

49 CFR Part 573 - DEFECT INFORMATION REPORT RECALL P065

573.6 (c) (6) - Chronology of Events

The concern was first reviewed at Jaguar Land Rover's Critical Concerns Review Group (CCRG) on March 9, 2015, where engineering identified a number of reports stating that the panoramic roof assembly was either noisy, loose, leaking water into the vehicle or the panoramic roof glass panel, in one case, had detached from the vehicle.

Extensive investigations by Jaguar Land Rover engineering and the component suppliers during March 2015 were conducted on the current bonding agent used in the manufacture of panoramic roof assemblies, the bonding agent used 6 months prior and the bonding agent on the panoramic roof assembly returned from the market identified a difference in the chemical properties on returned component with the primer being unexpectedly the wrong specification.

Further investigations in March and April 2015 identified that during the manufacturing period of the returned component (August 2012) a quality improvement activity was being undertaken at the supplier during the holiday closure period to change the bonding agent. During the change process all the previous primer was removed from the bonding cell. When manufacturing re-started after the holiday period the operator noted that the bonding cell had not been re-stocked with the new primer and an incorrect primer was used. The incorrect primer did not give the correct level of adhesion between the bonding agent and roof glass.

The investigation identified through stock usage, that 300 panoramic roof glass systems have been manufactured with the incorrect primer.

The investigation was reviewed at the CCRG on March 30, 2015 and the CCRG concluded that this issue be progressed to the Jaguar Land Rover Technical Review Group (TRG) for consideration.

The TRG reviewed all information on May 7, 2015 and recommended that this concern be progressed to the JLR Field Review committee (FRC).

The FRC reviewed all information on June 4, 2015 and concluded that the concern represented an unreasonable risk to safety and that a voluntarily safety recall be conducted.

There have no reported accidents or injuries as a result of this concern.