

DLMSO

May 23, 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply Process Review
Committee (PRC) Meeting 02-2, April 23-25, 2002

The attached minutes of the DLMS Supply PRC Meeting 02-2 are forwarded for your information and appropriate action. **Please note the action item responses due 30 or 45 days from the date of these minutes.** The Supply PRC Meeting 02-3 was tentatively scheduled for September 10-13, 2002.

The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office points of contact are Ms. Ellen Hilert, at (703)767-0676, DSN 427-0676 or e-mail: ellen_hilert@hq.dla.mil; and Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, (703)767-0677, DSN 427-0677, or e-mail: maryjane_johnson@hq.dla.mil.

/signed/

JAMES A. JOHNSON
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment

DISTRIBUTION:
ADUSD(L)SCI
Supply PRC Representatives
Attendees

DLMSO

May 23, 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply Process Review
Committee (PRC) Meeting 02-2, April 23-25, 2002

Purpose: The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) hosted the subject meeting at the Headquarters Complex, Ft. Belvoir, VA. Specific discussion topics are noted below. A list of attendees is shown at Enclosure 1.

Brief Summary of Discussion: Ms. Ellen Hilert Supply PRC (SPRC) Chair, Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, MILSTRAP Administrator, and Ms. Vermella Savage, MILSTRIP Administrator, facilitated discussion:

Review of Meeting Topics:

a. **DLSS/DLMS Change Evaluation, Status Review, and Issue Resolution.**

The following specific changes were discussed:

(1) **DRAFT Proposed Addendum to DLMS Change 6, Identification of Critical Safety Item (CSI) on Shipments to Disposal.** **BACKGROUND:** This change was prepared to capture a planned new value of the FLIS Criticality Code for identification of the CSI. **ACTION:** DLMSO is waiting a DoD decision on the proposed code "S" for CSI. An alternate proposal is also being discussed in which CSI identification would be incorporated within the existing flight safety critical aircraft part (FSCAP) code definitions. FSCAP identification has already been addressed under DLMS Change 6 and no further action would be required if the alternate proposal is adopted.

(2) **Revised Request for Implementation Dated (RFID) AMCL 9, Processing Materiel Receipts Not Due for GSA Managed Items.** **BACKGROUND:** AMCL 9 was developed to address unauthorized returns of GSA-managed items. To implement the change, the Services would be required to provide the distribution depot receiving the unauthorized return of GSA assets, with a Service organization to which the receipt should be reported. This change can be implemented on a staggered basis, in conjunction with the DLA depot system. It was noted at SPRC meeting 01-3 that Component use of the SDR recoupment process would provide a deterrent to unauthorized returns. **DISCUSSION:** Army has provided an implementation date of December 2004; Air Force response was that they were ready to implement; Navy, Marine Corps and DLA have not yet responded to the RFID. Air Force was asked to explain how the change was being implemented since interface with DLA distribution depots would be required. This information may helpful to the other Components, and would have to be coordinated with the DLA depot system. **ACTION:** **Within 45 days** from the date of the minutes, request **Air Force** provide information on their implementation plans/method; request **Navy, Marine Corps, and DLA** to respond to the RFID.

(3) **Approved DLMS Change (ADC) 9A, Validation of F/AD I Activities; ADC 9B, Automatic Downgrading Based upon Validation of F/AD; and Implementation Issues.** **BACKGROUND:** Based upon a table of authorized activity DoDAACs maintained at DAASC, requisitions reflecting unauthorized use of F/AD I associated priority designators (PDs) are identified for Component review. All improper PD 04 and 11 requisitions and Security Assistance (SA)/USCG PD 01s are downgraded automatically. **DISCUSSION:** The Committee reviewed March report data. **ACTION:** No new action. Components will continue efforts to identify instances of high volume abuse, seek corrective action and investigate potential for educating the user community on appropriate PD assignment. Air Force will look into impact of new policy and possible reconsideration of their position on PDC 29, Requisition PD Validation (SPRC 02-1 action).

