IN REPLY
REFER TO DLMSO

DEC 2 1 2006

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Systems (DLMS) Supply Process Review
            Committee (SPRC) Meeting 06-02, November 28-30, 2006

         The attached minutes of the DLMS Supply PRC Meeting (06-02) and forwarded for you
information and appropriate action. The next meeting will be scheduled at a later date.

         The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office points of contact are Ms. Ellen
Hilert, 703-767-0676, or e-mail: Ellen.Hilert@dla.mil; Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, 703-767-0677,
or e-mail: Mary.Jane.Johnson@dla.mil; and Mr. Bob Hammond, 703-767-2117, or e-mail
Robert.Hammond@dla.mil.

                                        DONALD C. PIPP
                                        Director
                                        Defense Logistics Management
                                        Standards Office

Attachment

DUSD(L&MR)SCI
Supply PRC Representatives
SDR Committee
Attendees

December 21, 2006

DLMSO

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Supply Process Review
            Committee (PRC) Meeting 06-02, November 28-30, 2006

        Purpose: The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) hosted the
subject meeting at the Headquarters Complex, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Specific discussion topics
are noted below. A list of attendees is shown at Enclosure 1. All meeting handouts and briefing
material are available on the Supply PRC Web page (refer to the meeting agenda):
 http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlmso/Programs/Committees/Supply/supplyPRC.asp.

        Brief Summary of Discussion: Ms. Ellen Hilert, Supply PRC (SPRC) Chair, facilitated
discussion. Ms. Hilert began the meeting with a review of the minutes from the SPRC 06-1
meeting and provided update on topics not scheduled for discussion during this meeting.

            (a) Army Off-Line Integrated Process Team (IPT). The Army IPT lead was
unable to attend this meeting; however, Ms Hilert provided a brief overview of the initiative and
status.   This Amy-led IPT, with representatives from DLA, GSA, DLMSO, and DAASC,
addresses problems associated with off-line purchases (requisitions processed outside the
standard Army "retail" supply system). The problems identified by the Army are common to all
Services and an effort will be made to achieve resolutions with wide application. These
problems include inadequate/ incomplete information flow between the supply support from
DLA/GSA and Army financial processes, resulting in disbursements without prior obligations.
Since the last SPRC meeting the IPT has had one meeting. There have been changes proposed
for DoD EMALL to correct/minimize problems, to include a pop-up box that reminds the user of
his responsibility for ensuring that the obligation is recorded when ordering material via EMALL
and a direct interface with Army Funds Control is being planned.   In addition, the Army has
instituted a process for periodic revalidation of Army users authorized to order material via
EMALL.   The Technical Team for phase II of the IPT has not yet made significant progress on
the requirement to communicate supply status for prime vendor orders, which would provide a
means of recording the obligation prior to billing.   An effort is also being made to associate the
part numbers used for many off-line requisitions with cataloguing information to support demand
history and other Army processes. **ACTION:** An update by the IPT will be requested for the
next SPRC meeting.

(b) Project Code Validation. The SPRC 06-1 meeting included a discussion of business rules for project code assignment and an issue reported by LMP due to an overly restrictive project code edit applied to all project code categories. The business rules were clarified and all Services were asked to provide a list of Category B Project Codes applicable for recognition by Army LMP. **Discussion:** The Army (LOGSA) reported to Ms Hilert that their reported problem appears to have been corrected, although they will know more after expanded deployment. The LOGSA representative asked that the SPRC reinforce the requirement to coordinate the Category B project codes with the applicable Army Life Cycle Management Command (LCMC). **NEW RELATED ISSUE:** Mr. John Will, TRANSCOM, asked if there was a DoD system that tracked project codes. Ms. Hilert told him that DLMSO had identified an initiative to the Business Transformation Agency (BTA) to develop and application that would store and disseminate project codes. Mr. Will offered for consideration a TRANSCOM system called Table Management Distribution System (TMDS) which he indicated could be used for tracking and management of the codes. **ACTION:** DLMSO to investigate with TRANSCOM the capability of TMDS to meet envisioned project code functionality.

