DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

IN REPLY REFER TO DLMSO

DEC 08 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR SUPPLY PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC)
FINANCE PRC

SUBJECT: Approved DLMS Change (ADC) 108, Customer Asset Reporting Status Code SB for Unmatched Credit Followup (MILSTRIP/MILSBILLS/Supply/Finance) (Staffed as PDC 105)

This attached change to DOD 4000.25-1-M, Military Standard Requisitioning and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP), and DOD 4000.25-M, Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS), is approved for staggered implementation. Components may defer associated automated processing pending logistics systems modernization. Components should identify implementation dates to DLMSO. DLA has reported that this process is implemented under legacy systems and will be perpetuated under modernization.

Addressees may direct questions to the DLMSO points of contact, Ms. Ellen Hilert, Chair, Supply Process Review Committee, 703-767-0676, DSN 427-0676, or e-mail: ellen.hilert@dla.mil or Ms. Vermella Savage, DOD MILSTRIP System Administrator, 703-767-0674, DSN 427-0674, or e mail: vermella.savage@dla.mil. Others must contact their Component designated representative.

James A. Johnson

JAMES A. JOHNSON
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment

cc:
ADUSD(L)SCI
LMI

ADC 108
Customer Asset Reporting Status Code SB for Unmatched Credit Followup

1. ORIGINATOR:

a. Service/Agency: DLA

b. Sponsor: Supply PRC Chair, Ellen Hilert, DLA DLMSO/J-6411, DLMSO, 703-767-0676 (DSN 427), ellen_hilert@hq.dla.mil

c. Functional Point of Contact: Ms Brenda Meadows, J-332, 703-767-1606 (DSN 427), brenda.meadows@dla.mil

2. FUNCTIONAL AREA: Finance/Supply

3. REFERENCE: DOD 4000.25-7-M, Military Standard Billing System (MILSBILLS)

4. REQUESTED CHANGE:

a. Description of Change: Revise MILSTRIP SB Status to reflect additional usage on MILSBILLS FTB, Reply to Followup for Credit Status. This will support a response to the customer indicating that there is no match on document number in response to a credit followup under the Material Reporting Program (i.e., directed material returns).

b. Procedures: Revise MILSTRIP AP2.16, Status Codes, to read as follows:

CODE	**EXPLANATION**
	CUSTOMER ASSET REPORTING TRANSACTION STATUS CODES
SB	Rejected. ***(Use on DI FTR or FTB.)*** ***(1)*** Report garbled and incomplete. Corrective action cannot be determined. Review entire contents, correct, and resubmit if appropriate (Assign a new document number if a new asset report is submitted.). ***(2) When provided in response to a MILSBILLS DI FTP, Followup for Credit, this status indicates that the supply source has no matching document on file. Research, correct, and resubmit, if appropriate.***

5. REASON FOR CHANGE:

a. BACKGROUND: Once a creditable MRP status (promise) is provided, further communications should be under MILSBILLS FAE/FAR procedures. MILSBILLS FAR (replies) and associated billing status codes cover this particular and other “where-is-my-credit” situations. However, when the FTB and FTP processes were transferred from MILSTRIP to MILSBILLS, the extensive system changes which would be required to transition to FAE/FAR processes were not viewed as justifiable. Therefore, it was decided to keep the MILSTRIP processes, including MILSTRIP transaction status codes to avoid the redesigns needed. This resulted in the gap identified by this change proposal.

b. Current Problem: DLA identified a situation occurring in Business System Modernization (BSM) processing where customers are sending in followups for credit for customer returns where the system (in this case SAP) has no record of the document number. There was logic in the DLA legacy system, SAMMS, to reject these with SB Status. However, that status really does not describe the situation accurately. Under BSM there is no method to respond to the customer.

6. ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES:

a. Advantages: In the current environment, it is more feasible to redefine SB to specifically add language which states “no record of this document number,” than to create and implement ***either*** a new Billing Status Code or a new Customer Asset Reporting Status Code.

b. Disadvantages: Perpetuates a misalignment of this process.

7. Alternatives:

a. Since this is fundamentally a financial issue, the alternative would be to submit request for new Billing Status Code. These are used in replies to requests for billing adjustment, duplicate billing, or billing status.

b. The MILSBILLS Administrator suggested several alternatives for the overall process: (a) transfer the processes to the FAE/FAR;
(b) transfer or restate all FTB/FTP related FT_ processes to MILSBILLS; (c) transfer the FTP and FTB back to MILSTRIP and insure “financial requirements” are adequately covered there; e.g., add “new” billing status code equivalents to the transaction

status codes.

8. IMPACT: Undefined.