(4) **Joint AMCLs 11 (MILSTRAP) & 15 (MILSTRIP), Revised Materiel Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA) Procedures.** **BACKGROUND:** The AMCL 11/15 procedures were initially developed to resolve DoD system deficiencies identified in various DoDIG and GAO reports. In 1996, ADUSD(L)MDM, recognizing the benefits AMCL 11/15 could have for metrics analysis (presently addressed under the DoD Customer Wait Time initiative), directed and funded implementation of AMCLs 11 and 15. Components accepted the funding and implemented on a staggered basis from 1997 into early 1999, subsequently reporting full implementation. Numerous significant implementation issues have since been identified but have not been fully resolved. DLMSO noted at SPRC meeting 02-1, that they would elevate issues of non-implementation to ADUSD SCI for resolution. DLMSO also agreed at that meeting to consider using smaller working group meetings, either led by DLMSO or delegated to the affected Components to lead, to address some of the specific implementation problems that have been identified. **DISCUSSION:** The following issues were addressed at this meeting (**refer to the minutes of SPRC meeting 01-1 and 01-2 for detailed documentation of implementation issues**):

(a) **Army implementation of AMCL 15 (MILSTRIP).** Review of DAASC records in May 2001 revealed a complete absence of DI Code ASH transactions for Army. This implies that Army has not implemented the AMCL 15 procedures in their ICP system or, if implemented, the transactions are not getting to DAASC. At the past few SPRC meetings, Army was asked to investigate and provide status of corrective action. **ACTION:** Request Army provide the initial results of their findings of investigation into AMCL 15 implementation status in their ICP system, and anticipated corrective action, to DLMSO within 45 days from the date of these minutes.

(b) **MRA Submission Rate Concerns.**

1 Navy Overall MRA Submission Rates.

BACKGROUND: Despite having accepted funding from OSD to implement AMCLs 11/15 in 1996/1997, and having reported the change as implemented in their legacy systems, Navy's overall MRA submission rate remains low, indicating the change was never fully implemented. At previous SPRC meetings, Mr. Michael Morra, Navy SPRC representative, stated that because Navy legacy systems are being replaced by ERPs, Navy will not apply resources to change the legacy systems to fully implement AMCL 11/15. Rather, implementation would be accomplished through Navy's ERPs which will have the "transactional agility" to accommodate

the AMCL 11/15 procedures. At SPRC meeting 01-3, DLMSO advised the Navy Supply PRC representative that he must ensure that all Navy system modernization efforts/offices are apprised of the AMCL 11/15 requirements, and their importance to DoD. Further, DLMSO tasked Navy to document when and how Navy will implement the AMCL 11/15 MRA procedures. If implementation is to be accomplished by the 4 Navy ERPs, Navy must, as a MINIMUM: a) document which ERPs will implement the procedures; b) document when each ERP will implement the procedures; c) identify what systems each ERP is replacing; and d) assure that all recipients of shipments of DoD wholesale materiel will be capable of submitting MRAs under the ERPs. **DISCUSSION:** The documentation requested at the previous meeting was not provided. DLMSO and DAASC questioned whether Navy's ERPs would provide a solution for their low submission rate, since the fix would have to come from the customer level not the wholesale level. The Navy SPRC representative believes that the Navy ERPs would replace the Navy retail systems as well as wholesale systems. DLMSO emphasized the ERPs would have to replace all of Navy's customer systems. **ACTION:** DLMSO will formally task Navy to provide the information requested.

(c) **DI Code D6S Transactions : BACKGROUND:** To accommodate staggered implementation from 1997-1999, DAASC provided a temporary conversion of DI Code D6S to DI Code DRA. This interim procedure should not be required with full implementation of the MRA procedures, however, DAASC query in July 2000 revealed continued generation of D6S transactions. Air Force indicated that their D6S transactions are limited to the Air Force medical system (MEDLOG) which is being phased out and replaced by DMLSS which will include the AMCL 11/15 requirements. DMLSS implementation began one year ago (April 2001) and was scheduled to be staggered over a 3-4 year period. Air Force has requested that full AMCL 11/15 implementation for their Medical system be obtained through DMLSS implementation, while DAASC continues conversion of MEDLOG generated DI Code D6S transactions to DI Code DRA in the interim. As DMLSS implementation continues, the Air Force D6S numbers should be dropping.

DISCUSSION: The Services have been successfully working this issue over the past year and continue to do so. From recent monthly statistics, it appears that Marine Corps has successfully stopped their D6S generation, while Army D6S transactions dropped 95% in the past year, from 1,122 monthly to well under 100. Navy D6S levels have dropped somewhat and they anticipate a system change will significantly reduce their numbers.

