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

August 23, 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System Office (DLMSO) Pipeline Measurement
(PM) Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting, July 20, 2016

The attached minutes of the subject meeting are forwarded for information and action, as
appropriate. The minutes and related agenda items are available on the DLMSO PM PRC
Committee's Webpage at;
http://www.dlmso.dla.mil//Programs/Committees/pmprc/pmprc.asp.

The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office point of contact for this meeting is
Mr. Kenneth R. Deans, (703) 767-2611, DSN 427-2611; or email kenneth.deans@dla.mil

HEIDI M. DAVEREDE
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment
As stated

cc:
ODASD(SCI)
PM PRC
Meeting Attendees

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) Pipeline Measurement (PM) Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting of July 20, 2016.

      Purpose: The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) hosted the subject meeting at DLA Headquarters in Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Defense Collaboration Services (DCS) and a conference call bridge provided real time sharing of the presented materials with remote participants. The primary focus of the meeting was to review and discuss validation of the Logistics Metrics Analysis Reporting System (LMARS), LMARS reports, report criteria to Component representatives of the PRC, many of whom are recently appointed and unfamiliar with LMARS. The meeting agenda, list of attendees, and action item tracking list will be available on the PM PRC Committee Archives webpage: http://www.dlmso.dla.mil/Archives/archives_pmprc.asp within 30 days of the date of these minutes. The meeting related materials are hyperlinked from each topic in the meeting agenda.

      Brief Summary of Discussion: Discussion of each agenda topic is briefly summarized below. Established action items are referenced at the end of the relevant discussion.   The action item tracker will be posted to the PM PRC webpage with updates for responses as they are received. Action items are to be worked within 30 days from the PM PRC 16-1 meeting unless otherwise noted.

      a. **Opening Remarks**:   Mr. Kenneth Deans, DLMSO/PM PRC Chair, asked each participant to introduce themselves. He introduced himself, provided a summary of his supply/logistics experience, brief introductory remarks, and thanked the PRC members for their participation. He introduced Mr. Paul Blackwell, ODASD(SCI); CDR Jason Morris, DLMSO Deputy Director; and Ms. Samantha Mosser, DLMSO/PM PRC co-chair. Mr. Blackwell provided brief opening remarks: He thanked the PRC members for the work they do, noting that their expertise and the support that DLMSO provides to ODASD(SCI) enables the PM PRC to generate and publish the DOD enterprise metrics.

      b. Pipeline Measurement PRC Overview: It was noted that many of the current representatives to the PM PRC are new and that much of the overview would cover the functionality and reporting capabilities of LMARS, the LMARS Web Portal and the importance of insuring that LMARS reporting criteria is current. It was noted that the most important attribute of LMARS data is that it is "raw"— LMARS does not process the data that it receives and it functions as a "pass-through" to consolidate and relay the data it receives to the Components that use the LMARS output data. Mr. Deans responded to several questions from participants.

      (1) Dave Irvin, Army, asked if data quality has improved since DLA's Enterprise Business System (EBS) has come on-line; Mr. Deans replied that although Logistics Response

Times (LRT) are down since the deployment of EBS, he had no information about the quality of the EBS data.

(2) Stephen Meyer, DLA, asked if there was a listing of the types of transactions that LMARS uses as "requisitions." Mr. Deans said that list was included in the Report Reference Tables (Agenda Item 2.B)

(3) CMSgt Taurus Hawk, U.S. Air Force, asked how the mapping between legacy MILS transactions and DLMS transactions is accomplished. Mr. Deans and Mary Maurer, contract support to Transaction Services, replied that Transaction Services maintains bi-directional maps that allow translation between the formats. Transaction Services refers to legacy transactions as "User Defined Files" (UDFs) and when mapping from DLMS to UDF format, adds the DLMS enhancement data (data not contained in "native" MILS transactions (Document Identifier Codes—DICs)) to the end of the UDF file. Mr. Blackwell added that each DLMS transaction contains all of the data in the "equivalent" legacy transaction (DIC), and reiterated that all systems must be DLMS compliant by 2019.

c. LMARS Reports (LRT) – Report Criteria

(1) Business Rules: Mr. Deans explained that LMARS reports are broken down in to sub-sections that are populated according to the LMARS "fill Rules." Those sub-sections are:

- Composite Total,
- Composite Immediate,
- Composite Planned Direct Vendor Delivery (DVD),
- Composite Backordered,
- Composite Unplanned DVD, and
- Composite Other.

