



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

November 13, 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

**SUBJECT: Enterprise Business Standards Office (EBSO) Pipeline Measurement (PM) Process
Review Committee (PRC) Meeting 18-1, September 20, 2018**

The EBSO is forwarding the attached minutes of the subject meeting for information and action, as appropriate. The minutes, related agenda items, and other supporting meeting materials are available on the DLMS PM PRC webpage at:

<http://www.dla.mil/HQ/InformationOperations/DLMS/DLMSPrograms/committees/pmprc/>.

The EBSO points of contact for this meeting are Ms. Joanne Norman, e-mail Joanne.Norman@dlamail, or Ms. Tonja Daniels-Carter, e-mail: Tonja.Daniels-Carter@dlamail.

HEIDI M. DAVEREDE
Director
Enterprise Business Standards Office

Attachment
As stated

cc:
ODASD Logistics
PM PRC
Meeting Attendees



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

November 13, 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Enterprise Business Standards Office (EBSO) Pipeline Measurement (PM) Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting 18-1, September 20, 2018.

Purpose: The EBSO hosted the subject meeting at LMI Headquarters in Tysons, Virginia. Defense Collaboration Services (DCS) and a conference call telephone bridge provided real time sharing of the meeting materials for remote participants. The primary focus of the meeting was to review/update the status of action items from the previous PM PRC meeting, discuss any new issues raised by the PRC representatives, and foster a culture of teamwork, cooperation, and shared goals among the PRC participants.

The EBSO will move posted meeting materials to the PM PRC Committee Archives webpage: <http://www.dla.mil/HQ/InformationOperations/DLMS/> (click “Quick Links” on the left-hand navigation frame, then select “Committees”) within 30 days of the date of these minutes. Please refer to the briefing slides in the meeting materials for details of the discussions summarized in these minutes.

Summary of Agenda Items: Ms. Norman and Ms. Daniels-Carter (and other briefers) led discussion of each agenda topic (summarized below).

1. **Opening Remarks and Welcomes:** Ms. Heidi Daverede, EBSO Director, welcomed the participants and noted that the work of the PRC enables DOD to use Logistics Metrics Analysis Reporting System (LMARS) and Logistics Response Time (LRT) data as an asset—an important focus across the enterprise, especially within DLA J6, Information Operations.

Mr. Paul Blackwell, ODASD Logistics, expressed his appreciation for the work that EBSO (specifically the PM PRC) does, which enables OSD to provide metrics reporting up the chain of command as required. He noted that with the appointment of Ms. Ellen Lord as Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, it is likely we will see a shift in the types of metrics reporting requested from OSD. As the former CEO of Textron Systems, Ms. Lord has greater familiarity with “commercial focused” metrics than traditional DOD metrics, and Mr. Blackwell expects that we may see a shift in that direction.

2. **Logistics Pipeline Dashboard:** Ms. Mary Maurer, Rainbow Data Systems/DAAS provided the participants with an introductory background on LMARS and an overview of the 12 Pipeline Measurement segments (see Slides 9 and 10 in the briefing). In her introduction, Ms. Maurer emphasized that the LMARS uses the “raw” data that the Components send, and as a result, the LMARS reports reflect exactly what the Components send to DAAS—if a transaction contains a bad serial date, for example, the LMARS reports will reflect that bad date. She also

noted that business processes at each Service/Component are different, and LMARS needs to maintain up-to-date information from the Components in order for the data reported by LMARS to be accurate and useful.

Slides 11 and 12 describe the pipeline segments and summarize the trigger events for each one. The DLMS Manual ([DLM 4000.25, Volume 6, Chapter 4](#)) provides more detailed definitions of the segments, the trigger events, and the business rules upon which they are based.