MONTHLY D6S TOTALS									
	2001					2002			
	MAY	JUL	AUG	OCT	NOV	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR
Navy	12,651	10,763	11,853	10,542	10334	9059	12055	11469	9929
Air Force	2,248	2,312	2,590	2,829	1697	1839	2067	1840	1944
Army	1,122	794	996	4	13	33	51	20	64
Marine Corps	100	60	45	69	13	12	0	0	0

(d) **Quantity Problems. ARMY: BACKGROUND:** Army programmed their system to cite the quantity received rather than the missing quantity, when less than the shipped quantity is received. This approach conflicts with approved

procedures. At SPRC meeting 01-2, Army indicated a system change to correct the problem has been written, however, due to a moratorium on changes to the Standard Army Retail Supply System (SARSS), the requirement must be elevated within Army.

AIR FORCE: BACKGROUND: Air Force programmed their system to report MRAs showing a discrepancy indicator code F, indicating a quantity missing, for materiel that has in fact not yet been shipped. Air Force is pursuing a correction to the problem. **DISCUSSION:** The Army representative, Mr. Ed Allen, agreed to investigate and provide status. The Air Force representative, Ms. Bobbi Ziolek, indicated she would determine when their system fix is projected. **ACTION:** **Army and Air Force** to provide status of their corrective action to DLMSO **within 45 days** from the date of these minutes.

(e) **Security Assistance (SA) Concerns.** DLMSO issued a memorandum, April 11, 2001, formally tasking the Services to respond to DSADC questions/concerns. To date DLA, Navy, and Air Force have provided a response to the Security Assistance issues. Marine Corps indicates their response is the same as the Air Force.

ACTION: Request **Army** provide formal written responses to the April 11, 2001 memorandum to DLMSO **within 45 days** of the date of these minutes.

(f) **Partial and Split Shipments. BACKGROUND:** At SPRC meeting 01-1, the PRC was tasked to provide by May 15, 2001, detailed documentation on how their retail receipt and MRA processes/systems react to the partial and split shipment coding in the TCN field; documentation on the full impact of partial and split coding on SDR generation; and identification of what, if any, entry is currently being made in rp 7 of the DI Code DRA/DRB, to include the associated programming logic and procedural guidance.

Requested documentation has not yet been received from Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

DISCUSSION: See SPRC 01-1 and 01-2 for detailed explanation of the problem. At SPRC meeting 02-1, Army retail, and Air Force, verbally indicated they did not react systematically or procedurally to the TCN partial or split shipment coding.

ACTION: In light of the widespread use of partial shipments by DSS, all Components should be looking at the impact of partial shipments on their systems and procedures. DLMSO again requests that **within 45 days** from the date of these minutes, Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps provide detailed documentation on their procedures for processing partial and split shipment coding contained in the TCN field in their retail receipt, MRA, and SDR processing; and the impact if procedures/systems do not consider this data. DLMSO will identify to Navy those areas for which additional clarification is required for the information Navy previously provided. Request DLA continue efforts to verify the magnitude of the depot's use of partial shipments, and ascertain the extent to which transportation splits shipments.

(g) **Supply Discrepancy Reports (SDRs) Based upon Army "Pseudo" Receipts (Material Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA) with Discrepancy Code F).** **BACKGROUND:** Refer to 01-1 minutes for details. DLA reported continued receipt of a high volume of unresearched pseudo receipt SDRs. A copy of the standard response form letter was shared with the Committee. It is used to notify the customer that DLA will not accept the generated SDRs without verification, indicated by annotating "VERIFIED AS TRUE SDR (ROD)". DLA publishes helpful guidance for customers preparing SDRs in the recently updated Customer Assistance Handbook, **ACTION:** To determine the extent of the problem DSCs will count numbers of pseudo receipt SDRs received for a three month period

(May-July). The Army will continue to pursue corrective action and report back to the Committee.

(h) **MRA Report.** DAASC will web host the MRA report. This effort is under development at DAASC. Prior to SPRC approval of the report, DAASC will limit web access to the SPRC by password authorization. The web hosted report will contain documentation about the report, as well as drill down capability. Once available on-line, the SPRC will be able to review the report and make recommendations for change. USMC suggested that a breakout of MRA information by “medical” would be useful since this is a commodity with lower MRA submissions rates across all Services.

