Interpretation of DOE output	01.02.2018	24.02.2018	

PSCC 23.01.2018

Next Steps from PSCC 28.11.2017 - Update

- Finalise D-FMEA review regarding bearing areas cw50/2017 -> done
- Evaluate CC and SC characteristics on further single parts cw50/2017 -> done
- Defined characteristics of bushing and KV transmission lever to be implemented in supplier process (Change management) cw04/2018 -> done
Process at supplier under control
PPAP target cw12/2018

Brose will focus on investigation of robustness increase of latch design, as follows:

- Forced resetting of O/S transmission lever detailed planning to be done Q3-2018
- Investigate feasibility of smaller chamfer on bushing cw04/2018
- Investigate feasibility of more wear-resistant material of KV-transmission lever. ZP2 ordered. cw7/2018
Next step: abrasion test to compare with ZP5 (serial) cw10/2018

Backup









- Presentation shown to PSCC at 28.11.2017 and 12.12.2017

PSCC 12.12.2017

Questions raised by PSCC on 28.11.2017

1. What evidence can Brose present, that the failure mode will not occur on latches built before Jan 2016 and after Mai 2016?
 - batch issue
 - Nio parts + conditions
 - Design issue
2. Brose to present timing plan regarding risk assessment
3. For how long will abrasion occur? Does it stop at some point of time?
Team should perform a DoE to judge/identify influence factors.
4. Are there relevant minor deviations during supplier audits for bushing and KV transmission lever?
5. KV-Function disabled in RFA – explain technical effect

Investigated design	picture	Investigation result
Spring outside transmission lever		- currently discussed failure mode - If parts are nok (chamfer too big, lever too thin) spring can be forced in the area of chamfer
CL clutch spring		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
Spring pawl		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
Spring KV transmission lever		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
KV lever (plastic)		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
o/s release lever		Evaluated → no risk of jamming

PSCC 12.12.2017

Risk evaluation - Timing

No	Chapter	Task	Start	End
1	Abrasion test	Target: Abrasion rate on KV-Transmission lever	30.11.2017	15.12.2017
2	Disassembly of field parts	Target: Bush and KV-Transmission lever from PD before 5/2016 Re-use of components to build test samples	11.12.2017	15.12.2017
3	Field latch components	Target: Dimension results from Bush and KV Transmission lever from PD before 5/2016 Availability of components for (old) design index before 5/2017	15.12.2017	05.01.2018
4	DOE components	Target: Prepare samples acc. DOE Plan	05.12.2017	12.01.2018
5	DOE samples build	Target: Latches acc. design Index before Mai 2016	15.01.2018	18.01.2018
6	Pre-Testing	Target: Procedure for DOE is feasible to detect the failure mode (3 times) Most critical (No5) and uncritical (No16) combination from DOE-Plan.	19.01.2018	31.01.2018
7	DOE	Target: Evidence for contribution of nok chamfer/height	31.01.2018	23.02.2018
8	Result	Target: Interpretation of DOE output	01.02.2018	24.02.2018

PSCC 12.12.2017

Risk evaluation overview

Target: Identify the risk of jamming for latch status before 5/2016

Input:

DOE:

Factor: 1) Height of KV-Transmission Lever 2) chamfer of bush
Effect/Interaction of factors -> What ?

Data:



Measured components from field return parts (approx. 200)
Process capability / probability -> How many ?

Output:


Are the factors causing the jammed status?
What is the probability of the identified critical factor?
What is the probability for jamming?

PSCC 12.12.2017

KV-Function disabled in RFA – explain technical effect to latch „jammed“

Failure mode	„cord will not unwind“ (P068)	Spring jams KV mechanism
<p>Technical influence of disabled KV function in RFA</p>	 <p>- green KV lever will stay in home position – KV mechanism can not jam in activated position</p>	 <p>- overall rotation angle of KV transmission lever (light blue) is reduced - Less tilting of KV transmission lever under load - different abrasion behavior expected</p>
<p>Will disabling the KV Function in the RFA solve the issue?</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>no, spring could still move into the gap</p>

Systemlieferant der internationalen Automobilindustrie



Questions from Mail Matt Newman



Key questions that were asked and require responding to are as follows;