Several participants asked specific questions during Ms. Maurer's briefing:

- Mr. Stephen Meyer, DLA, asked if Segment 2 – Internal Service Processing Time is always populated. Ms. Maurer replied that it is populated only for intra-service requisitions.
- Mr. Meyer asked if LMARS measures ICP processing time (Segment 3) in hours. Ms. Maurer replied that although the time stamps in hours are available in the LOTS database at DAAS, the LRT reports that LMARS generates processing time in days.
- Mr. Oliver Pryor, Army, asked how the start and stop times for Storage Activity Processing Time (Segment 4) are determined. Ms. Maurer replied that the timestamps are the actual transaction timestamps in the LOTS database.
- Ms. Daverede reiterated the point from Ms. Maurer's background information (Slide 9) that LMARS is the authoritative source for LRT across the DOD enterprise.
- Mr. Meyer asked if LMARS adds time to Segment 4 based upon the Time Definite Delivery (TDD) standards. Ms. Daverede replied it does not—the trigger event in Segment 4 is the carrier's actual "closed door" time as reported in the 856S.
- Mr. Meyer asked, "What is the source of the trigger event for the end of Segment 6 – Consolidation Containerization Point Processing Time?" Ms. Maurer replied it is the date reported in the 856A transaction. Discussion ensued regarding how to account for time waiting for a carrier to pick up a shipment. Major Dereck Wilson, USTRANSCOM, said that is available via the TDD reporting.
- Discussion ensued regarding references to the legacy DIC D6S. Several participants (in particular Ms. Maurer) said they had not seen any D6S transactions in the DAAS processing for a number of years—the DLMS 527R – Materiel Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA)/Legacy DRA/DRB superseded the D6S for use as an MRA nearly 20 years ago.

Action Item 1¹: Ms. Norman to submit an LDG scan request to determine if DAAS processed any D6S transactions recently.

Participants agreed that systems need to revise reporting to eliminate any references to D6S transactions (see USTRANSCOM Slide 17); the pending PDC 1211, which revises

¹Ms. Norman submitted the LDG scan request; results show DAAS has not received any D6S transaction since June 2016.

DLMS Volume 6, Chapter 4, deletes references to the D6S. Mr. Blackwell noted this issue soon would become moot, since OSD mandated DLMS compliance by 2019.

- Ms. Daverede asked which transactions are the trigger events for Segment 8 – POE Processing time. Major Wilson replied the shipping status transactions (either 214 or 315) that Integrated Data Environment (IDE)/Global Transportation Network (GTN) Convergence (IGC) provide to DAAS are the trigger transactions for Segment 8.

Action Item 2: Major Wilson to provide a listing of the specific transactions that trigger Segments 8–10 and 12 (POE Processing, POE to POD In-Transit Time, POD Processing, and Receipt Take-Up Time).

- With regard to Segment 11 – In-Theater In-Transit Time, Mr. Pryor asked if the consignee receipt date (or “tailgate” date) referred to an Army Supply Support Activity (SSA). Major Wilson replied that if the SSA ordered and received an item, then yes, Segment 11 refers to the SSA.
- Ms. Maurer clarified that Segment 13 – Total Pipeline Time, is the actual time measured from the start of Segment 1 to the end of Segment 12, not the sum of the other 12 segments.
- Participants added several additional comments and clarifications:
 - Ms. Daverede noted that Segments 8-11 apply to OCONUS shipments.
 - Mr. Blackwell commented that while USTRANSCOM has responsibility for Segments 7–11, the Components generate the transactions that trigger the end of Segment 12.
 - Major Wilson commented that USTRANSCOM does not always receive trigger event transactions for Segments 7-11, and therefore cannot always forward the transaction(s) to DAAS for LMARS processing.
 - In response to a question from Mr. Meyer, Ms. Maurer clarified that the MRA date is the one specified by the customer in the transaction, not the date on which DAAS receives the transaction(s).
 - Teresa Kaiser, USTRANSCOM, noted that the Strategic Distribution Database (SDDDB) calculations generated by USTRANSCOM drop backorder time in the overall pipeline time; Ms. Maurer said that LMARS does not, since the backorder time is included in the definition of LRT.