(5) **RFID Joint AMCLs 12 (MILSTRAP) and 43 (MILSTRIP), Maintaining Accountability During Maintenance Actions. BACKGROUND:** Joint AMCLs 12 and 43 were developed to provide more accurate DoD accountability for items undergoing maintenance, in response to DoDIG and GAO audit reports identifying weaknesses in this area. In light of the importance of this change, the GAO and DoDIG interest, and the positive implementation response previously provided by Army, Air Force and Marine Corps, DLMSO requested that DLA and Navy provide their response to the RFID in anticipation that the procedures can be implemented and published in the near term. DLA indicated that this approved change may be an agenda topic at the next meeting of the joint maintenance subgroup. **ACTION:** Carried over from SPRC meeting 01-3 and 02-1, request that **within 45 days** from the date of these minutes: (1) **DLA and Navy** provide their AMCL 12/43 implementation dates; and (2) **Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps** verify or update the implementation dates previously provided, since implementation would require some interface/coordination with the DLA depot system.

(6) **Revised RFID ADC 14, New Supply Condition Code (SCC) V, Unserviceable (Waste, Military Munitions). BACKGROUND:** ADC 14 was issued July 27, 2000, with a December 2004 joint implementation date. This date was selected to accommodate the outside Component implementation date, which was provided by Army. In May 2001, Army advised they could implement ADC 14 immediately, and asked if joint implementation earlier than 2004 was possible. DLMSO reissued the RFID on June 21, 2001. This change is needed in DoD to support the Environmental Protection Agency Military Munitions Rule, which was effective August 12, 1997. **DISCUSSION:** Responses to the RFID were due Aug 6, 2001, and only Navy has responded. Navy provided an implementation date of June 2002. **ACTION:** Request **Air Force, Marine Corps, and DLA** provide DLMSO their response to the RFID **within 45 days** of the date of these minutes.

(7) **RFID AMCL 40, Processing Cooperative Logistics Supply Support Arrangement (CLSSA) Requisitions. BACKGROUND:** This change was developed in 1999 to clarify policy regarding the use of Not Mission Capable Supply (NMCS) and expedited signal codes as they apply to FMS requisitions. It restricted use of NMCS (Code N) and Anticipated NMCS (Code E) to FMS CLSSA requisitions. This change was never accepted by the Security Assistance community and an implementation date could not be established. **DISCUSSION:** It was jointly accepted that this change reflected outdated misinterpretations and was no longer applicable. Currently, no such restriction is imposed

upon CLSSA vs. non-CLSSA by any Component, nor is one recommended by DSCA.

ACTION: This AMCL will be cancelled and minor revisions for clarification of existing rules will be incorporated in ADC 57.

(8) Navy Proposed Addendum to ADC 44, Addition of Unique Item Tracking (UIT) Data to Two-dimensional Symbol on IRRD (DD Form 1348-1A).

BACKGROUND: This change proposes the inclusion of UIT data (e.g. serial number, part number, manufacturer) within the 2D symbol. **DISCUSSION:** The Navy responded to a barrage of questions concerning the intended use of the new data. The Committee expressed concern about the limited application of the proposal as written because it does not address the interfaces necessary to incorporate the UIT data into standard logistics processes. This would include procedures for perpetuating the UIT data within the transportation area (e.g. shipping documentation, corresponding EDI transaction). The Navy indicated their desire to proceed with a limited scope PDC which would only address the inclusion of the UIT in the 2D symbol. The Navy agreed to clearly document the restricted usage for retrograde, single UIT number, movements. The limited use PDC will not address multiples of the UIT data within a shipment nor the interfaces for associating the new data with other processes. **ACTION:** The AIT office provided the necessary technical information for inclusion of the new elements. Navy and DLMSO will rework the PDC for formal staffing.

(9) ADC 56 (staffed by PDC 68), Deletion of Obsolete Type of Media Codes.

BACKGROUND: ADC 56 updates the MILSTRAP Type of Media codes to eliminate those codes that are no longer applicable due to advancements in technology.

DISCUSSION: Responses to the February 4, 2002 RFID for ADC 56 were overdue. Since this change deletes outdated codes, near-term implementation/publication may be possible. RFID due date extended to allow for Component responses. **ACTION:** Components to respond to RFID for ADC 56 **within 30 days** of these minutes.

(10) Draft ADC 57, Enhanced Edits for the Required Delivery Date (RDD) Field in Requisitions (PDC 65). **BACKGROUND:** Per SPRC 00-3 agreement, and in response to OIG Report D-2000-113, Required Delivery Dates in Requisitions for Secondary Items of Supply Inventory, DLMSO prepared a change proposal to address specific RDD usage problems that could be resolved with enhanced DAASC validation.