-
- Current Production;
 - 1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers (Tier 2, Tier 3 etc)?
 - 2. What controls are in place at Brose Roznov to ensure supplier parts meet specification before being assembled into the latch?
 - 3. How are we able to confidently say that the issue with the KV lever being out of specification and the bush chamfer being out of specification was resolved in May 2015?
- Future Production;
 - 4. Complete DFMEA review
 - 5. Assurance that all potential failure modes on the latch have been considered and mitigated, including any abrasion or wear and tear conditions that could reasonably be expected
 - 6. What can Brose do, from a specification perspective, to ensure that parts supplied from Tier 2 and Tier 3 suppliers meet specification on function-critical parts

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Focus: KV-Subassy



Components

HEBEL (ABH-innen) LEVER
HEBEL (Kupplungshebel) LEVER
HEBEL (Uebertragungshebel) LEVER
FEDER (Schenkelfeder ABH-innen) SPRING
HUELSE (ABH-innen) BUSH
FEDER (Schenkelfeder Uebertragungshebel) SPRING
HUELSE (Kupplungshebel OBW) BUSH

Current Production;


1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC´s	Feasibility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC´s	Current cpk
Lever ORL 738819	3	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable
Lever D01886	2	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable
Lever D01888	0	confirmed	released	confirmed	n/a
Spring D02491	3	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable
Bush D01885	2	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable
Spring D01826	1	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable
Bush D01891	0	confirmed	released	confirmed	n/a

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC´s	Feasibility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC´s	Current cpk
Lever ORL 738819	3	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable



LH
Dimension Cpk

Profil 0,4	1,36
Profil 0,35 at M1	2,7
Profil 0,35 at M2	3,19
Dim 4,5 at P7	1,57
Dim 4,5 at P8	1,85

RH
Dimension Cpk

Profil 0,4	1,34
Profil 0,35 at M1	3,72
Profil 0,35 at M2	7,45
Dim 4,5 at P7	1,33
Dim 4,5 at P8	1,62


Remark: SC´s not linked to KV jammed issue

Conclusion: Part is ok and under control

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC 's	Feasebility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC 's	Current cpk
Lever D01886	2	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable



LH
Dimension Cpk

Profil 0,1	2,21
Diam 9,6	2,56

RH
Dimension Cpk


Profil 0,1	2,04
Diam 9,6	1,93

Remark: SC 's not linked to KV jammed issue
Conclusion: Part is ok and under control

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC 's	Feasibility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC 's	Current cpk
Lever D01888	0	confirmed	released	confirmed	n/a



LH

Dimension Cpk

Diam 9,1	1,29
Height 5,2	1,57

Height 5,2-0,05

#	C01888	C01889
1	5,17	5,17
2	5,18	5,18
3	5,19	5,18
4	5,18	5,18
5	5,19	5,18
6	5,19	5,18
7	5,19	5,18
8	5,18	5,18
9	5,18	5,18
10	5,17	5,18
Min	5,17	5,17
Max	5,19	5,18
Average	5,18	5,18

Conclusion: Part is ok and under control
 SC 's will be defined, see slide answer
 question 6

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

C01888/9 KV-Transmission Lever actions since Mai 2016

Problem: Height less than 5,2-0,05

Against occurrence:

- Tool cleaning process improved
- Maintenance updated

Against non detection, CP update:


- Included in 1st part release,
- Random check every 8 hours of diameter (gauge) and height (caliper)

Brose since 23.11.2017

Incoming inspection of height and diameter

5 parts – each delivery

Diecast tool



Diameter – Gauge TA177




Control plan

Item	Part	Spec	Control	Frequency	Method	Equipment	Operator	Inspector	Signature	Date
1	1000000000	9.10	✓	8h	TA177					
2	1000000000	5.2-0.05	✓	8h	Caliper					
3	1000000000	9.10	✓	8h	TA177					
4	1000000000	5.2-0.05	✓	8h	Caliper					
5	1000000000	9.10	✓	8h	TA177					
6	1000000000	5.2-0.05	✓	8h	Caliper					

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC 's	Feasebility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC 's	Current cpk
Spring D02491	3	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable



LH		RH	
Dimension	Cpk	Dimension	Cpk
M1	2,96	M1	3,18
M2	3,58	M2	3,69

Third SC is regarding durability 200.000 cycles between M1 and M2


Remark: SC 's not linked to KV jammed issue

Conclusion: Part is ok and under control

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC 's	Feasibility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC 's	Current cpk
Bush D01885	2	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable



Dimension

Cpk

Diam 9	2,1
Dim 6,9	1,97
Chamfer -0,6	1,53
Chamfer -0,4	1,68

additional
additional

Remark: SC 's linked to KV jammed issue

Conclusion: Part is ok and under control

Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers


C01885 Bush actions since Mai 2016

Problem: Chamfer

Against occurrence:
Improvement of tool venting

*Against non detection:
New software for 100% camera chamfer
detection.*


Confirmed by supplier visit



Current Production;

1. What controls are currently in place that guarantee parts meet specification at Brose's suppliers

Component	Drawing SC 's	Feasebility	PPAP	CP check Incl. SC 's	Current cpk
Spring D01826	1	confirmed	released	confirmed	capable



LH		RH	
Dimension	Cpk	Dimension	Cpk
M1	3,45	M1	2,13
M2	3,71	M2	2,44

Remark: SC 's not linked to KV jammed issue

Conclusion: Part is ok and under control

Current Production;

2. What controls are in place at Brose Roznov to ensure supplier parts meet specification before being assembled into the latch?

- Bush C01885-102

- **Incoming inspection:**

- After claim in Mai 2016 the first two deliveries have been checked → result OK
Standard incoming inspection (without counter measurment)

- **Supplier audits:**

- 2016 ISO 16949 → no major deviation found,

- 2016 ISO 9001 → no major deviation found,

- 2017 D part self assessment → result 100%

- **Requalifications:**

- 2017 Technical requalification → result OK

Current Production;

2. What controls are in place at Brose Roznov to ensure supplier parts meet specification before being assembled into the latch?

- KV Transmission Lever C01888/C01889-104

- Incoming inspection:

After claim in Mai 2016 the first two deliveries have been checked → result OK
Standard incoming inspection: Height and diameter check added 23.11.2017

- Supplier audits:

2016 ISO 16949 → no major deviation found,

2016 ISO 9001 → no major deviation found,

2017 P-Audit → result 94%

2017 D part selfassessment → result 90%

- Technical requalifications:

In 2014 → result OK, no major deviation found,

In 2017 for different parts → result OK, no major deviation found.

4. DFMEA review

▪ Logic for performed DFMEA review

3. Root cause →


← 4. Result Brose investigation

<p>1.1.1.3.3.6.1.1.2 B_iORL_JLR (Hülse ABH-Innen/ bushing transmission lever O/S release): PM: >Rhombus 01< : bearing seat for outside release lever- inner (iORL_JLR) outer diameter too large</p>	<p>Drawing D01885-103: 3D-Geometries are checked with CAD-Model 937670-002 and tolerance calculation "Toleranzbetrachtung_Lagerstellen_18-06-2012.xls"</p> <p>=> Test-Result: I.O. Also see function test and durability-test V10065_Klima-DT_Holiday / V9922_DT Easter Egg / V9844_DT-PressbördelungTest</p> <p>File for latch-test: G:\Projects_customer\Closure_Systems\JLR\K-1260_SL_JLR_Unilatch_Module_L405_L494\Data\3_Entwicklung_Versuch3_16_Versuchsdokument\Versuchsberichte\ID-Musterphase</p> <p>File for tolerance calculation: G:\Projects_customer\Closure_Systems\JLR\K-1260_SL_JLR_Unilatch_Module_L405_L494\Data\3_Entwicklung_Versuch3_04_Technische_Berechnungen\4005 Toleranzbetrachtung\</p>
<p>1.1.1.3.3.6.1.1B_iORL_JLR (Hülse ABH-Innen/ bushing transmission lever O/S release): outside release lever- inner (iORL_JLR) sticks/ sluggish</p>	

← 2. Failure mode


1. Failure consequence

Failure consequence / Fehlerfolge:
latch doesn't latch (opens directly after door has been closed; door remains open)



4. DFMEA review

- Evaluated failures that could lead to the failure consequence „door will not latch“



5. potential further failure modes relating to wear out



- Brose uses Standard-DFMEA 's including Lessons Learned from the organisation
- Single parts will be evaluated for possible design failures and their influence regarding the latch function e.g.:
 - Part is too thick/too thin
 - Wrong material used
 - Freeplay too big/too small
 - Reset force too high / too weak
- Evaluation done in „one dimension“
 - Abrasion reduces lever height – does less height of the lever lead to functional failure?
- Seen failure mode requires more complex analysis
 - abrasion → bigger gap → spring into gap → wedging effect → jamming

→ This failure mode has been analysed in particular for other bearings in the KV release chain as well (see next slides)





5. potential further failure modes relating to wear out

Investigation lever bearings

- Approach for evaluation of potential jamming:
 - Is spring leg positioned between moveable parts (e.g. levers)?
 - Can spring leg get between two parts (potential for jamming) in case of abrasion or too much play?

