



Zulieferkreis Treffen am 30.08.2005 bei DuPont in Bad Homburg

- Begrüßung
- Vorstellung des Gastgebers
- Ergänzungen zur Tagesordnung
- Anmerkungen zur letzten Sitzung / Protokoll
- Aktionsliste/ Communication ZK-SC, Zwischenergebnisse (Timo Unger)
- Fragen SC an Lieferanten
- Disclaimer in Use Conditions
- Einheitliche Sprache für MDS (z.B. Englisch) (Pristl)
- Löschung von MDBs (nicht mehr existierende Firmen, Altbestände)
- Erfahrungen mit Release 3.0 / 3.1, Konflikt mit Recommendation 22, Change Management, Empfehlung
- Zusammenarbeit mit der CLEPA
- IMDS Kosten, Stand der Diskussion, Info an ACEA
- Erfahrungsaustausch
- Gewichtstoleranzen, Stand der Diskussion
- Arbeitsgruppen, vorhandene: Ergebnisse?, neue: Ziele?
- Vereinheitlichung OEM Anforderungen (Dr. Jürgens)
- Zu lösende Aufgaben/ Fragen an SC
- Die nächsten Treffen: etwa Mitte November bei Continental Teves in Frankfurt. Angebote für Januar 2006 oder später willkommen.



Welcome
Begrüßung

Wolfgang Diegmann welcomes the participants.

Presentation of the host company
Vorstellung des Gastgebers

Rainer Kurzknabe gave a short overview over the DuPont organisation and its automotive business.

Presentation by 'identif' – DuPont security systems

Systems are visible or invisible identification codes on parts or packaging, which allows company individual product marking. Technology is based on artificial DNA and nano technology (colour shift).

identif
TECHNOLOGIES

identif GmbH
Ulrich-Schalk-Strasse 3
D-91056 Erlangen
Tel: +49-9131-750 88-632
Fax: +49- 9131-750 88-629
bauer@identif.de

Additions to the Agenda
Ergänzungen zur Tagesordnung

- DaimerChrysler – additional requirements -> *see below*
- Application codes for material entries from suppliers cannot be modified -> *Address questions to Peter Müller, EDS*

Remarks to the last meeting protocol
Anmerkungen zur letzten Sitzung / Protokoll

The last meeting protocol is accepted without remarks.

List of actions / communication ZK-SC, interim results (Timo Unger)
Aktionsliste/ Communication ZK-SC, Zwischenergebnisse (Timo Unger)

Timo Unger is now working for Hyundai and member of the IMDS Steering Committee. The established 'Communication Report Sheet' was reviewed.

General remark: Questions to be formulated detailed enough in order to avoid different interpretations.

Individual questions discussed:

1. Remark field on the page 2 (recycled content) is not visible anymore -> Information content of MDS has been changed for all entries which had inserts into this field. These have been disclaimers and / or specific OEM related information.
Lack of free text field results e.g. in PAH values for greases not being entered into IMDS anymore; information is needed for compliance assessment. Such information can be addressed through declaration requirements through GADSL. Rainer Weber, Henkel, to discuss GADSL entries to better identify declarable substances as needed for compliance.
- 1a. GM US still requests specific entries. Requirement is to use the part identification field instead of the remark field in the recycling area (since release 3.0 not available anymore).
2. Submission & acceptance dates not visible. Requirements of Recommendation 22 not implemented into software. Pop-up window could not be found.
3. Application codes for 'old' parts: Requirements (e.g. VW) are to update 'old' MDS. Previous OEM evaluation of applications in the the IMDS seems to have been discontinued. 'Carry-over' parts do not need to add application codes, since existing. New parts with 'old' sub-components considered as 'new' part and needs update also for 'old' sub-components attached. Conclusion: IMDS SC refers only to Tier 1 level with