(c) Air Force AIT in the Supply Chain. Mr. Mark Reboulet, who is the Program Manager of the Air Force AIT Office, provided the committee with a briefing that proposed the use the original manufactures RFID tag throughout the supply chain. Mr. John Will from the U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) suggested that Mr. Reboulet should brief Mr. Fred Lewis, USTRANSCOM. The briefing stimulated a good deal of discussion; further study by DUSD(L&MR)SCI and USTRANSCOM would be appropriate. No action for the SPRC at this time.

(d) Use of Suffix Code X on Requisitions/TCN: BACKGROUND: There is a long-standing inconsistency involving the significance of the 15th position of the Transportation Control Number (TCN). MILSTRIP allows an X in that position as a valid suffix code and the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) allows X as a default when the suffix code in the document number is blank. **DISCUSSION:** DLA requested a requirements review to determine if the two sets of guidance could/should be de-conflicted. Three options were discussed: (1) Modify MILSTRIP to remove X as a valid suffix code. This option is not viable as Supply Sources use all suffix codes currently available and, with decentralized sourcing/lateral redistribution, occasionally run out of available codes. (2) Expand the Suffix Code to two positions and the TCN to 18 positions under a DLMS implementation. This solution would have an unacceptable systems impact. (3) Continue to allow the use of X as both a valid suffix code and as a default when there is no suffix code assigned. The Committee also discussed the possibility of removing the current restriction which prevents the use of values assigned as Demand Codes in the Suffix Code data element. MILSTRIP does not permit dual use of these values because of a potential for confusion since both data elements are carried in the same record position (rp) of various 80 rp transactions. However, normally, demand and suffix codes are not found on the same transaction. In addition, selected values (I, 1, 0, and Z) are currently not allowed as suffix codes or demand codes due to potential confusion between alpha and numeric characters. Removing restrictions on these two sets of values might help alleviate the lack of available Suffix Codes and would seem less of a risk with modern automated processing.

In conclusion, agreement was reached to continue the use of X as a valid suffix code and as a default when there is no suffix code.   However, it was considered appropriate that both the MILSTRIP manual and the DTR be annotated to identify the redundancy. **ACTION:** DLA will propose a clarifying note for the DTR, and DLMSO update MILSTRIP.   GSA will provide clarification of their internal use of position 15 of the GSA-assigned TCN denoting excess material. Mr. Bob Vitko, DLMSO, will contact BSM order fulfillment to evaluate whether allowing use of the restricted values would be worth pursuing, since even this minimal change would impact system edits.

(e) Property in Possession of Contractors (PIPC) Initiative:

BACKGROUND: DOD policy says that solicitations and contracts that include Government Furnished Property (GFP) must comply with the new Government PIPC IUID policy requirements. The policy requires direct Item Unique Identification (IUID) Registry update or the submission of a Wide Area Work Flow (WAWF) 856.   A proposed Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) rule requires contractors to report to IUID Registry changes in the status, mark, custody or disposition of PIPC for all PIPC delivered, shipped consumed, expended or disposed of. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Lydia Dawson, from the OSD UID Program Office provided the SPRC with an update on accomplishments in implementing the IUID registry and PIPC policy. Ms. Dawson explained that several key events in the life cycle of an item will require an update to the registry. A list of those events and definitions were provided subsequent to the meeting and are at enclosure 2. Currently, these events update the registry by input of a flat file or direct update to the web site. Ms. Hilert discussed potential for transaction update generated as a by-product of an existing process where applicable. **ACTION:** DLMSO will continue to participate with DUSD(L&MR)SCI and the UID Program Office toward synchronization of UID/RFID/SIM policy and provide feedback to the SPRC.

(f) Jump Start Update:

Mr. Dale Yeakel, DLMSO, briefed the group on the BTA initiative that would provide a financial incentive to the Services for near-term DLMS implementation. The initiative defines a phased, coordinated implementation of current and future high priority transactions such as those containing RFID, IUID, and support OSD Business Transformation priorities. The goal is to bring about near term process improvements and gives Components experience in implementing the DLMS. BTA initially identified the Army's Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) to receive focused support under the Jump Start and that effort is now reporting good progress toward full DLMS implementation by the December 2007. OSD subsequently set aside $4 million dollars for those systems nominated by the Components and which meet selection criteria established by the BTA.   It is expected that additional funding will be made available for FY 08.