5. potential further failure modes relating to wear out


Investigation lever bearings

Investigated design	picture	Investigation result
Spring outside transmission lever		- currently discussed failure mode - If parts are nok (chamfer too big, lever too thin) spring can be forced in the area of chamfer
CL clutch spring		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
Spring pawl		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
Spring KV transmission lever		Evaluated → no risk of jamming
Further designs to be investigated	KV-Hebel + ABH aussen	

6. Single part specification on function-critical parts

bush outside transmission lever



- Link failure consequence „door will not latch“ with „chamfer bush outside transmission lever too large“
→ Failure consequence „door will not latch“ will require severity of 10 in FMEA
- Change of severity will generate an CC evaluation
→ Bush supplier already implement 100% camera check on this characteristic
- Control of suppliers can further be improved:
 - Certified delivery



6. Single part specification on function-critical parts

KV transmission lever

- Link failure consequence „door will not latch“ with „KV transmission lever too thin“
→ Failure consequence „door will not latch“ will require severity of 10 in FMEA
- Change of severity will generate an CC evaluation
→ Supplier needs to implement ongoing process control
- Control of suppliers can further be improved:
 - Spot check of delivered parts during incoming inspection at Brose




Next Steps

- Finalise D-FMEA review regarding bearing areas cw50/2017 done
- Evaluate CC and SC characteristics on further single parts cw50/2017 open
Oliver
- Defined characteristics of bushing and KV transmission lever to be implemented in supplier process (Change management) cw04/2018 open
Oliver timing

Brose will focus on investigation of robustness increase of latch design, as follows:

- Forced resetting of O/S transmission lever Q3-2018 open Oliver
detailed planning to be done
- Investigate feasibility of smaller chamfer on bushing cw04/2018 open
Uwe (drawing with -0,2 to -0,3)
- Investigate feasibility of more wear-resistant material of KV-transmission lever tbd open (ZP2 in
ordered for cw7)

Systemlieferant der internationalen Automobilindustrie






POST P068 REPORTS – NORTH AMERICAN DATA SET ONLY
PARAMETRIC PREDICITON MODELS – 10 YEARS IN SERVICE

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA PRE-P068 “FAILURE TO LATCH”




MIS_Pre_NHTSA	95% CI		Upper Boundary
	Percent	Lower Boundary	
3	0.01	0.01	0.02
9	0.08	0.06	0.11
15	0.21	0.16	0.27
21	0.38	0.29	0.52
27	0.61	0.42	0.87
33	0.87	0.58	1.31
39	1.18	0.74	1.86
45	1.52	0.92	2.52
51	1.90	1.10	3.28
57	2.32	1.30	4.14
63	2.78	1.50	5.11
69	3.27	1.72	6.18
75	3.79	1.94	7.35
81	4.35	2.17	8.62
87	4.93	2.41	9.98
93	5.55	2.65	11.43
99	6.19	2.90	12.97
105	6.86	3.16	14.59
111	7.56	3.42	16.29
117	8.29	3.69	18.07

Pre-P068 action, the predicted parametric model indicates a worst case report rate of “Failure to Latch” of 180.7 R/1000 at ten years in service, covering all known failure modes. The global prediction for the same error state is 253.4 R/1000. Nominally the predicted failure rate is 82.9 R/1000.


Note the y-axis has been locked at 20%

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA POST P068 “FAILURE TO LATCH”



		95% CI		
MIS	Percent	R/1000	Lower Boundary	Upper Boundary
3	0.044484	0.444841	0.036141	0.0547528
9	0.161864	1.61864	0.143813	0.182179
15	0.294988	2.94988	0.269245	0.323188
21	0.437897	4.37897	0.401897	0.477114
27	0.588061	5.88061	0.53762	0.64322
33	0.744029	7.44029	0.675104	0.819962
39	0.904845	9.04845	0.813967	1.00582
45	1.06982	10.6982	0.954044	1.19957
51	1.23845	12.3845	1.09521	1.40029
57	1.41032	14.1032	1.23738	1.60725
63	1.58511	15.8511	1.38044	1.81985
69	1.76254	17.6254	1.52432	2.03761
75	1.94239	19.4239	1.66895	2.26012
81	2.12446	21.2446	1.81425	2.48703
87	2.30858	23.0858	1.96018	2.71804
93	2.49459	24.9459	2.10667	2.95286
99	2.68238	26.8238	2.25369	3.19128
105	2.87181	28.7181	2.40119	3.43305
111	3.06279	30.6279	2.54912	3.678
117	3.25522	32.5522	2.69747	3.92595




y-axis locked at 20% (direct comparison with pre-P068 failure rate)