- Recommendation 22. This is difficult to accept and generates important cost below Tier 1 level. Recom. 022 must be valid and applicable for all levels of IMDS users!
- 3a. Changes of substance list in IMDS (elimination of substance or 'joker'): how are 'old' entries handled for which one of the contained substances has disappeared? – Question needs to be addressed to SC.
 4. Recycled content: IMDS is global, not European. Recycled content entries for new MDS is no issue, review of old MDS is the problem. A VDA Work group could not identify neither for France nor for Missouri regulatory requirements or tax incentives for plastics, which require recycled content information collection through IMDS (France accepts as basis qualified assessments). Missouri tax incentives refer to metal recycling which is not covered by IMDS. (Dr. Jürgens)
 - 4a. Requirement to confirm that the parts are marked with the part marking code are redundant, since specified on the drawings. IMDS SC is in internal discussions over usefulness of such requirements. In any case, IMDS flat bills should be possible without parts marking confirmation, if single components are below the 100g limit, but total is above (fall back in case the requirement of part marking confirmation cannot be taken out completely).
 5. A significant amount of draft entries are not eliminated. Instead of creating new versions, the MDSs are copied and the original draft left in the system. Users are requested to clean up such entries. Possible archiving of those entries to be considered by "lean IMDS" working group.
 6. Button for SC recommended material: Supported by IMDS SC, but depends on budget. Project is to add button, which then will select only 'preferred entries' to prompt uniform entries. Suggested is a joint development of such 'preferred entries' with all parties concerned (following GADSL development example).
 7. Checker for outgoing / incoming MDS with unified criteria covering all OEM requirements. Planned for Release 4.0, beginning 2006. (cooperation with Dr. Jürgens, ContiTeves) ZK is asked to list differences in Recommendations and submit these to IMDS SC for clarification -> Clara Ramon agreed to co-ordinate: e-mail: Clara.Ramon@t-online.de
 8. Automatic correction of application codes in MDS is not acceptable (ownership issue). In house systems have recognised the applications (to attribute application codes) in the past. Such system should be kept for 'old' MDS to avoid that 'old' entries need to be reviewed.
 9. 'History Modification List' for IMDS Recommendations would facilitate the review of old MDS if they are still compliant to revised Recommendations. Approach similar to system used for drawings / drawing changes.
 10. Supplier representative (possibly from CLEPA) in the IMDS SC: For the IMDS SC, CLEPA is the partner from the supplier side. As a first test, CLEPA (Roland Gillebeert) has been invited to the next IMDS SC meeting and is allowed to be joined by up to 2 other representatives of suppliers. The IMDS SC will evaluate the contribution of such attendance and then decide, if and how often such invitations will be repeated. In order to create sustainable co-operation and efficient feed back from suppliers, regular attendance by suppliers should be considered. CLEPA needs to be set up for such representation. The ZK appreciates the 'new quality' in the relationship with the IMDS SC.

Request of IMDS ZK to IMDS SC:

1. For inputs entered before release 3.0 the 'Remark' field needs to be visible. This field contains information important for suppliers but also as per OEM requirements. The remark field on page 1 needs to be increased for non structured additional information like PAH values for greases.
- 1a. Re-emphasise with all IMDS members the IMDS SC objective to eliminate all additional specific OEM entry requests.
2. Creation of date fields as per previous discussions and Recommendation 22.
3. Review application of Recommendation 22 to below Tier 1 level.
- 3a. EDS to create solution, which allows that those MDS owners who have used disappearing substances are proactively informed.
4. Recycled content information to be required only for new MDS, not for 'old' MDS.
- 4a. Discontinue requirement to confirm marking of parts.
7. Recommendations to be harmonised to avoid rejects through conflicting requirements in different Recommendations.
8. In house systems have recognised the applications (to attribute application codes) in the past. Such system should be kept for 'old' MDS.

