KDD086 - SAP S/4H vs LIMS Results Recording

Status	Approved
Owner	MEDIMAGH-ext, Anes
Stakeholders	GERVAIS, Pascal COUDRY, Arnaud POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar @Andrew Liguori @Scott Tinlin @Bryan Cupples

Issue

A request was made by the Syensqo Manufacturing excellence team to consider the option of having one Quality system across Syensqo.

Rationale behind the request:

- No Standardized process within and across the GBUs.
- No standardized reports possible within the plants in a GBU and across GBU .
- Currently Labware is configured in a way which the local sites want to define it.
- In Labware / Web LIMS the Samples are generated manually without any trigger from upstream processes, resulting in a lack of control and process integration.
- In Labware / Web LIMS the operator can freely define whether execute a test or carry over previous results, without any predefined control.

Recommendation

This KDD recommends the continuation of a **decentralised approach for Quality Management**, labelled as **Option 1** in this document.

It must be noted that the original recommendation of SyWay was for Option 4 (unified Labware system), in order to allow for full process standardization, however the resources and effort required to implement this option were significant and introduced the risk of delaying the overall SyWay program timelines. When also considering the cost of implementation, integration, and change management impacts, it was decided to move forward with Option 1. This approach allows each GBU to maintain its current Quality Management setup, with existing LIMS/Labware versions and configurations continuing to operate across different sites.

This decision was made following a comprehensive evaluation and was presented to the SteerCo on 26th November 2025, where the endorsement to proceed with Option 1 was received.

Importantly, as part of this approach, SyWay will redesign the interfaces using the latest frameworks. This will lay the groundwork for future harmonization and standardization efforts, aligning with our long-term ambition to create a more unified and efficient system across all GBUs. By taking this step, we are ensuring operational continuity while also positioning ourselves to progressively achieve greater integration and consistency in our Quality Management processes.

Note: Subsequent to the decision to proceed with Option 1, the P&C GBU has initiated a program to decommission WebLIMS and replace it with Labware. Consequently, the integration between SAP S/4HANA and WebLIMS will be out of scope for SyWay. If the migration program does not meet the SyWay timelines, the alternate option will be to manage the inspection process offline. Integration of S4 with Labware is still in scope of SyWay.

Background & Context

Current Status and Challenges:

Syensqo currently operates with a distributed Quality Organization, where quality management responsibilities, processes, and systems are spread across multiple business units and sites. Over time, each GBU/plant has implemented its own technology landscape, leading to the coexistence of different Quality Management Systems, LIMS, and data management tools.

- Lack of Standardization Across GBUs and Sites
  - There is no standardized process within or across the Global Business Units (GBUs)
  - Measured values vary because LabWare configurations and test setups differ across sites.
- Inconsistent Reporting and Configuration
  - It is not possible to generate standardized reports either within a GBU or across GBUs due to differences in local configurations.
  - LabWare and WebLIMS are currently configured independently by each site, based on local preferences and practices, leading to different data models and test definitions.

- Lack of Integration and Process Control
  - In LabWare / WebLIMS, samples can be created manually without any trigger from upstream processes (e.g., production, batch release, or quality notification).
    - This results in a lack of integration and limited traceability between quality results and operational data.
  - Operators can manually decide whether to execute a test or reuse previous results, this step is ad-hoc and without predefined system controls or approval steps.



Assumptions

- Master Data creation and maintenance will be in SAP S/4HANA for SpP.
- Master Data creation and maintenance will be in SAP S/HANA and Labware for P&C and Composites.
- Inspection Lot creation will remain in SAP S/4HANA when is needed and the sample will be created in Labware.
- Usage Decision will be taken in S/4HANA in order to be able to manage Stock Posting.
- Lab Equipment will remain integrated into Labware.
- The P&C-Novecare Plants not using S/4HANA for the QM Results Recording will be migrated to Labware.

Constraints

Various lab test equipment are currently deployed across multiple sites, but the full inventory of interfaces and underlying technologies remains undefined. This lack of visibility makes it difficult to accurately estimate the technical effort required to develop SAP integrations for test result capture. Therefore the continuation of the existing decentralised approach is recommended as a pragmatic solution (i.e. Option 1).