DISCUSSION: The proposal and Component comments were reviewed and a few additional adjustments were accepted. The most significant of these was the elimination of the Expedited Transportation Signal 777 from consideration during demand sequencing. Further clarification was provided concerning the elimination of the RDD/RAD when earlier than the SDD. DSCA gave a tentative agreement pending discussion with the ILCOs. **ACTION:** DSCA will coordinate with ILCOs. See AMCL 40 discussion above. DLMSO will finalize the approved change. Additionally, DLMSO will propose a DoD 4140.1-R (super reg) revision for the UMMIPS appendix to address extended RDD (codes S/X).

(11) Draft PDC 59, Revision to DLSS/DLMS Requisition/Referral Order for Commingled Stock Issues (Reviewed as draft ADC 58). **BACKGROUND:** This change modifies the requisition and referral order format and associated procedures applicable to directing disposition of commingled assets centrally managed/stored by DLA.

DISCUSSION: Background and procedures will be discussed. **ACTION:** DLMSO will finalize the proposal for formal staffing.

(12) PDC 62, Proposed Change to the DAASC Mailing Process.

BACKGROUND: This change requested termination of DAASC mailings to be replaced by alternative communications methods to include DAMES, WEBREQ, and DDN. The Components objected to complete termination and refocused this effort toward identifying customers and situations for which mailings can be eliminated. **DISCUSSION:** Preliminary feedback from DAASC indicates that cumulative efforts may not have significantly reduced the number of mailings. As alternative communication measures are adopted at a specified location, new problem locations continue to be identified. **ACTION:** DAASC and Components will continue to investigate highest volume customers for replacement technologies. DAASC will provide statistics for the next quarterly meeting. DLMSO will investigate progress with effort to establish a site for electronic forwarding of previously mailed billings. DLMSO will close out action on the PDC and look into potential policy/procedural changes. Suggested actions include a policy change to the DoDAAC/RIC establishment process requiring identification of a communications link at the time the RIC is posted; an edit check to ensure compliance with this policy, and a DFAR change requiring a contract clause for new contractors requiring identification of an electronic communications link.

(13) Draft PDC 75, Air Force Unique Management Coding for Materiel Management Aggregation (MMAC) Code. **BACKGROUND:** This proposal establishes a DLMS requirement to pass the Air Force Materiel Management Aggregation Code (MMAC) to support legacy system requirements using EC/EDI processes. The unique code is carried in rp 21-22 in association with the stock identification in DLSS transactions and is used to identify specific items to be managed by a specific manager. A separate 1270 qualifier is being requested so that the AF will continue to maintain control over this unique code list. **DISCUSSION:** The Committee agreed that reference to the MMAC should be included in MILSTRIP. Mr. Vitko, DLA, expressed concern that the DLA most likely will not be able to accommodate DLMS changes for the phase I implementation of BSM. **ACTION:** DLMSO will amend and finalize the proposal for formal staffing. Alternative mapping approaches will be explored if DLA cannot implement on a timely basis.

(14) Draft PDC 76, Air Force Unique Management Coding for Not Mission Capable Supply/Mission Impaired Capability Awaiting Parts (NMCS/MICAP). **BACKGROUND:** This proposal establishes a DLMS requirement to pass the Air Force NMCS/MICAP justification code to support legacy system requirements using EC/EDI processes. The unique code is carried in RDD in association with NMCS Code N in DLSS transactions. A separate 1270 qualifier is being requested so that the AF will continue to maintain control over this unique code list. **DISCUSSION:** The Committee agreed that reference to the AF coding should be included in MILSTRIP. As with the previous proposal, Mr. Vitko, DLA, expressed concern that the DLA most likely will not be able to accommodate DLMS changes for the phase I implementation of BSM. **ACTION:** DLMSO will amend and finalize the proposal for formal staffing. Alternative mapping approaches will be explored if DLA cannot implement on a timely basis.