The "Composite" subsection of the LMARS reports comprises transactions from Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Others (Federal & Civil Agencies). The LMARS fill-type business rules also break down the data in its reports according to these Services/Components.

Mr. Blackwell clarified that a planned DVD transaction is one that is managed by a vendor under contract; an unplanned DVD is a transaction for an item that is unstocked for which a contract instrument has to be created. Ms. Maurer added that each Component may have minor differences in the fill rules that affect which transactions go into the unplanned DVD report.

(2) Report Reference Tables (A–H): Mr. Deans reviewed the content and usage of the LMARS Output Report Specific Tables (Tables A–H) and the importance of insuring the information in each table is current. It was recommended that the PRC members validate the information in the tables and if there were any changes, submit a Proposed DLMS Change (PDC). He particularly noted that the Air Force must update their entries in Table D.

- Table A documents component-specific codes (in addition to the MILSTRIP standard codes of BB and BC) used by components to indicate an item is backordered.
- Table B documents the transactions that are considered requisitions for the purposes of LMARS processing. (This table provides the answer to Stephen Meyer's question above.)
- Table C identifies documents that are used for initial outfitting; these transactions are excluded from LMARS reporting.
- Table D lists the RICs that each Component has identified as representing an Inventory Control Point (ICP) for that Component. Each Component provides its RICs to LMARS so it may keep the listing in Table D current.
- Table E lists the document identifier codes (DICs) used by each Component, that equate to standard material release orders (MROs).
- Table F lists other cancellation and rejection codes used by each Component.
- Table G documents DLA's prime medical vendor (PMV), maintenance, repair, and operations (MRO), perishable, and semi-perishable goods computational rules.
- Table H lists the codes each Component uses to identify RIC affiliations (i.e., if a RIC identifies a contractor location for that Component).

Action Item 1: Components to verify and update as necessary the data in the LMARS Output Report Specific Tables A–H. Discussion ensued regarding whether the Navy backorder codes in Table A replaced standard codes BB and BC but Ms. Ellen Hilert, DLMSO, reported during the meeting that she was able to resolve that question off-line, and the Navy codes are used only for internal transactions and do not replace standard MILSTRIP codes. Mr. Blackwell expressed concern that the additional Navy codes might result in double counting of transactions but Ms. Maurer assured him that LMARS processing is unique by document number. With regard to Table F, Ms. Maurer noted that if an order is cancelled, the transactions for that order are removed from LMARS. Mr. Dave Irvin, U.S. Army, suggested LMARS establish a new category to track cancelled orders. Mr. Deans asked Mr. Irvin to submit a PDC to make that happen.

Action Item 2: U.S. Army (Dave Irvin) to submit a PDC to establish a new fill type category to track cancelled orders. Ms. Hilert expressed concern about the Navy code 721 in Table C, noting that MILSTRIP does not recognize transactions with 721 in record positions 57–59 as initial outfitting. Navy and Ms. Hilert will work together off-line to resolve this question.

Action Item 3: U.S. Navy staff to follow up off-line with Ms. Hilert to resolve the question of what codes are valid to indicate initial outfitting transactions.

(3) Anomaly Code List (1–50): Mr. Deans showed participants where to access the LMARS anomaly report and code lists and explained that Components use the report and the codes to reconcile errors in their LRT reports. Ms. Maurer commented that many of the errors in the LRT report result from a particular document not having both a start event and an end event for a particular pipeline node. She also noted she had never had any inquiries from the Components regarding the Anomaly Code List file. CMSgt Taurus Hawk, Air Force, asked

where to get this report. Ms. Maurer said Transaction Services sends it to the PRC representatives each month.

       (4) Data Values: Mr. Deans showed participants where to access the Data Values table for LMARS. This table identifies the abbreviations used in the LMARS master data record for a number of data elements including: Component, area code, priority, pipeline node, fill types, nodes used for CONUS/OCONUS shipments, and wholesale ICPs by Service. Mr. Deans again emphasized that Services must regularly review and maintain their ICP tables in LMARS or the reporting will not be accurate.