3. USTRANSCOM—Improper Discrepancy Codes Affect Performance Analysis. USTRANSCOM briefing—Major Dereck Wilson, J64L Branch Chief (Slides 15-21²). Major Wilson provided background on this issue (see Slide 16).

When delivery timeframes for complete shipments are longer than expected, and DAAS receives an MRA with Discrepancy Code F, LMARS, in accordance with legacy business rules, records a materiel receipt date and closes the pipeline segment. ADCs 474 and 1114 updated the business

² Slide 14, *ADC 1114*, also relates to this topic

rules so that if DAAS receives a Code H or G before receiving the Code F, LMARS will maintain the segment as open. Although EBSO published and approved ADCs 474 and 1114 for implementation, many supply systems have not yet updated system programming to implement the changes called out in these ADCs.

Current programming in SDDB assigns an “incorrect” status to any DRA/DRB transaction after LMARS has closed out a shipment (based on receipt of Status F) and therefore blocks any valid process dates after an initial segment closure. The result of this business process rule is that the MRA Discrepancy Code F could result in incorrect, shortened shipping times. These incorrect times limit distribution performance analysis and result in reported aggregate performance that is actually better than reality (i.e., LRT times should be longer than reported).

Reports generated from SDDB currently list the legacy MRA transactions as D6Ss. As documented above, however, DLMS 527R – MRA (legacy DRA/DRB) transactions replaced the D6S.

Action Item 3: Major Wilson to update SDDB/TDD reporting to remove references to D6S.

Ms. Daverede noted that Bob Carroll, OSD Logistics, is spearheading an effort to get ADCs 474 and 1114 prioritized in the DLA “Risk Registry”, which should accelerate their implementation in shipper systems. Mr. Pryor stated that implementing ADCs 474 and 1114 is problematic for the Army, essentially being an unfunded mandate without direct benefit to the Army. Ms. Daverede replied that this is one reason why Mr. Carroll is establishing the risk registry—it will prioritize changes across the entire DOD enterprise, and ensure the Components implement the changes with the most benefit for the most users first. The risk registry will enable the community to synchronize implementation of the most important enterprise changes across all Services and Components.

As an interim solution, Major Wilson said that SDDB will move shipments for which transactions convey Discrepancy Code F to an “inactive” status until systems complete implementation of ADCs 474 and 1114. Ms. Maurer reminded Major Wilson that systems can apply Discrepancy Code F to partial or total shipments, and SDDB will need to account for that in its processing. Discussion ensued regarding whether we need to update LMARS with regard to this issue. Ms. Maurer explained LMARS simply passes through the transaction events to SDDB, and that with implementation of ADCs 474 and 1114 LMARS will hold the shipment open after receipt of Discrepancy Code G or H for 170 days; Ms. Norman noted that no system has sent any Discrepancy Code G or H transactions to DAAS to date. The participants concluded that LMARS is working as intended and no changes are needed; once Service systems implement ADCs 474 and 1114 this issue should be resolved. Ms. Norman noted that the Navy will implement ADCs 474 and 1114 in 2022 when the Navy Operational Supply System (NOSS) replaces Relational Supply (R-Supply). Ms. Daverede asked Navy to investigate whether it might implement an interim solution (FEDMALL?) before it deploys NOSS in 2022.

Action Item 4: Navy to investigate whether it might implement an interim solution (FEDMALL?) before it deploys NOSS in 2022

Discussion ensued regarding how to track this issue and ensure an expeditious resolution.

Action Item 5: Major Wilson will provide detailed background to Mr. Blackwell

Action Item 6: Mr. Blackwell will submit the issue to the DLMS IPT and include the issue for discussion in the Supply Chain Metrics Group (SCMG) agenda.