(g) Department of Defense Activity Address File (DoDAAF) Table.

Mr. Jackie Carter, DLMSO, provided a demonstration of the redesigned DoDAAF table. This web-based table provides update and inquiry capability of the DoDAAF. Several new features have been added in FY 06 to include the Unit Identification Code (UIC), a link to TRANSCOM for Port Codes and Zip Codes. Ms. Wendy Evans from the Defense Distribution Center (DDC) who joined the meeting via telephone, indicated she thought the link to the TRANSCOM Port Code provided a lists of ports that was too voluminous. She said there are only about 100 port codes

authorized for use and would like the list of codes to show only those. During the demonstration, it was noted that none of the DODAACs entered had RICs populated in the file. **ACTION:** Mr. Carter will investigate the possibility of reducing the list port codes made available for user selection and look into the missing RIC issue.

    (h) DLMS Changes. Discussion included a number of DLMS changes currently under development, in staffing, and awaiting implementation**.**   Status is also posted to the DLMSO Web site: http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlmso/eLibrary/Changes/Qtrly_Status_Rpts/DLMSStatus06_ baseline.doc. Changes below are listed in numerical sequence where Proposed DLMS Change (PDC)/Approved DLMS Change (ADC) numbers are assigned.

    (1) Proposal to Delegate Disposal Authority for NIIN Status Code 4 and 8 at Time of Receipt by the Distribution Depot(DD). This was a preliminary discussion lead by Brian Mackie, from the DDC, to determine if the Components are in favor of developing a policy that would allow DDs the authority to dispose of material with NIIN status code of 4 and 8. These NIIN status codes identify items that are either cancelled without replacement (4) or cancelled – inactive (8). The problem arises when material is turned into a DD, without a Pre-Positioned Material Receipt Documentation (PMRD). A receipt transaction is sent to the Inventory Control Point (ICP), however since the material is no longer recognized as an active item by the ICP no disposal transactions are generated. As a result the material stays in storage and the ICPs are charged storage cost for items that are no longer in use. **DISCUSSION:** The correct procedure is for the customer to offer the material to the ICP utilizing the procedures outlined in the Material Returns Program (MRP).   The ICP would not accept such material for credit under MRP.   If the DD was then to receive the material without a PMRD a Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) should be sent to the ICP.   The ICP should then authorize disposal and, under approved MILSBILLS/MILSTRIP procedures, bill the disposal costs to the activity responsible for the unauthorized return. Ms. Hilert said that there may be a gap in the current procedures for MRP in that this situation is not specifically addressed. **ACTION:** All Components provide by January 15, 2006 current automated system response to reports of excess (DI FTE) for cancelled NIINs (are such FTEs rejected or processed for response to customer?). DLMSO will review MRP procedures for possible inclusion of a new paragraph and/or status code.

    (2) Proposed DLMS/MILSTRIP Change for Price Notification. Customers submit requisitions for acquisition cost-plus items based on pricing data reflected in the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS). Because these prices are often inaccurate or priced at 0, as is the case for Acquisition Advice Code (AAC) L items, the customer may charged more than is available in their budget.   This proposed change, initiated by the Marine Corps and with strong support from the FMS community, would establish a new Advice Code which would enable customers to request that Supply Sources identify the actual cost and permit the customer a choice on whether to proceed prior to contract award. **DISCUSSION**: Mr. Hellion Flowers, the DLA SPRC representative indicated that DLA would not support the change until there is an evaluation of the systems impact to accomplish the change. However, DLA has proposed several initiatives that would help mitigate some of problems identified by the proposed change as follows:

- DLA would perform market survey to get a better idea of the cost of the item.
- A system change to BSM to update FLIS in a timelier manner.
- A change to FLIS to allow a price to be recorded for AAC L items where the price is currently blank.