Questions SC to suppliers *Fragen SC an Lieferanten*

11. Top 20 users send 65% of MDS (10 Mio.). The high amount of traffic reduces system performance (speed). The IMDS SC asks for ideas to clean up the inactive / obsolete / unused MDS. Such MDS can be put into



archive space (still available but not in the active search space). Long term also the number of MDS may come to a critical amount for hard ware capacity. (Work Group 'Lean IMDS' will take up this issue).

12. Quality of published MDS in certain cases insufficient. Such MDS may be used without further check. Options could be to have published MDS only issued through the IMDS SC, exclusive outside contractor for public MDS, or publication only by 'certified' users. Possibly also restricted to materials, excluding semi-finished and parts. Published MDS need to be released only after verification ('Checker') (Work Group 'Lean IMDS' will take up this issue).

Recommendation by the ZK:

Work Group 'Lean IMDS' will take these issues up.

Disclaimer in use conditions

Disclaimer in Use Conditions

Discussion to incorporate the disclaimers into the use conditions. The Legal Advisory group of CLEPA incl. Mr. Keitel, Delphi, Mr. Müller, EDS, to be formed / reactivated.

Common language for MDS (e.g. English) (Pristl)

Einheitliche Sprache für MDS (z.B. Englisch) (Pristl)

International use of IMDS calls for a common language, which would be English. Problems may be encountered at lower Tier level. Official IMDS language is English (since about 4 years, 13 July 2001). OEMs also need to adhere to this convention. Issues are part names for which the (same) English expression has to be used by various suppliers -> standardisation. OEMs need to accept English, even when the OEM drawings are in another language, e.g. German. Some OEM still have problems with this question. Further discussion needed, if English is requirement as only language or optional besides other languages. Today, this has to be based on customer – supplier agreement with OEMs asking for MDS different than in English.

Request of IMDS ZK to IMDS SC:

Have all OEM accepted English submissions. Other languages as per individual agreements and optional.

Elimination of MDSs (companies not existing anymore, old entries)

Löschung von MDBs (nicht mehr existierende Firmen, Altbestände)

Options are to put MDS of companies, which are not anymore active, into an archive. This could be triggered by e.g. 2 years inactivity. Work Group 'Lean IMDS' will take up these issue.

Experience with Release 3.0/3.1, conflict with recommendation 22 'Change Management', Recommendations

Erfahrungen mit Release 3.0 / 3.1, Konflikt mit Recommendation 22, Change Management, Empfehlung

Clara Ramon will formulate specific question to the IMDS SC. The Work Group 'Lean IMDS' will take up these issues.

Co-operation with CLEPA

Zusammenarbeit mit der CLEPA

CLEPA is the official voice of the suppliers for questions discussed with the IMDS SC and other organisations like AIAG. The ZK is the active forum to discuss IMDS questions, which are then carried into the CLEPA for further discussion with OEMs / IMDS SC. CLEPA itself has no active working group. The discussion of cost related to IMDS have not been conducted within CLEPA, which is regretted by the ZK. However, through the CLEPA board, ACEA has obtained a cost summary of IMDS for consideration.

CLEPA has indicated readiness to co-operate with the IMDS ZK and to contribute constructively.

Mr. Diegmann will invite Roland Gillebeert, CLEPA, to a next ZK meeting.

Cost of IMDS, status of discussion, Info to ACEA

IMDS Kosten, Stand der Diskussion, Info an ACEA

See above.



Exchange of experience *Erfahrungsaustausch*

1. WOCO has presented an additional request from DaimlerChrysler to provide in Excel format identical information to IMDS, since the requesting DaimlerChrysler department has no access to IMDS data. Purpose of the request is to calculate recycling quotes. SC to organize improved OEM inhouse use of IMDS.

{ see attachment: HandOut_AAV-Prozess_P-Freigabe.pdf }

2. Opel: GP11 (parts in development phase) requires only data available at Tier 1 level, but does not require further details. Mrs. Heymann indicated that the requirements for IMDS entries for parts in the development phase should be specified in a separate Recommendation. Such Recommendation has been drafted and is awaiting approval of the IMDS SC (information Mr. Unger) For new recommendations early involvement of suppliers needed to avoid endless discussions after release.

