

## SUMMARY

The following conclusions were obtained from this Master Thesis work:

1. Time to close a claim indicator for proposed workflow is better than current situation with HUBs, but not as good as when assembly was done only in EE AS.
2. Workflow proposed reduces the current workflow with HUBs by 20%.
3. One Quality Specialist is needed per HUB
4. If the volume in the HUB is very low, then the workflow proposed should be slightly revised.

The P2P interorganizational workflow method explained on topic 1.9.1. is applied on topic 5.2 to propose a workflow for quality control system between EEAS and HUBs, if it goes deeper on the solution, the resources proposed needed for HUBs on topic 5.2.2. are tight to information shown on theoretical review, such as the need of SAP quality management transactions explained on topic 1.7.1. and the experience needed from quality specialist, explained on topic 1.6. The SWOT analysis explained on topic 1.8. is done to define if the solution is feasible, and what aspects can affect it, this is applied on topic 5.4.

To compare the results of the analyzes for EE AS, HUBs and proposed workflow, a time to close a claim indicator formula was used, by this formula it was obtained the result of conclusion number one.

SQEs in EE AS are starting to deal with more HUBs, it will continue working with this workflow, probably some aspects will change, this is not the final solution, a more feasible workflow will be developed in the near future.