Impacts

The Selected approach does not have an impact on the infrastructure, other SAP modules or systems and inflight projects, It does have an impact on the business processes and the interfaces.

The Business process models needs to be adjusted based on the recommended option, Interface will be added to scope to connect S/4HANA with Labware.

The SpP Master Data currently stored in Labware needs to be migrated to SAP, as SAP will become the new central repository for all Master Data.

Business Rules

All Inspection Lot triggers are properly defined (e.g., Goods Receipt, Production Order, Stock Transfer).

The Inspection Types defined during the Detailed Design are correctly assigned to the Material Master.

Automate selection of specifications based on material, Customer/Vendor, or batch attributes.

Define valuation logic (e.g., accepted, rejected, conditional acceptance).

Link usage decisions to follow-up actions like stock postings or notifications.

Automate decisions where possible based on recorded results and valuation codes.

Options considered:

Following are the options proposed:

Option 1 – Decentralized Approach

Under this approach, each GBUs continues operating its existing Quality Management setup. Different LIMS versions and configurations remain in use across sites, which means data structures, reporting formats, and inspection results will continue to vary.



Option 2 - Hybrid Approach (CM As-Is / P&C and SpP Standardised)

Under this approach, Composites retains its current configuration (“As-Is”), while other GBU’s standardize their quality processes and integrate with SAP S/4HANA. This hybrid model promotes partial standardisation while reducing disruption to ongoing CM operations. This option will also enable Syensqo to roll out a centralised Quality Management Organization.



Option 3 – Technology Standardisation (All GBUs Move to different LabWare systems, no Process changes in Labware)

This option envisions a complete migration where all GBUs (including P&C, SpP, and CM) move to a unified LabWare Technology(One instance for CM and other instance for rest of GBU's). This option acknowledge the possibility for P&C to unify their plants in the current Labware implementation, removing WEBLIMS.



Option 4 – Full Process Standardisation (All GBUs Move to unified Labware Design)

This option envisions a complete migration where all GBUs (including P&C, SpP, and CM) move to a unified LabWare Design (One instance for CM and other instance for rest of GBU's).. Quality processes would be fully standardised across the enterprise, ensuring consistent data structures, harmonised reporting formats, and a single source of truth for all inspection results. It requires a deep redesign of the Labware implementation.