Recommendation by the ZK:

1. This is an internal problem of DaimlerChrysler and needs to be addressed directly to DaimlerChrysler. In principle, it should be expected that OEMs share the IMDS information internally.
2. Prototype declarations in IMDS to be if possible postponed until clear guidelines for all OEMS are established by the IMDS SC.

Request of IMDS ZK to IMDS SC:

Request information on status of 'Prototype' Requirements, ideally in the form of a IMDS Recommendation.

Weight tolerances, status of discussion *Gewichtstoleranzen, Stand der Diskussion*

Weight tolerances depend on material and part (variability of foams, machined parts, etc.). Automatic checks comparing calculated and actual weight have difficulties to cope with such variability. Current discussion within the IMDS SC is to not include a check of weight tolerances due to difficulty of automatization of weight checks. Individual OEM requests for weight tolerance standardisation across parts needs to be discussed with the OEM's SC.

Request of IMDS ZK to IMDS SC:

Either do not introduce weight tolerance checks or allow ranges big enough to screen out obvious errors but allow material / part inherent variability.

Work Groups: existing Work Groups: results?, new Work Groups: objectives? *Arbeitsgruppen, vorhandene: Ergebnisse?, neue: Ziele?*

Dr. Jürgens: *Uniformisation of OEM requirements:*

IMDS SC has requested a list of additional, contradictory and conflicting requirements of different OEMs from CLEPA and AIAG (2 separate inputs).

The ZK Work Group has provided a matrix on 26 August 2005 to CLEPA to be forwarded to IMDS SC. This discussion item is on the agenda for the next IMDS SC meeting with CLEPA being present.

Rainer Weber: *ZK restructuration.*

Suggestion: Detailed work to be carried out in Work Groups, not anymore in full plenum. Information flow within Work Groups through access to protected web forum pages. A new web page is suggested with different, partly restricted access areas. Content of the different sections needs to be defined, especially which documents can be made publicly available. Rainer Weber volunteers as web master. Time frame for realisation: beginning of 2006.

{ see attachment: webauftritt_050830.ppt }

Wolfgang Diegmann: *Lean IMDS*



New Work Group: structural changes of IMDS. Interested persons to send e-mail to Wolfgang Diegmann.

Request of IMDS ZK to IMDS SC:

IMDS 'Checker' needed to verify and assure correctness up front and thus avoid rejects. This implies, that all OEM accept MDS which have passed the IMDS 'Checker'.

Uniformisation of OEM requirements (Dr. Jürgens)
Vereinheitlichung OEM Anforderungen (Dr. Jürgens)

See above.

Pending tasks / requests to the SC
Zu lösende Aufgaben/ Fragen an SC

See above

Next meeting: November 29th at Continental Teves in Frankfurt. Offer for January/ February 2006 from Kroschu: Renningen or Leonberg *Die nächsten Treffen: 29. November bei Continental Teves in Frankfurt. r Janua / Februarr 2006 bei Kroschu (Renningen oder Leonberg).*

Next Meeting: 29 November 2005.

Coordination: Dr. Gunnar Jürgens

Gunnar.Juergens@contiteves.com

Additional information concerning location and access will follow in due time.

Additional information.

1. Upload to PSA Macsi system under development and expected to be ready by year end.
2. Aluminum (IMDS SC standard entry) with 0 – 0.4% Lead cannot be handled by in-house systems at OEMs since all materials are considered as containing 0.2% (average) lead, which leads to rejects by Ford. This problem needs to be address through system improvements. (EDS)
3. Annex II: VDA recommends to already implement the expected Annex II modifications (especially 1,5% Lead for machining purposes in Aluminium). **This recommendation should be taken by ZK Members as fact. OEMs are encouraged to also follow their own VDA recommendations** and not to issue deviating requests.
4. Application codes introduced by lower Tiers must also be visible at Tier 1 level. Today only OEM can see them. This leads to repeated inputs of data. This has to be changed. EDS

Request of IMDS ZK to IMDS SC:

4. Make application codes visible up the supply chain.


End of meeting.