Mr. Bob Vitko, DLMSO, proposed that there be a change in DOD policy that would require supply sources to notify the customer when a price change, either by a significant percentage or a flat dollar amount, without the customer having to use an advice code to request the information. Ms. Hilert discussed a combination approach with a DOD policy change requisitions as well as an advice code that customers could use for a tighter variance edit. Ms. Hilert indicated that the DoD Supply Chain Materiel Management Regulation, DoD 4140.1R, is currently being rewritten and this would be an opportune time to include new policy to require customer notification of significant prices change. **ACTION:** DLMSO will prepare a draft change to 4140 and submit to OSD (with coordination of the SPRC).   **DLA:** Provide by January 15, 2007: A list of AACs that are identified as Acquisition Cost-Plus (or are otherwise associated with pricing problems). DLA will also provide status of the change to FLIS to allow a price for AAC L items.   DLA was to research policy on this topic, but was unable to locate a copy of policy believed to have been previously included in the FAR and later rescinded. **Marine Corps and DLA IL Office:** Update the proposal to reflect the alternatives discussed and provide to DLMSO by January 30, 2007. **All Components** provide to DLMSO by January 30, 2007, procedures currently in place for communicating to customers significant changes in pricing. Also provide any planned changes as the result of implementing ERP Systems. Indicate if these procedures are for Security Assistance customers only or apply to all**.   Subsequent to the meeting** the Marine Corps raised questions regarding why FLIS does not update prices in a timelier manner and how BSM handles these price updates. Currently the updates occur once a year and it was suggested that this could be done at least quarterly. Mr. Hellion from DLA responded and indicated that FLIS price updates are controlled by OSD guidance. Changes to the effective date policy in FLIS has been proposed but was non-concurred in by all the Services. Mr. Flowers recommended that this be revisited by the new pricing integrated process team (IPT). In addition, Mr. Flowers explained the time delay between BSM and FLIS updates. For a first time buy, price challenge or other FMR exceptions that result in a standard price change outside the normal annual cycle, BSM creates/changes the price immediately. However there are times when there is a difference between the FLIS and BSM price. FLIS must adhere to the DOD effective date policy and can't immediately effect the price change. The price is visible in FLIS with the effective date (48 to 78 days in the future). This discrepancy causes a difference between the obligation and what DLA bills the customer.

(3) Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Automated Stock Screening Request/Response.

This proposal which for which a PDC is under development, is a new automated process using a DLMS transaction in which BSM sends a request for stock screening to a DSS depot. The DSS depot will respond with a transaction indicating no stock, no defects, or if there is defective material the DLMS 842S/Q equivalent of a DD-1225, Storage Quality Control Report (SQCR), will be sent. Ms. Hilert indicated that it might be advisable to extend this process to all Services so that a SQCR created in DSS for owners other than BSM, could be sent to DAASC WebSDR, which would automatically generate an e-mail to that owner.

ACTION: Ms. Hilert asked all Services interested in this new process to consider sponsoring the change and insure that modernization programs are aware of that this non-MILS process falls under the DLMS.

(4) **AMCLs 10 and 34, Identification of Product Quality Deficiency Report (PQDR) Material.** This approved change provides a standard means of identifying and controlling potential/confirmed product quality deficiency related material with a staggered implementation. DLA, USAF, and some Army systems have reported implementation. The Navy has deferred until modernization. There was a discussion concerning whether the Marine Corps is considered to have implemented this change since they use an Air Force-designed system which accommodates this process. **ACTION:** Marine Corps verify by January 15, 2007, if this change is considered implemented in all their systems. Implementation includes use of Supply Condition Code Q and future capability to include a management code in the disposal release order.

(5) **ADC 44A, Inclusion of Supplemental information for UIT/SIM in the 2D Symbol On the Issue Release/Receipt Document (IRRD) (DD Form 1348-1A).** This addendum adds supplemental optional data fields to the PDF 417 2D symbol for the purpose of item unique identification (IUID). This approved change does not yet have a planned implementation date. Ms. Hilert indicated the Navy should provide a date when they would be capable of reading the 2D symbol for UII and serial number, and this could provide some impetus to DLA to prioritize the change in DSS. **ACTION**: The Navy is requested to provide by January 30, 2007, an estimated date implementation date. Other Service implementation dates should also be identified. Implementation includes capability to read or write UID content in the DD 1348 2D symbol.

(6) **ADC 205, Assignment of MILSTRIP Document Number Serial Number Record Position (rp) 40/DLMS Utilization Code M for BRAC.** This change authorizes RP 40 of an A5J to identify a BRAC disposal release order. **ACTION:** Since the publication of the ADC, the USAF has identified a concern for system integration and competing uses of the code M. The USAF representative was asked to report status/provide the impact.