Evaluation

Criteria	Option 1 – Decentralised	Option 2 - Hybrid Approach (CM As-Is / P&C and SpP Standardized)	Option 3 – Technology Standardization (All GBUs Move to different LabWare systems, no Process changes in Labware)	Option 4 – Full Process Standardization (All GBUs Move to unified System and Design)
Process Standardization	⊖ Minimal – each GBU defines its own processes and data structures.	⊕ Partial – standardized processes across P&C and SpP; CM remains independent.	⊕ Partial – standardized system across P&C and SpP; CM remains independent.	⊕ Full – consistent processes, test methods, and reporting across all GBUs.
Master Data Standardization	⊖ None – master data remains fragmented and inconsistent.	⊕ Partial – standardized for P&C and SpP; CM remains decentralized.	⊖ None – No standardization of processes for P&C and SpP; CM remains decentralized.	⊕ Full – unified material, test, and specification data across all GBUs.
Organizational Standardization	⊖ None – each GBU follows its own quality governance.	⊕ Partial – alignment between P&C and SpP.	⊖ None – each GBU follows its own quality governance.	⊕ Full – common governance, reporting, and performance metrics across Syensqo.
Syensqo Benefits (Strategic)	⊖ Limited – maintains current inefficiencies and fragmented data.	⊕ Moderate – visible improvement in quality alignment and data governance for majority of operations.	⊖ Limited – maintains current inefficiencies and fragmented data.	⊕ High – enterprise-level visibility, compliance assurance, and digital integration.
Operational Benefits	⊖ Minimal – continues manual effort and inconsistent results.	⊕ Moderate – improved efficiency and consistency in key GBUs.	⊖ Minimal – continues manual effort and inconsistent results.	⊕ High – streamlined operations, cross-site benchmarking, and automation benefits.
Timeline Feasibility	⊕ Short-term feasible; minimal project effort.	⊕ Feasible within Sy-Way program timeline.	⊖ To be ready for SyWay SIT, to be started ASAP to follow program timeline.	⊖ Feasible with extended timeline (leveraging P&C project starting April 2026).
Scalability	⊖ Limited – requires reassessment for each plant's integration.	⊕ Moderate – scalable for GBUs using SAP; limited for those on LIMS.	⊖ Limited – requires reassessment for each plant's integration.	⊕ High – fully scalable once unified configuration is achieved.
Operational Risk	⊖ Medium – inconsistent data, manual controls, and limited visibility across GBU.	⊖ Medium – standardized in key GBUs, but residual fragmentation in CM.	⊖ High – inconsistent data, manual controls, and limited visibility across sites.	⊕ Low – consistent quality and reporting standards minimize operational errors.
Project Risk	⊕ Low – minimal change effort.	⊖ Medium – integration complexity and alignment challenges across GBUs.	⊕ Low – minimal change effort.	⊖ High – large-scale migration and change effort across multiple systems.
Change Impact	⊕ Low – limited user change.	⊖ High – process and tool alignment required for two GBUs.	⊖ Medium – Web LIMS users to move to Labware.	⊖ Medium – full process, data, and system transformation for all sites.
Technical Constraints	⊖ None specific, but heterogeneous systems require multiple custom interfaces.	⊕ No major constraints; minor adaptation for Web LIMS sites.	⊖ None specific, but heterogeneous systems.	⊖ Requires migration of 16 P&C sites from Web LIMS and 6 from SAP to LabWare.
Technical Solution Complexity	⊖ Medium – multiple integrations but limited new development.	⊖ Medium – moderate integration and enhancement effort.	⊖ Medium – multiple integrations but limited new development.	⊖ High – complex migration, reconfiguration, and system consolidation.
Effort Estimate	⊖ RICEFW development for 10 LIMS interfaces + 50 equipment links + 5 enhancements.	⊖ Interface development between LIMS and SAP + harmonization setup.	⊖ RICEFW development for 5 LIMS interfaces + 50 equipment links + 5 enhancements.	⊖ High – full migration effort across all GBUs and interface redevelopment.

See also

File	Modified
PDF File KDD086 - SAP S4H vs LIMS Results Recording - Approval 3.pdf	Apr 29, 2026 by CRESPIN-ext, Edouard
PDF File KDD086 - SAP S4H vs LIMS Results Recording - Approval 2.pdf	Apr 02, 2026 by CRESPIN-ext, Edouard

	PDF File KDD086 - SAP S4H vs LIMS Results Recording - Approval.pdf	Mar 25, 2026 by CRESPIN-ext, Edouard
	PDF File 945058710_f59cdb6eb3ab458b85b7cc734349e071-180326-1535-6472.pdf	Mar 18, 2026 by GERVAIS, Pascal

Download All

Change log

Version	Published	Changed By	Comment
CURRENT (v. 48)	**Apr 01, 2026 12:51**	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 47	Feb 26, 2026 11:17	**MEDIMAGH-ext, Anes**	
v. 46	Feb 19, 2026 22:43	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 45	Feb 19, 2026 22:42	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 44	Feb 19, 2026 22:29	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 43	Feb 19, 2026 22:29	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 42	Feb 18, 2026 13:39	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 41	Feb 16, 2026 18:07	**NARAHARI-ext, Bhargavi**	
v. 40	Feb 14, 2026 07:52	**POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar**	
v. 39	Feb 05, 2026 14:16	**MEDIMAGH-ext, Anes**	

Go to Page History

Workflow history

This view shows the 5 most recent entries. The complete workflow log is available from the 'Document Activity' menu item.

Apr 01, 2026	Actor	Type	Activity	Version
Approved	POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar	Edit	updated the page at 12:51 pm	
	LEIGHTON-ext, Dean	State	changed state to Approved at 11:13 am	v48
Edited following Approval	LEIGHTON-ext, Dean	State	gave *Minor change* approval at 11:13 am *Minor change in impact assessment to change "Site" to "GBU" for process standardization and Operational Risk*	
	POOVADAN-ext, Vineet Kumar	State	changed state to Edited following Approval at 10:51 am	v48
Mar 31, 2026				
Approved	LEIGHTON-ext, Dean	State	changed state to Approved at 11:25 am	v47