4. **PM PRC Topics – Output Report Specific Tables.** Ms. Norman and Ms. Maurer reviewed the LMARS Output Report Specific Tables, Tables A–H. (Please refer to Slide 22 for the hyperlink to the PM PRC webpage; the hyperlink to these tables is near the bottom of PM PRC Committee webpage, under Other Documents and Resources).

Discussion ensued regarding Army’s use of the BE9_ as a requisition equivalent transaction, with Ms. Maurer reporting that DAAS has received no BE9_ transaction since September 2017.

Action Item 7: Mr. Pryor will research Army’s use of BE9_ (Table B), BAY/BAZ (Table C), and B99 (Table E) and report back to the PRC with updated information as needed.

Action Item 8: All Services³/Components to review/update transactions in the Output Report Specific Tables. In particular, Mr. Bob. Klezack, Navy, will verify Navy codes in Table C, specifically Code 721.

5. **PM PRC Topics –** The EBSO and DAAS staff provided status updates on the following topics:

- **Anomaly Files (Slide 26):** Ms. Maurer provided participants with an overview of how to use the LMARS Anomaly File. (See Topic 9. below).
- **Special Feeds (Slide 26):** DLA Troop Support, Philadelphia, provides a manual monthly report to DAAS of data summarizing Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (FFV); Semi-Perishables; and Maintenance, Repair, and Operations (MRO) shipments. The PRC chairs have been working with DLA to automate this process, but progress has been slow. Mr. Meyer identified Mr. John McDonald,⁴ DLA Troop Support, as the current point of contact (POC) for these programs.
- **Priority Group Heading Updates in LMARS Reports (Slide 27):** Currently, the LMARS report headers show shipment priority as “Proc GP1–Proc GP3”. A draft proposed DLMS change (PDC) to revise DLM 4000.25, Volume 6, Chapter 4 would update those headers to “IPG I–IPG III” (Issue Processing Group). IPG I will comprise Issue Priority Designators (IPD) 1–3; IPG II will comprise Issue Priority Designators (IPD) 4–8; and IPG III will comprise Issue Priority Designators (IPD) 9–15.⁵
- **Validation of Navy DoDAAC in the LRT File Field Description.** Ms. Norman asked Navy to validate their DoDAACs in the LRT report file and provide any updates to the PRC representatives (see Slide 27); Mr. Klezack said that he did not believe Unit Identifier Codes (UICs) 09115 and 09132 are valid for use as DoDAACs.

Action Item 9: Mr. Klezack will research validity of UICs 09115 and 09132 for DoDAAC use. Mr. Meyer asked where to find these values; Ms. Maurer replied they are in the monthly LRT files.

³ No Air Force or Marine Corps representative participated in the PRC meeting

⁴ Mr. McDonald replaced Mr. John Graybill who formerly was the POC for these processes.

⁵ Source: Draft PDC 1211

- **GSA/LMARS Type of Fill Criteria Incorrect (Slide 28).** GSA transitioned to a business model under which it no longer maintains warehouses and fulfills all requisitions via direct vendor delivery (DVD). This paradigm change requires an update to the LMARS Type of Fill Table to reflect this new business model. No representatives from GSA participated in the PRC meeting, so Ms. Norman took ownership of an action item to follow up with GSA to complete the process of updating the Type of Fill Table.

Action Item 10: Ms. Norman to organize meeting(s) with GSA to develop a PDC to revise GSA type of fill criteria in LMARS.⁶

6. **Process for Proposed/Approved DLMS Changes (Slide 29).** Ms. Daniels-Carter re-iterated that PRC members can implement changes to LMARS procedures and processing by submitting a PDC to EBSO. She then conducted a high-level training session for the participants, walking them through the process of creating and submitting the PDC. She also emphasized that EBSO staff are available to assist end-users in the submission process. Slide 29 provides a process diagram of the procedure to submit a PDC. That diagram is also available in the DLMS manual at:

<http://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/DLMS/Manuals/DLM/V1/0209-v1a9.docx>.