15.50h

Attachment:

Participants list

Teilnehmer IMDS Zuliefererkreistreffen - DuPont Bad Homburg - 30. August 2005

#	NAME	FIRMA	E-MAIL	UNTERSCHRIFT
1	Bachmann, Erik	Technidata	erik.bachmann@technidata.de	
2	Bartsch, Boris-Bodo	Huf Hülsbeck & Fürst GmbH & Co. KG	bbartsch@huf.de	
3	Becker, Uta	JCI	uta.becker@jci.com	
4	Bergfeld,	AB Elektronik		
5	Beuchel, Sandra	Küster ACS	sandra.beuchel@kuester.net	
6	Bihl, Andrea	ZK-Lenksysteme	andrea.bihl@zf-lenksysteme.com	
7	Böddeker, Martin	INA-Schaeffler KG	Martin.Boeddeker@de.ina.com	
8	Bolay, Ulrich	Beru AG	ulrich.bolay@beru.de	
9	Bredemeier, Frank	Visteon Corporation	fbredeme@visteon.com	
10	Brück, Hans-J.	Tyco Electronics AMP GmbH	hbrueck@tycoelectronics.com	
11	Buczilowski, Marco	Faurecia Innenraum Systeme GmbH	mbuczilowski@hagenbach.faurecia.com	
12	Bunke-Lude, Helmut	Valeo Wischersysteme	helmut.bunke-lude@valeo.com	
13	Capuani, Peter	Freudenberg Vliesstoffe KG	petercapuani@freudenberg-nw.com	
14	Diegmann, Wolfgang	Delphi	wolfgang.diegmann@delphi.com	
15	Dr. Hammer, Klaus	LEONI Bordnetz Systeme GmbH & Co. KG	Klaus.Hammer@leoni.com	
16	Dr. Liebig, Berthold	EBM Papst Mulfingen	berthold.liebig@de.ebmpapst.com	
17	Dr. Struve, Daria	Coveright Surfaces Germany GmbH	daria.struve@coveright.com	
18	Drusselmann, Christoph	AB Elektronik	christoph.drusselmann@abelektronik.de	
19	Edelböck, Wolfgang	Oris Fahrzeugteile Hans Riehle GmbH	Edelboeck@oris-gmbh.de	
20	Emmrich, Siegfried	GKN Driveline Deutschland GmbH	siegfried.emmrich@gkndriveline.com	