(7) **PDC 206 New DLMS Information Exchange for Tracking Non-Ready-For-Issue (NRFI) Carcass Return.** This PDC was developed in support of the Navy NRFI carcass tracking process and will be available for use/adaptation by other Components. Since the last PRC meeting, the PDC has been completed and is awaiting final review by the Navy. It will be sent to all Components for comments and concurrence. Other Services will be asked to review for applicability/enhancement to support their internal processes.

(8) **PDC 208, Revised Procedures for Logistics Accountability During Maintenance.** This PDC, which is out for review, incorporates changes recommended by the Joint Group Materiel Management (JGMM) subgroup for inter-Service Supply Support to Depot Maintenance. In addition, this change proposes related revisions recommended during the April 2006 Supply PRC, as well as administrative changes which insert missing MILSTRIP text and provide clarifying language for cancellation of customer asset reports. The changes as a result of the PDC fall within the MILSTRIP/DLMS functional area; a separate proposed change is

under development for coordination of revisions and updated procedures in the MILSTRAP/DLMS functional area as discussed during the April PRC meeting. **DISCUSSION:** The PDC formally publishes standard requisitioning procedures for the induction of reparables into maintenance using requisition transaction and a prescribed format. The induction process was adopted under JGMM, but the finalized formats had not yet been integrated into standard documentation. New to this process are procedures associated with storage activity denial of directed release of the asset for maintenance action and a requirement for a shipment notification transaction when material is shipped from the maintenance depot (organic and commercial) to a distribution depot or DRMS. Under the proposed change, this requirement may be satisfied by a DLMS Shipment Status, 856S, or an Advance Shipment Notice, 856, for property transfer. The Committee recommended this PDC for approval. Ms. Hilert asked the Army the status of the implementation of Commercial Asset Visibility (CAV). The Army representative indicated CAV was being fielded, but has some problems will some of the CAV transactions. **ACTION:** Components are requested to provide confirmation by email of concurrence/comments by January 15, 2007. The Army is requested to provide status of the fielding of CAV and identify problems with CAV transactions January 30, 2007.

(9) PDC 224, DLMS Shipment Status Enhancements: Secondary Transportation Number, Initial Shipping Activity, Carrier Identification, and Port of Embarkation (POE). This change provides guidance for implementation of multiple enhancements to the DLMS Shipment Status (856S) transaction, specifically requesting implementation of enhancements identified during the development of the DLMS: secondary transportation number and initial shipping activity. It provides clarification on how DLMS handles identification of the POE for air or water or the Consolidation and Containerization Point (CCP) which are mapped to the same record positions in the MILS and may not be identifiable by code characteristics. Additionally, it inserts language in the DLMS manual for RFID and IUID content for UIT within the shipment status guidance. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hilert told all Components they should be building these enhancements into their enterprise resource planning systems (ERPs). She also indicated that this could be a phased implementation with no adverse impact if some systems implemented while others did not. All Components agreed to approve the change. **ACTION:** DLMSO to issue ADC.

(**10) PDC 222, Communication of Unit Price and Total Price under DLMS.** This PDC expands the field size for the unit price and total dollar value on the Issue Release/Receipt Document (IRRD) (DD Form 1348-1A). The change establishes a corresponding field size for the unit price in the DLMS transactions. Currently, MILSTRIP transactions restrict the size of the unit price due to the space limitation within the 80 record position transactions. The current field size is structured with 5 digits for dollars and 2 digits for cents. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hilert explained that this problem can't be corrected within MILSTRIP, and therefore DLMS must be used. The PDC was recommended for approval during the meeting although there are some comments requiring clarification/correction within the final version. **Subsequent to the meeting**, Ms Hilert learned that DLA Distribution Standard System (DSS) plans to expand the field size for total cost to a length different from that in the proposal. However DLA did not provide explanation of this during staffing of the PDC. **ACTION:** DLA must provide justification for field size and clarify how much of the proposed

change will be implemented by DSS. DLMSO to finalize and issue the ADC, pending receipt of clarification from DLA.