Ms. Daniels-Carter noted that although EBSO issues ADCs in “real time” and the ADCs specify an implementation time schedule when published, EBSO only publishes the DLM 4000.25 Series of Manuals 2–3 times a year. This results in a lag between when the Director, EBSO officially signs and releases an ADC, and when the documentation of that ADC appears in the DLM 4000.25 Manuals. Systems should implement ADCs in accordance with the implementation schedule in the ADC—they do not need to wait until EBSO publishes the corresponding Formal Change to the DM 4000.25 Manuals.

Mr. Napoli reminded the participants that it is important to use the PDC submission template available on the EBSO Website

(<http://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/DLMS/eLibrary/Changes/ChangeProposalFormat.docx>); it contains embedded formatting needed to comply with both the DOD and DLA correspondence guides.

- **PDC 1211 (Slide 30).** This draft PDC is a complete re-write of DLM 4000.25, Volume 6, Chapter 4 Pipeline Measurement. It updates Chapter 4 to bring it into compliance with updated policies, administrative changes, and revised verbiage in DoDM 4140.01 and DoDD 8190.1.
- **PDC 1038A (Slide 31) LMARS Sub-category Other Change.** LMARS assigns shipment to one of five type of fill sub-categories based on the Type of Fill Table discussed above in 6.e. Four of the sub-categories are Immediate Issue, Backordered, Planned DVD, Unplanned DVD. If the LMARS type of fill logic cannot assign a shipment to one of these categories, it assigns it to Other. (The sixth category is Total, the sum of all the preceding five.) Analysis conducted under the auspices of the SCMG indicates that a number of shipments currently assigned to the Other category, could be assigned to another category. One example is the Unit outfitting process at the Kentucky Logistics Operations Center (KyLOC) where new recruits receive their uniforms. Currently, LMARS assigns these transactions to the Other category, but they more

⁶ An initial meeting took place October 18, 2018.

logically fit in the Immediate Issue category. This PDC will update the Type of Fill logic to reassign KyLOC outfitting transactions to Immediate Fill.

- **ADC 1025E (January 22, 2018) - Provide Navy Unit Mobile Data and Update COCOMs, CONUS and OCONUS LMARS Data into the Logistics Metrics Analysis Reporting System (LMARS).** This ADC updates the COCOMs and utilizes the CONUS/OCONUS indicator in addition to the Combatant Command (COCOM) feed from DAAS. It updates the logic used to report LRT to all DOD Customers with the exception of Navy Mobile Units afloat identified in the AFLOAT File. For those Navy Mobile Units afloat, this ADC documents the process that the Navy uses to provide the AFLOAT file to DAAS via Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP) at the end of the third week of each month. LMARS accesses this file from DAAS for reporting LRT by identifying the COCOM delivery areas, specified by beginning and ending date, for Navy Mobile Units. During discussion, Navy representatives noted that the AFLOAT file process is manual and could benefit from automation.
- **ADC 1025F (November 29, 2017) - Approved Addendum for ADC 1025C Administrative Update of Air Force Routing Identifier Codes (RICs) in Logistics Metrics Analysis Reporting System (LMARS).** The LMARS Output Report Specific Tables Table D provides RICs used by Service/Agencies in Logistics Pipeline Segment 3, Inventory Control Point (ICP) Processing Time (IPT) and in Materiel Release Acknowledgement (MRA) reporting. IPT measures the time from when DAAS releases a requisition to the ICP, until DAAS receives a Materiel Release Order transaction directing shipment. In order for LMARS to calculate IPT accurately, each Component must ensure the accuracy of its RICs in the LMARS Output Report Specific Tables Table D and update the table as necessary. This ADC updated the LMARS Report Data Table D and Updated the Air Force RICs. Mr. Pryor observed that he did not see any alternative to periodic manual verification and update of Table D.
- **ADC 1264 (January 10, 2018) -Approved Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Change (ADC) 1264 Contract Number for Planned DVD Transactions under LMARS.** This ADC implemented new guidance issued in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 204.16 and the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to define use of the Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID) to identify contract numbers. For DLA orders, LMARS derived the contract data from the DLMS 870S Supply Status transaction, which contained the Procurement Instrument Identification Number (PIIN) for indefinite delivery contracts and the associated call/order number. Now that the PIID call order is independent, the supply status transaction will no longer contain the base contract number. LMARS requires the code from both the base contract number and call order number for visibility of indefinite delivery contracts to identify planned vs. unplanned DVD shipments. DLA EDI 850 Purchase Order retains the functionality to include both the base contract number and the call/order number contracts. This ADC authorizes LMARS to extract the base contract number and call order number for contract data from the DLA EDI 850; LMARS will continue to receive the DLMS 870S Supply Status. This will allow LMARS to provide visibility of indefinite delivery in compliance with the FAR and DFARS guidance.