21	Ernst, Kathrin	Kraiburg TPE	Kathrin.Ernst@kraiburg-tpe.com	
22	Gottschalk, Anja	Woco Industrietechnik GmbH	agottschalk@de.wocogroup.com	
23	Haas, Sabine	Sarnamotive Schenk GmbH	sabine.haas@sarnamotive-schenk.de	
24	Hacker, Thomas	Nexans autoelectric GmbH	THacker@autoelectric.de	
25	Hektor	tec4U GmbH		
26	Hepp, Daniel	Woco Industrietechnik GmbH	dhepp@de.wocogroup.com	
27	Hipp, Wilhelm	EBM Papst St. Georgen	wilhelm.hipp@de.ebmpapst.com	
28	Hirsche, Torsten	IEE S.A.	torsten.hirsche@iee.lu	
29	Jakobeit, Dietmar	Tyco Electronics AMP GmbH	DJakobeit@tycoelectronics.com	
30	Jeppe, Michael	TRW Occupant Safety Systems GmbH & Co. KG	michael.jeppe@tnw.com	
31	Jürgens, Gunnar, Dr.	Continental Automotive Systems	gunnar.juergens@contiteves.com	
32	Kegler, Monika	Hirschmann	monika.kegler@hirschmann.de	
33	Keidel, Michael	Bühler Motor GmbH	mkeidel@buehlermotor.de	
34	Krumrei, Jörg	MatFlow	jkrumrei@matflow.net	
35	Kunkel, Roland	Takata-Petri AG	Roland.Kunkel@eu.Takata.com	
36	Kurzknabe, Rainer	DuPont	rainer.kurzknabe@dupont.com	
37	Le Rolland, Anne	Robert Bosch GmbH	Anne.LeRolland@de.bosch.com	
38	Lossy, Annemarie	Pierburg GmbH	Annemarie.Lossy@Pierburg.com	
39	Ludwig, Carsten	ThyssenKrupp Umformtechnik GmbH	carsten.ludwig@thyssenkrupp.com	
40	Marold, Christa	Brose	Christa.Marold@brose.net	
41	May, Thomas	DuPont Performance Coatings		
42	Meyer, Guido	WAECO International GmbH	meyer@waeco.de	
43	Meyring, Wolfgang	Hengst GmbH & Co. KG	w.meyring@hengst.de	

44	Möhring, Tina	Brose	tina.moehring@brose.net	
45	Mujadzic, Erim	Peguform GmbH	e.mujadzic@peguform.de	
46	Müller, Peter	EDS Operations Services GmbH	Peter.Mueller@eds.com	
47	Nieser, Stefan	tec4U GmbH	s.nieser@tec4u.de	
48	Omorac, Anita	Busak+Shamban Deutschland GmbH	anita.omorac@busakshamban.com	
49	Parczanny, Norbert	DuPont Performance Coatings		
50	Paucker, Holger	Marquardt GmbH	holger.pauder@marquardt.de	
51	Pranschke, Andreas	MatFlow	andreas.pranschke@matflow.net	
52	Pristl, Alfred	Mann+Hummel GmbH	alfred.pristl@mann-hummel.com	
53	Ramon, Clara	CR Consulting	clara.ramon@t-online.de	
54	Roring, Albert	Kaschier und Laminier GmbH	roring@kaschier.de	
55	Salomon, Ulrich	Alcoa Fujikura	ulrich.salomon@alcoa.com	
56	Schulte, Ulrich	Hella KGaA Hueck & Co.	Ulrich.Schulte@hella.com	
57	Schwarz, Martina	Wieland-Werke AG	martina.schwarz@wieland.de	
58	Sperling, Igor	Webasto	isperling@webasto.de	
59	Spillner, Rainer	Getrag-Innovations GmbH	rainer.spillner@getrag.de	
60	Thomas, Helga	Klüber Lubrication München KG	Helga.Thomas@klueber.com	
61	Thull, Eike	Leoni Kabel GmbH	eike.thull@leoni.com	
62	Unger, Timo	Hyundai Motor Europe Technical Center GmbH	tunger@hyundai-europe.com	
63	Wasem, Peter	KEIPER GmbH & Co.KG	Peter.Wasem@KEIPER.com	
64	Watzler, Bettina	FCI Automotive Deutschland GmbH	Bettina.Watzler@fciconnect.com	
65	Weber, Rainer	Henkel	rainer.weber@henkel.com	
66	Zahn, Edeltraud	Behr GmbH & Co.	edeltraud.zahn@behrgroup.com	

67	Zbigniew, Dusza	Coroplast	z.dusza@coroplast.de	Dusza
68	Wilke Hanni	Weberlo Flg	H.Wilke@weberlo.de	
69	Fraisner Heinz	Fraisner Command Zieg	Fraisner - command Zieg @ t-online.de	
70	Paul, Steffen	Vroschen		
71	Helice Gail-Karacas	Fa. Küster	helice.gail-karacas@kuester.net	H. Gail K.
72				
73				
74				
75				
76				
77				
78				
79				
80				