Post P068 action, the predicted parametric model indicates a worst case report rate of “Failure to Latch” of 39.25 R/1000 at ten years in service, covering all known failure modes. Nominally the prediction is 32.5 R/1000

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA POST P068 “FAILURE TO LATCH” – 2.7% MODIFIER



MIS_2.7%_All_NA_FTL	95% CI		
	Percent	Lower Boundary	Upper Boundary
3	0.00	0.00	0.01
9	0.01	0.00	0.01
15	0.01	0.01	0.02
21	0.02	0.01	0.02
27	0.02	0.01	0.03
33	0.02	0.01	0.04
39	0.03	0.02	0.05
45	0.03	0.02	0.06
51	0.04	0.02	0.07
57	0.04	0.02	0.09
63	0.05	0.02	0.10
69	0.05	0.03	0.11
75	0.06	0.03	0.13
81	0.06	0.03	0.14
87	0.07	0.03	0.16
93	0.07	0.03	0.17
99	0.08	0.03	0.19
105	0.08	0.03	0.21
111	0.09	0.04	0.22
117	0.09	0.04	0.24






y-axis locked at 20% (direct comparison with pre-P068 failure rate)

Post P068 action, using a modifier of 2.7% and applying this pre-processing to the quantity of reports, the model indicates a worst case report rate of “Failure to Latch” of 2.4 R/1000 at ten years in service, covering specifically corroded KV actuators. Nominally the prediction is 0.9R/1000

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA POST P068 “FAILURE TO LATCH” COMPARISON



Pre-P068 Predicted Failure Rate at 10 years in service, all failure modes

Post-P068 Predicted Failure Rate at 10 years in service, all failure modes

Post-P068 Predicted Failure Rate at 10 years in service, corroded KV actuator specific

We know from returned latches that 2.7% of them are confirmed as failing due to a corrode KV actuator. Using 2.7% as a modifier for the data set before processing delivers the expected failure rate for the corrosion specific failure mode;

Pre-P068 prediction at 10 years in service is

82.9 R/1000

Post-P068 prediction at 10 years in service is


32.5 R/1000

Post-P068 prediction at 10 years in service (KV Actuator Corrosion) is

0.9 R/1000

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA PRE P068 “UNLATCHED IN MOTION (UIM)”




MIS_Pre_NA_UIM	Percent	R/1000
3	0.00	0.02
9	0.02	0.22
15	0.06	0.65
21	0.13	1.30
27	0.22	2.19
33	0.33	3.32
39	0.47	4.69
45	0.63	6.31
51	0.82	8.18
57	1.03	10.29
63	1.26	12.65
69	1.53	15.26
75	1.81	18.12
81	2.12	21.22
87	2.46	24.58
93	2.82	28.17
99	3.20	32.01
105	3.61	36.10
111	4.04	40.42
117	4.50	44.99

Pre-P068 action, the predicted parametric model indicates a nominal report rate of “Unlatched in Motion” of [45 R/1000](#) at ten years in service, covering all known failure modes


Note the y-axis has been locked at 20% as with the previous prediction (200 R/1000)

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA POST P068 “UNLATCHED IN MOTION (UIM)”



MIS_Post_NA_UIM	Percent	R/1000
3	0.01	0.07
9	0.02	0.21
15	0.03	0.35
21	0.05	0.49
27	0.06	0.63
33	0.08	0.77
39	0.09	0.92
45	0.11	1.06
51	0.12	1.20
57	0.13	1.35
63	0.15	1.49
69	0.16	1.63
75	0.18	1.78
81	0.19	1.92
87	0.21	2.06
93	0.22	2.21
99	0.24	2.35
105	0.25	2.50
111	0.26	2.64
117	0.28	2.79



y-axis locked at 20% (direct comparison with pre-P068 failure rate)

Post P068 action, the predicted parametric model indicates a report rate of “Unlatched in Motion” at ten years in service, covering all known failure modes of 2.8 R/1000