       (5) Record Layout: Mr. Deans showed participants where to access and how to interpret the LMARS report record layout; this file serves as the data dictionary for the LMARS report, identifying the LMARS data element names and where each data element is conveyed in the LMARS report file. Mr. Meyer observed one of DLA's supply chains (SUP-CHN; rp 111-112) was missing. Ms. Maurer said that DLA had notified LMARS that it no longer used the supply chain data, so LMARS no longer processes the Demand and Supply chains for DLA. Mr. Blackwell said that SCI still uses the supply chain data, and needs it broken out in LMARS.

Action Item 4: ODASD(SCI) will work with DLA to ensure that needed supply chain data is included in the LMARS report.

       (6) Type of Fill Table Criteria (LRT):   Mr. Deans showed participants where to access the type of fill table for LMARS and provided a high-level overview of how the file is used by the compound conditional coding employed by LMARS to sort documents into the correct fill category. Mr. Deans emphasized again that the Service must maintain accurate data in the LMARS Report Reference Tables in order for LMARS to sort documents into the correct fill category. Ms. Maurer noted that there are two sets of reports generated: the IMD CORP FILL reports include data from all components; the CORP FILL reports are special reports for DLA containing only DLA data. These two sets of reports employ different fill type sorting rules.

     d. LMARS Reports

       (1) <u>LMARS Reports</u>: Mr. Deans showed participants where to access the LMARS Reports. He noted several instances in the reports where Logistics Response Times (LRT) are lower over time, (e.g., Guard, Reserve, Contractor Wholesale ICP, and Total Processing Time (TPT)). He also pointed out that the report criteria vary somewhat depending on the report. For example, in Slide 10, (Composite Wholesale ICP report) only the lower 95 percent of LRT are reported. Mr. Meyer noted that this is not a percentile figure, but instead the top five percent longest processing times (outliers) are eliminated before processing.

       (2) Mr. Blackwell also noted that USTRANSCOM is currently negotiating to change this to 85 percent to be consistent with Time Definitive Delivery (TDD) goals.

       (3) Mr. Irvin asked what the "Other" category represents. There are two (somewhat confusing) categories in the LMARS reports: "Other" and "Others" The "Other" category contains those transactions that do not fit into the Immediate Issue, Backordered,

Planned or Unplanned DVD categories; the "Others" category contains transaction that are not Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Mr. Deans noted that a significant number of the "Other" transactions are transactions for uniform/clothing issued by the Kentucky Logistics Operations Center (KYLOC); he is currently developing a PDC to move these transactions into the Immediate Issue category.

(4) Mr. Deans said he wanted the participants to have three key take-aways from this overview of the LMARS Reports:

- know where to go to view/download the LMARS Reports,
- understand what the reports look like and where to find specific data within the report layouts, and
- understand that all the data used by LMARS to calculate LRT is "raw" data.

e. **Quality Metrics for LRT** (Jennifer Shafer, LMI)

(1) Ms. Jennifer Shafer, LMI support to ODASD(SCI), briefed the participants on SCI efforts to document and improve the reliability and quality of data used to calculate supply chain metrics.

(2) Mr. Blackwell filled in background information that a Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit had identified areas that needed improvement in reliability and quality in the Supply Chain metrics. SCI's high level approach to implement a Total Data Quality Management (TDQM) process is based upon the DOD's Guidelines for Data Quality Management, and comprises these steps:

- Define—identify data quality requirements and establish data quality metrics,
- Measure—Measure conformance with established business rules and develop exception reports,
- Analyze—verify, validate, and assess the causes for poor data quality and analyze opportunities for improvement, and
- Improve—select data quality improvement opportunities that provide the most benefit and implement the selected improvements.

(3) Mr. Napoli noted that this process is cyclical, and that once the "improve" step is completed, the process re-starts at the "define" step, resulting in continuous process improvement.

