DoD Product Quality Deficiency Reporting (PQDR) Committee
Bi-weekly Teleconference Notes
January 7, 2026

I. ATTENDEES:

Service/Agency PQDR Policy Lead(s) identified with an asterisk.

DoD Component/Service/Agency	Name of Attendee	
ODASD(LOG)	☐ Vacant*	☐ Vacant
DEDSO	☒ Ben Breen*	☒ Corbin Austin
DLA	☒ Robert Bednarcik*	☐ Jose Pereira
U.S. Army	☒ Mythanh Nguyen*	☒ Chad Lang
U.S. Marine Corps	☐ CWO5 Pierce*	☒ Ted Wiechman
U.S. Navy	☒ Krystal Abreu*	☐ (Vacant)
U.S. Air Force	☒ John Beal*	☐ (Vacant)
DCMA	☒ Chris Ford*	☐ (Vacant)

II. ACTION ITEMS:

Date Opened	Action	Responses	Date Due	Date Closed	Status
12/10/2025	Process Review Committee (PRC) revalidation appointment letters.	☑ DLA ☑ U.S. Air Force ☐ U.S. Army ☐ U.S. Marine Corps ☐ U.S. Navy ☐ DCMA	01/30/2026	TBD	OPEN
12/08/2025	Proposed Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Change (PDC) numbering discussion.	☐ DLA ☑ U.S. Air Force ☐ U.S. Army ☐ U.S. Marine Corps ☑ U.S. Navy ☐ DCMA	01/02/2026	TBD	OPEN

Date Opened	Action	Responses	Date Due	Date Closed	Status
12/02/2025	PDC 1443C staffing responses.	☐ DLA ☑ U.S. Air Force ☑ U.S. Army ☐ U.S. Marine Corps ☑ U.S. Navy ☐ DCMA	01/02/2026	TBD	OPEN
12/10/2025	Each Service Screening Point, Action Point, and Support Point document PQDR parent/child process regarding how it is currently handled.	☐ DLA ☑ U.S. Air Force ☑ U.S. Army ☐ U.S. Marine Corps ☐ U.S. Navy ☐ DCMA	01/30/2026	TBD	OPEN
12/10/2025	Each Service Screening Point, Action Point, and Support Point document the repetitive PQDR process regarding how it is currently handled.	☐ DLA ☐ U.S. Air Force ☑ U.S. Army ☐ U.S. Marine Corps ☐ U.S. Navy ☐ DCMA	01/30/2026	TBD	OPEN
12/11/2025	Each Service Screening Point, Action Point, and Support Point document when the Screening Point (SP) wants to request to do a major update, however during this time the exhibit has already been requested or shipped and how it is currently handled.	☐ DLA ☑ U.S. Air Force ☑ U.S. Army ☐ U.S. Marine Corps ☐ U.S. Navy ☐ DCMA	01/30/2026	TBD	OPEN

III. MEETING NOTES, January 7, 2026:

1. Annual PRC Appointment Letter Revalidation:

- The annual appointment letter requirement per Approved DLMS Change (ADC) 1240B.

- Link to the appointment letter template: www.dla.mil/Portals/104/Documents/DLMS/eLibrary/Changes/Official-Letter-of-Appointment-TEMPLATE.pdf

2. ADC Addendum Vice New Number:

- Requested feedback regarding how we manage addendums versus assigning new ADC numbers. Is it easier to draw relationships between related DLMS changes if DEDSO uses the addendum methodology?

- **Action:** Each Service PRC Representative is to send documented responses by 01/02/2026.

3. ServiceNow Reminder: Reminded the DoD PQDR group to continue to please use the new DEDSO PQDR ServiceNow tile to request support, training, and to submit change requests and general questions.

4. PDC 1443C PQDR Policy Migration: Comments were due by 01/02/2026.

5. Parent/Child PQDR Discussion: Discussed how different services handle child PQDRs inconsistently (open versus closed); need standardization.

- **AF Response:** Parent/Child DR guidance for Air & Space Force organizations is contained within Technical Manual 00-35D-54…it states the following:
    1. "Parent Child relationship in JDRS: This tool allows the Screening/Action Point to associate like deficiencies by assigning one or more Child DRs to a Parent DR. This reduces redundancy in the investigation process but still allows for independent processing of each DRs related exhibit(s) as needed. This tool is available after the Screening Point Acknowledge Receipt is approved and is applicable to the PQDRs and EIs assigned to the same Action Point Unit. There can only be one Parent DR, however, a Parent DR can have unlimited Children. There can only be one "Generation" of DRs (you cannot assign a Parent DR to another Parent DR). When the Parent record closes (i.e. Final/ Closing Approval), all Children DRs associated with that Parent DR close, except when material disposition is "Pending"."