POST-P068 REPORTS ANALYSIS

NHTSA POST P068 “UNLATCHED IN MOTION (UIM)” – 2.7%



MIS	Reports	2.7% Modifier
25	1	0
24	1	0
23	1	0
22	6	0
21	1	0
20	0	0
19	3	0
18	1	0
17	1	0
16	3	0
15	4	0
14	2	0
13	3	0
12	1	0
11	1	0
10	0	0
9	1	0
8	3	0
7	2	0
6	4	0
5	2	0
4	1	0
3	7	0
2	5	0
1	4	0

The data set, once modified to a rate of 2.7%, yields zero failures when rounded to the nearest full integer.

Parametric analysis cannot occur on this data set.

However, in summary, the forecasted failure rate would be 0 R/1000 at 10 years in service for the failure mode “Unlatched in Motion”

Pre-P068 prediction at 10 years in service is	45.0 R/1000
Post-P068 prediction at 10 years in service is	2.80 R/1000
Post-P068 prediction at 10 years in service (KV Actuator Corrosion) is	0.00 R/1000

POST-P068 RETURNS

WHAT IS THE FAILURE MECHANISM?




- Latch “blind spot” issue – fixed on L405 rear doors only in July 2014. Can still occur L405 fronts and L494 all doors
- Cinch transmission lever spring location – fixed in production Oct 2015
- Exterior release handle jamming after actuation – strap modification in production May 2014
- KV motor cord wound and jammed - spring strength increase in Aug 2014
- RFA software applying short circuit to KV motor – software fixed in production Dec 2015
- KV transmission lever jammed by spring – bush and lever controls implemented Jun 2016
- Exterior release handle jamming (ii) – handle chassis modification in production Feb 2017
- Cinch motor multiwall broken – cable reversed in production Aug 2017
- Cinch motor cable disconnected from the multiwall – ongoing (QSF)
- Customer sensitive to latch issues on L405 and L494

	Ajar Warning	Physical Indicator	Hazardous
Blind Spot	N	N	N
Cinch Spring	Y	Y	N
Exterior Handle (i)	N	Y	N
KV Motor Cord	N	N	Y
Jammed KV Transmission Lever	N	N	Y
RFA Software	N	N	Y
Exterior Handle (ii)	N	Y	N
Cinch Multiwall Broken	Y	Y	N
Cinch Cable Disconnected	Y	Y	N

Definition for Hazardous; A door that can appear fully closed, without the ajar warning on the instrument pack, and with no physical indicators that are clearly visible to the customer that there is an error state present, that fails to secure in both the primary and secondary latched positions.

POST-P068 RETURNS

OUT OF SCOPE FAILURES



Out_Of_Scope_MIS	95% CI		
	Percent	Lower Boundary	Upper Boundary
3	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	0.01	0.00	0.02
15	0.04	0.02	0.07
21	0.10	0.04	0.22
27	0.19	0.07	0.54
33	0.32	0.09	1.15
39	0.50	0.12	2.15
45	0.73	0.14	3.71
51	1.02	0.17	5.94
57	1.37	0.20	8.99
63	1.79	0.23	12.98
69	2.27	0.27	17.96
75	2.83	0.30	23.97
81	3.46	0.34	30.92
87	4.17	0.37	38.67
93	4.97	0.41	46.97
99	5.84	0.45	55.50
105	6.79	0.48	63.91
111	7.83	0.52	71.82
117	8.96	0.56	78.91

The Out Of Scope reports for Unlatched in Motion (UIM) have 11 reports post recall scope.

These have been plotted against the build volumes for the months in question, NA market sold vehicles only.

The intervals are too wide to have confidence in the prediction.

POST-P068 RETURNS OUT OF SCOPE FAILURES



DOC_NUM	Category	Vehicle owner or fleet name (and fleet contact person) street address, email address and telephone number;	VIN	Last Six	Build date	Model
434419C	Consumer complaint		SA	222875	27/02/2015	Range Rover
523901A	Consumer complaint		SA	624415	08/04/2015	Range Rover Sport
611710A	Consumer complaint		SA	224666	09/05/2015	Range Rover
256008D	Consumer complaint		SA	225787	13/05/2015	Range Rover
597668A	Consumer complaint		SA	249824	14/08/2015	Range Rover
043636A	Consumer complaint		SA	636261	29/09/2015	Range Rover Sport
192885A	Consumer complaint		SA	264868	05/11/2015	Range Rover
011985A	Consumer complaint		SA	640486	16/11/2015	Range Rover Sport
112403B	Consumer complaint		SA	576540	25/01/2016	Range Rover Sport
265792E	Consumer complaint		SA	289277	04/04/2016	Range Rover
103909A	Consumer complaint		SA	653960	04/04/2016	Range Rover Sport