(4) Ms. Shafer summarized steps SCMG is taking to support data quality, including synchronizing Component metrics calculation with SCI enterprise calculation and verifying transactional data from such sources as LMARS, SDDB, and CWT to ensure six facets of accuracy, completeness, validity, timeliness, uniqueness and consistency. She then outlined specific data elements, data sources, proposed measurements and computational methods that SCI will apply to each of these six facets to implement TDQM. Ms. Shafer noted that SCI currently finds that only 97.1 percent of the document numbers in LMARS are unique. Ms.

Maurer questioned that figure, indicating that LMARS validates for document number uniqueness. Ms. Maurer will work with Ms. Shafer to do root cause analysis for this anomaly.

Action Item 5: Ms. Maurer will work with Ms. Shafer to ensure uniqueness of document numbers from LMARS in the SCI data.

(5) During the discussion of validity, Ms. Hilert asked which code(s) are used to identify a depot. Ms. Maurer said in LMARS depots are identified by the RIC-TO codes, but LMARS does not validate the RIC-TO values in the data stream. Ms. Shafer said that SCI uses DAASINQ to validate the RICS. Ms. Shafer said she will work with Ms. Maurer to clarify processes on both sides.

Action Item 6: Ms. Shafer will work with Ms. Maurer to synchronize identification of depots between LMARS and SCI using the RIC-TO codes.

(6) During discussion of timeliness, Mr. Meyer asked why only three data elements, all of which are source times, were proposed. Ms. Shafer said SCI will re-evaluate choice of the timeliness data elements.

Action Item 7: Ms. Shafer will work internally within SCI to re–evaluate the data elements proposed to evaluate timeliness.

f. How LMARS LRT Data is Used by Strategic Distribution Data Base (SDDB) (Ms. Lynn Jacobs, USTRANSCOM TCJ5/4)

(1) Ms. Jacobs provided participants with the current as-is, and the future to-be workflow diagrams showing data and process flows surrounding the SDDB system at USTRANSCOM and noting that over 80 systems provide input into the SDDB process. Ms. Jacobs emphasized one of the main differences between LMARS and SDDB: while LMARS relies on raw transactional data for its input, much of the input data to SDDB is processed by the sending systems and SDDB consolidates and augments the data from those multiple sources to meet its business needs.

(2) Two goals of the to-be process is to make the process more automated and reliable. SDDB will ingest data in multiple formats, including text, .xls, Database replication etc., and inbound data will be subject to a "data reliability check" step to validate it for quality and reliability. This step will help to address some of the issues noted in the GAO audit that Mr. Blackwell referred to in d. (1) above. Ms. Jacobs committed to work with Ms. Shafer to ensure the synchronicity of data outputs from SDDB and the SCI metrics tools.

(3) Mr. Meyer commented that SDDB post processing sometimes overwrites data; he requested greater transparency when that happens.

Action item 8: Mr. Meyer to work with Ms. Jacobs to clarify and resolve issue of SDDB overwriting data.

g. LMARS Relationship to IGC (Mary Maurer, Transaction Services)

(1) LMARS Relationship to IGC – Transaction Services: Mr. Deans and Ms. Maurer briefed the participants on the user defined format (UDF) data feeds that Integrated Data Environment (IDE)/Global Transportation Network (GTN) Convergence (IGC) provides to LMARS to open and close the transportation pipeline segments. Specifically, IGC provides data for the following segments

- Segment 7 – Continental U.S. (CONUS) in Transit Time (CIT)
- Segment 8 – Port of Embarkation (POE) Process Time (POET)
- Segment 9 – In Transit to Port of Debarkation (POD) Time
- Segment 10 – POD Processing Time (PODT)
- Segment 11 – In Transit-In Theater Processing Time (ITIT)
- Segment 12 – Receipt Take-up Time (RTT)

Ms. Maurer added that IGC also provides Tailgate data to LMARS via DICs DRA and DRB transactions. Mr. Blackwell noted that IGC does not overwrite data, it adds new data points.

h. Concluding Remarks. PM PRC Chair, Mr. Deans, extended his sincere appreciation to those who participated in the PRC and their continued support to maintain the integrity of LMARS reports and data.   The discussions were very productive. The chair will announce the next PM PRC meeting date once the schedule is set.

_____   Approved: _____
KENNETH R. DEANS   HEIDI M. DAVEREDE
Chair, DOD PM PRC   Director,
                                                                    Defense Logistics Management
                                                                    Standards Office