b. **Component Unique DLMS Requirements. BACKGROUND:** Data is transmitted within the DLSS and DLSS-like transactions, for which business rules, validation criteria, and meta data have not been vetted through the DLMS PRCs and are therefore undocumented in the DoD 4000.25 series manuals. This includes intra-Component transactions (some of which have evolved for inter-Component use); multi-or dual-use record positions in existing DLSS transactions; and data transmitted within "Blank" DLSS record positions. Undefined data may not be retained during DLSS-DLMS conversion with an unknown impact on Component processes. **DISCUSSION:** Although the Components are beginning to respond to this on-going action, the DLA representative cautioned that it may be too late to incorporate any new data requirements into the phase 1 implementation of BSM (July 1, 2002). **ACTION:** Components will continue to identify and submit DLMS proposals for unique data requirements. DLA will look into how (if) the BSM accommodates previously identified Navy unique data requirements. DLMSO will work with DLA to determine best approach for accommodating data. Service modernization efforts are expected to recognize data identified in approved DLMS transactions.

(1) **Draft Proposals for DLA Uniques. BACKGROUND:** DLMSO contracted with LMI to review DLA internal and external transactions to document requirements for DLMS which fall in the above category. Several requirements have been isolated and prioritized for incorporation under DLMS. **DISCUSSION:** LMI presented mapping and DLMS supplement notes to familiarize the Committee with proposals to be formally staffed shortly. One proposal addresses clear text exception data currently forwarded from the supply source to DSS on the DI Code CGU. Another proposal addresses "post-post" requisition and referral orders. Several recommendations for improved mapping were accepted. **ACTION:** LMI will complete the proposals and submit through DLA to DLMSO for formal staffing.

c. **Financial Impact of Non-Customer-Generated Requisition Rejection/Cancellation. BACKGROUND:** The Army reported a loss of approximately \$60M in FY 01 due to de-obligation of requisition funding subsequent to cancellation/rejection. The problem is perceived to be caused by MILSTRIP procedures which dictate strict rules for rejecting/canceling nonconforming requisitions and then require resubmission of cancelled requisitions under a new document number. When the fiscal year changes during this process, the funds cannot be reused and are lost. **DISCUSSION:** The Committee provided clarification of MILSTRIP for the Army financial representatives. Army was encouraged to submit a proposal to modify MILSTRIP rules. **ACTION:** Army will determine whether internal implementation of requisition processing is consistent with MILSTRIP. Army will consider submission of proposals to modify the process to increase flexibility.

d. **DLA Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Routing Identifier Code (RIC) Implementation. BACKGROUND:** DLA plans to implement BSM using an ICP RIC SMS. Rather than instituting logistic reassignments prior to the BSM activation, DLA intends to use the DAAS requisition process to forward selected NSN requisitions to BSM and notify the customer of the new source of supply through BM status. The impact on Component systems is unclear. Refer to Agenda hyperlinks for details. **DISCUSSION:** DLA requested Component assessment on impact of the anticipated July 1, 2002

implementation employing the SMS RIC. **ACTION:** DLA indicated they would provide additional information concerning potential impact on inventory transactions. Components are to investigate for potential problems.

f. **DLMS Supplement (DS) Review.** The Committee reviews one or more IC/DS during each meeting. Issues which impact multiple IC/DSs, including the one reviewed at this meeting, were addressed: (1) DLA recommended that DLMSO add a DLMS note to the beginning segment of each DS indicating the DLSS DI Code equivalents; (2) DAASC recommended DLMSO consider re-mapping stock identification to use ZZ when part number is only assumed; (3) DLMSO will verify continued applicability of PCARS notes; (3) A general DLMS note is needed restricting multiple occurrences of data elements authorized under DLMS, but not accommodated during conversion to the DLSS; (4) . Detailed review of the **DS 180M, Material Returns Reporting**, resulted in the following:

- ✍ BGN07 requires clarification when used without a BGN08 action code.
- ✍ BLI01 is missing ZZ from list of codes.
- ✍ BLI05 needs enhancement note. Other missing enhancement notes where also noted.
- ✍ N907 delete qualifier 43 as not applicable to this process. Qualifier 72 refers to code 3H which is not present.
- ✍ LM02 should be marked not used.
- ✍ DTM01 should reference AMCL 5.

g. **Next Meeting.** The SPRC 02-3 meeting is scheduled for September 10-13, 2002. **ACTION:** Once again, the Navy is requested to coordinate internally to ensure that the long-promised overview of their modernization program will be provided at this meeting.

/signed/

ELLEN HILERT
Supply PRC Chair

APPROVE: _____ /signed/
JAMES A. JOHNSON _____
Director, DLMSO