(11) **DRAFT PDC 235, Revision of MILSTRIP, MILSBILLS and DLMS to Add DODAAC Authority Code Edits.** This proposed change will establish a new edit for DODAACs by Authority Code in order to restrict requisitioning, shipment, and billing by DODAAC. It will revise DLMS, MILSTRIP, and MILSBILLS to recognize DODAAC roles for requisitioning, shipment, billing and provide the authority for DAASC and the Source of Supply to reject for invalid usage. **DISCISSION:** Mr. George Gray, DLA, discussed having an additional authority code that would further limit items that could be requisitioned from the Defense Reutilization and Market Service (DRMS). Ms. Hilert indicated that Mr. Gray could propose a new code by providing comments to the published PDC. Also discussed was the problem of transitioning from the currently process of restricting DODAACs (through DAAS edits on the DoDAAC structure) to the new authority codes. Mr. Carter indicated part of the conversion would require automated/manual review by DAASC and the Central Service Points (CSPs). If the code is left blank, DAASC will default to 00, which has no restrictions. **ACTION:** Ms. Hilert asked everyone to carefully review the PDC to ensure that one authority code will work for every situation.

(12) **PDC 236 (subsequently published as ADC 219), Passive Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Visibility Transactions.** This change establishes data requirements for registering passive RFID readers at DAAS for the purpose of identifying the location of the reader so that subsequent tag reads can be associated with the physical location of the read. This change also establishes data requirements for sending scanned tag read identification with reader identification to DAAS via middleware (e.g., Savi Site Manager, Globe Ranger, etc.). The goal is to associate the tag identification and location with previously transmitted logistics transactions containing passive RFID, e.g., 856S, Shipment Status and 856A, Receipt/Shipment, Consolidation/Due-in Notice. The change is restricted to the Alaska RFID Implementation (ARI) program; however the intent is to validate the process for broad use in future passive RFID implementations. **DISCUSSION**: The scope of the project includes systems that currently collect supply and transportation data for the DLA and USTRANSCOM business processes used to generate that data, technologies to collect new data, software to integrate the data and tools to visualize the information. The initial scope of the ARI program is limited to DOD prepared shipment transactions (856S and 856A); it is anticipated that future expansion will incorporate vendor/contractor prepared advance shipment notices (856).   The Committee recommended that other code types that should be included to define reader location, for example, Water Port of Embarkation, (POE)/Port of Debarkation (POD) and Air POE/POD. **ACTION:** Ms. Laurie Barnhill, DLMSO, was asked to clarify with DAASC if they will be sending the latest 856A to the middleware when a reader location requests identification based upon a tag read. **Subsequently**, Ms. Barnhill confirmed that DAASC will provide either or both matching 856S or 856A.   Both air and water port codes were incorporated in the approved change.

(13) **DRAFT PDC 237, New Status Code for Free Issue Post-Post Orders.**   This change establishes procedures that allow the source of supply to modify post-post non-reimbursable requisitions so that they are processed as reimbursable with concurrent

generation of supply status notification. **DISCUSSION:** The change has not been out for comment, but will be sent out for a 45 day staffing. **ACTION:** DLMSO to finalize and issue the proposal.

        (i) Unit of Issue Errors Identified at DAAS. DAASC is proposing a new process to validate the U/I and if determined to be incorrect or invalid/unrecognizable they will check the DLIS abstract file resident at DAASC, and replace the U/I in the transaction with the U/I of record. (note, if the U/I is invalid/unrecognizable the transaction can't be translated to DLMS). This would be a front-end check and fix, accomplished before passing the transaction on to the mapping process. **DISCUSSION:** Changing the requisitioners transaction with a U/I error to FLIS U/I without quantity conversion logic could easily add complications to an already suspect order and result in the customer getting the wrong quantity. Accordingly, the decision for DAASC edits relative to U/I follows: (1) If the 80 RP transaction contains an incorrect U/I, DAASC will pass that incorrect U/I to the source of supply (SoS) in the DLMS transaction and allow normal SOS U/I edits . SOS already change incorrect U/I to the correct U/I if the associated quantity can be converted and provides status back to the customer indicating the U/I has been changed. If the quantity can't be converted, then the SOS rejects the requisition with Status Code CE and the correct unit of issue is provided for reordering purposes. (2) If the 80 rp transaction contains invalid/unrecognizable U/I (that can't be converted to a DLMS transaction) DAASC will reject the requisition with "CE" status and provide the correct U/I obtained from the DLIS abstract file. No DLMS change is required for this action. **ACTION:** DAASC will modify programs as outlined above and DLMSO will update the DLMS manual accordingly.