7. **LMARS Reports (Slides 35–37).** EBSO and DAAS staff provided a high-level overview of the LMARS Output Reports. Step-by-step instruction on the LMARS reporting, how to run the reports, and how to interpret the results was addressed in detail at a previous PM PRC meeting in December 2016. Meeting materials from the December 2016 meeting, including the slides explaining the report procedures are available on the PM PRC archive at http://www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/DLMS/Committees/PMPRC/meetings/15Dec16/02_Agenda.docx. If you have questions about the reports, or need assistance in running/interpreting a report, please contact the LMARS Support group at e-mail: DLMSLMARS@dla.mil

8. **LMARS Anomaly Code List (Slides 38–41).** Ms. Maurer provided a detailed briefing to the participants on how to use the LMARS anomaly code list. The anomaly file is a tool to aid Components in evaluating suspect data that DAAS receives. LMARS generates a complete anomaly file and makes it available every month. The report only identifies one anomaly for each record. Because anomalies are often the result of operator error, correcting one anomaly will often “fix” many errors. Some anomalies are not “fatal”, so LMARS will include transactions with those anomalies in the monthly reports. Fatal anomalies result in LMARS eliminating those transaction(s) from the monthly reports. If you have questions regarding the anomaly report, please send an e-mail to the LMARS Support group e-mail: DLMSLMARS@dla.mil

Action Item 11: Ms. Maurer will update the anomaly descriptions to eliminate the references to the D6S DIC.

9. **Way Ahead (Slide 42).** Ms. Norman facilitated a discussion regarding the way ahead for the PM PRC. She emphasized that the most important task for the PM PRC is to provide a forum that encourages open communication from the Components to EBSO with regard to Pipeline Measurement issues. The key topic discussed was how often should the PM PRC meet? The participants came to consensus that about twice a year seemed a reasonable frequency if Components identify issues to address. Additional points raised during the discussion included:

- Agenda items need to be generated from the bottom up (i.e., Services and Components—not EBSO—need to provide topics for PM PRC discussion/resolution).
- Agenda items need to be identified and distributed to the participants ahead of the meeting so Components have time to review/analyze the issues.
- Each Component should review its monthly output reports and anomaly code files regularly, but especially before each PM PRC meeting, and be prepared to report on any issues from the analysis.
- If the Components do not propose any major issues for the agenda, the chairs should schedule a shorter (1-2 hours) meeting, possibly more frequently than twice a year.
- PM PRC participants are encouraged to participate in the monthly SCMG meeting—the SCMG makes many of the same metrics that LMARS provides available on the OSD Logistic Dashboard, including the ability to drill down in the data.

Action Item 12: All Services/Components to provide future agenda topics to DLMSLMARS@dla.mil

The PRC chairs thanked the participants for their time and efforts, and said the target date for the next meeting would be March/April of 2019.

JOANNE NORMAN
PM PRC Chair

Approved: _____
HEIDI M. DAVEREDE
Director
Enterprise Business Standards Office