    2. In practice, Air/Space Force Screening & Action Points are given the flexibility to determine the likeness of deficiencies to warrant initiating parent/child relationships. In JDRS, a Parent/Child relationship can only be established between like DR types, i.e., you can't have a Parent PQDR with a Child Engineering Investigation (EI) DR. When a Parent/Child relationship is established, the Children DR(s) remain open, but the Children become ineligible to receive any individual interim updates or final replies. When the investigation produces the need to generate an interim or final, the update is made within the Parent DR, and the update is automatically copied/applied to every Child DR. Because exhibit availability is unique to each DR, and they can reside at multiple holding activities, all exhibit transactions are updated individually for each DR (Parent and Children). Screening or Action Points can establish or de-establish a parent/child PQDR relationship at any time following the associated Acknowledge milestone. Although JDRS doesn't prevent it from occurring, due to the lack of full data exchange between JDRS and PDREP, we discourage initiating Parent/Child relationships for PQDRs that will become interservice DRs.
- **Army Response:**
    1. Screening Point: Cannot make Parent/Child association
    2. Action Point: Perform scenarios #1 and #2
    3. Scenario #1: Children will only be closed "after" the Parent is closed because the Childs findings mirror the Parents

4. Scenario #2: Children may be closed while the Parent remains open. The reasoning is that Children may be closed due to component replacement while the Parent will remain open for the Investigation.

6. <u>Repetitive PQDR Discussion</u>: Discussed how different services handle repetitive PQDRs inconsistently (open versus closed); need standardization.

- **<u>AF Response:</u>**

- The definition of a "Repetitive PQDR" is unclear, depending on the definition, we see 3 different scenarios that could fall into this categorization:
  1. A PQDR is submitted that has the same deficiency as another PQDR (open) that is already being worked. In this scenario, we would work this under the PQDR parent/child guidelines. The Air Force is providing parent/child procedural information in a separate email.

  2. A PQDR is submitted that has the same deficiency as a PQDR that was previously investigated and is now closed. In this scenario, the Screening Point would submit the PQDR to the responsible Action Point. The Action Point would copy the investigation results into the new PQDR and if applicable, provide exhibit guidance/AIS transactions to address exhibit credit. Depending on the nature/outcome on the previous investigation, the PQDR could also warrant cancellation using one of the newly added PQDR Cancellation Codes (AP7.27.T12).

  3. The Air Force has a "Bad Actor" Program to identify serial numbered items that enter the repair cycle at an abnormally high rate when compared to the total population of like assets. Example Bad Actor criteria are 3 Could Not Duplicate (CND)/Re-test OK (RTOK) actions within a 12-month period, or 3 repair actions for the same recurring discrepancy within a 12-month period. A Bad Actor can be identified by the Originator or Action Point. JDRS has analytical/trending functionality that helps identify a potential Bad Actor. When a Bad Actor has been identified, the DR Subject line will include the words "BAD ACTOR". The Engineering Organization/Action Point will develop local procedures that involve engineering analysis beyond routine depot maintenance. Depending on the investigation outcome, the Bad Actor component can be repaired or scrapped/removed from service.
- **<u>Army Response:</u>**
  1. Repetitive: Multiple findings on the same or like deficiency (Trend Analysis)

2. Screening Point: repetitive only counts on initial submissions (multiple records come on the same day). Records that can be merged are returned to the Submitter for combining, if they come in on the same time/day.
3. Action Point: repetitive is identified in their Trend Analysis and feed into a Parent/Child. This is used to administratively close-out records with the same or like deficiency "and" known validated findings.

7. Screening Point (SP) wants to request to do a major update, however during this time the exhibit has already been requested or shipped. Therefore, if the SP is going oing to do a major update and the update will result in the Action Point (AP) being changed, how do we handle this situation, since the new AP wouldn't have any visibility of the exhibits, where there at and if they have been receipted.

Army Response: Action Point: record would have to be returned from the Support Point, so the Action Point reassigns it to the new Support Point. Screening Point will pay for the second destination shipment.

AF Response: This scenario further supports the Air Force's desire to have all PQDR transactions shared/transmitted across all PQDR Automated Information Systems. If this enterprise PQDR data sharing was occurring, if a new Action Point is assigned, regardless of their component AIS, they would have the entire history of the PQDR, to include exhibit location and status.

8. DLMS Summit: Scheduled for March 30th through April 3rd.

9. DEDSO Activities and Newsletter: Located at: www.dla.mil/Defense-Data-Standards/About-Us/DEDSO-Articles/.