        j. DoD WebSDR Update: Mr. Robert Hammond, DLMSO, provided an update briefing on the WebSDR Transformation Initiative. WebSDR moves Supply Discrepancy Reports (SDRs) into an integrated transactional environment, based on a DAAS hub for communication and centralized data management. The benefits include near real time SDR reporting for immediate identification and more speedy resolution of reported discrepancies, facilitates interoperability internal and external to DoD, supports unique item identification, and other DoD initiatives, maximizes the economy, efficiency and effectiveness and provides for the future capture of perfect order fulfillment computations. Current interfaces using transactions are: DSS (842), BSM (842), Air Force Security Assistance Command (AFSAC) (842), SAMMS (UDF) and a one way UDF interface with the Army. In addition, there is an e-mail interface with the Air Force. Next steps for WebSDR include testing DLMS X12-based XML interface with the Navy with implementation expected in Feb 07; implementing the two-way communication with the Army; testing DLMS X12 interface with PDREP for DoD wide distribution of Security Assistance quality reports under the product quality deficiency reporting process; and completing the interface with GSA.

        k. SAP Requirements Task Force: Ms. Marva White, DLMSO, briefed the PRC on the DOD SAP Enterprise Requirements Task Force. The task force, established by OUSD (AT&L) now sponsored by the Business Transformation Agency was chartered to:

- Leverage the size and buying power of the DoD to influence the design and development of SAP.

- Provide a single DoD voice with clear direction to maximize the benefit of the significant investment.

- Partner with other nations Defense Department representatives to maximize our leverage of SAP.

- Take advantage of opportunities as a result of lessons learned, common objectives and shared requirements.

Ms. White reported that significant progress has been made in meeting these objectives to include the formation of a DLMS/SAP Working Group which has submitted a Development Request (DRQ) to SAP on DLMS data elements. SAP has responded to the DRQ and the task force continues to review the response and compare it with existing/planned enhancements to address the DLMS requirements. **Subsequent** to the meeting additional information was hyperlinked to the SPRC agenda for those interested in the latest status of joint-interest topics. **ACTION:** Participation in DLMS/SAP Working Group telecom meetings is encouraged. Feedback may be provided to Ms. White.

ELLEN HILERT
Supply PRC Chair

Approved:

DONALD C. PIPP
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Enclosure

KEY EVENTS THAT REQUIRE AN UPDATE TO THE IUID REGISTRY

Ways items leave inventory

Term	Definition
Abandoned	Items left in place by DoD who relinquishes title.
Consumed	Non-reversibly incorporated into another item
Destroyed - Accident	Destroyed during a fire, natural disaster, or other unplanned natural or man-made incident.
Destroyed - Combat	Destroyed by the enemy during combat
Donated	Items provided to an church, club, or other organization without compensation; DoD relinquishes title.
Exchanged	Provided to a supplier for an equivalent replacement part.
Expended - Normal use	Such as in the firing of a missile during combat or consumed during a manufacturing process.
Expended - Experimental/Target	Such as the firing of a missile during training exercises and for testing; items destroyed while serving as a target during training exercises and tests.
Inactive	Still on books; excess.
Leased	Inactivated and leased to a foreign government for a specified period of time with title retained by the US Navy
Loaned	Owned by a DoD Component and loaned to contractors, scientific institutions or other organizations.
Lost	Items that cannot be located or accounted for that were previously in inventory.
Scrapped	Waste material that will be reused or reprocessed.
Sold - Other Federal	Title transferred to non-DoD Federal Agencies with compensation
Sold - State/Local	Title transferred to non-Federal governmental entities with compensation
Sold - Foreign Govt	Title transferred to non-US governmental entities with compensation
Sold - Nongovt	Title transferred to non-governmental entities such as churches, organizations, etc. with compensation.
Sold - Historic	Title transferred to a museum or similar entity with compensation
Stricken/retired	Off the books.
Stolen	Lost via theft.