These vehicles are all built with short circuit RFA software
Common cause failure


These vehicles all fall within the jammed KV clutch build window
Special cause failure

POST-P068 RETURNS


COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BY FAILURE MODE BY POPULATION



Comparative R/1000 by Population
"Failure to Latch"




Comparative R/1000 by Population
"Unlatched in Motion"



POST-P068 RETURNS

NHTSA FEATURE ANALYSIS – SOFT CLOSE




Most of the 84 originally confirmed reports come from vehicles fitted with a soft close feature

Of the 8 vehicles without soft close feature, 6 were reported as unable to latch, 1 unlatched while driving (which still does not mitigate the potential blind spot), and one unlatched with warning

JLR Uni-latch High End KV

SALGA3VF8GA [REDACTED], SALWA2VF1GA [REDACTED]




SALGA3VF8GA [REDACTED], SALWA2VF1GA [REDACTED]

▪ General:


- 5 latches have been received: SALWA2VF9GA [REDACTED], SALWA2VF2GA [REDACTED], SALWA2VF1GA [REDACTED], SALWA2VF0GA [REDACTED], SALGA3VF8GA [REDACTED].

▪ Analysis:

- Customer verbatim:
 - „Will not latch or door bounce back“.
- Technician verbatim:
 - Issue confirmed, replace door latch, test, OK.
- Visual inspection:
 - Latches have been received in not failed conditions,
 - KV lever in home position,
 - KV transmission lever in home position,
 - No corrosion of KV motor,
 - Greasing OK,
 - No issues detected.
- Electrical check:
 - All functions OK on IDU 2 and TB,
 - KV function checked 25x times, seal load 311N included → failure is not reproducible.
 - No issues detected.
- Mechanical check:
 - All levers release or non release in all states as it is specified.
 - No issues detected.



▪ Systematic disassembly:



- All single components have been assembled correctly,
- Abbrasion on KV transmission lever detected,
 - Height: 5,04/4,95mm
- Damage on bush surface from spring detected.

Conclusion: Spring winding jammed between outside release lever and bush as per L2CCA2BG5GG.

SALGA3VF8GA [REDACTED]

brose

▪ Systematic disassembly:



- All single components have been assembled correctly,
- Abbrasion on KV transmission lever detected,
 - Height: 5,05/4,95mm
- Damage on bush surface from spring detected.

Conclusion: Spring winding jammed between outside release lever and bush as per L2CCA2BG5GG [REDACTED].

SALWA2VF1GA [REDACTED], SALGA3VF8GA [REDACTED]



▪ Next steps:

- 3D scan of KV transmission lever and bush, TBD CW39.
- Failure simulation:
 - Following carset to be build:
 - 2 latches:
 - bush with milled chamfer 0,1mm above the spec.
 - KV transmission lever from:
 - SALWA2VF1GA [REDACTED], height: 5,04/4,95mm,
 - L2CCA2BG5GG [REDACTED], height: TBD/4,92mm.
 - 2 latches:
 - Serial latches from current production.
- Test specification:

Test:	Reproduce failure mode "sticky KV-transmission lever"		
Latches with:	KV-Transmission lever from: field parts approx 5mm (Spec. 5,2 -0,05) Bush with chamfer similar to field part - 0,5 (Spec. -0.4) and -0,7 (Spec. -0.6) Rest: current series components		
Variant:	LH latches		
Amount:	2		
	2	total series parts for comarison	
Procedure:	Testing within specification limit did not lead to any failed function in validation/requalification test Test procedure needs to be definded with conditions out of specification		
Potential criteria:	Number of needed cycles according MTF of field parts = 10% of spec. cycles Wet-Dust application directly to critical KV-lever area to provoke abrasion Salt spray application earlier in test sequence Temperature / humidity We need extra storage time simulate real conditions in usage		
Timing			
	Procedure	22.09.2017	
	Test duration	approx. 30% of total life cycle testing (approx 3 weeks)	
	Test start	tbd	

System supplier of the international
automotive industry

