IN REPLY
REFER TO   DLMSO   NOV — 6 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Systems (DLMS) Supply Process Review
Committee (SPRC) Meeting 07-02, October 9-11, 2007

The attached minutes of the DLMS Supply PRC Meeting (07-02) are forwarded for your
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 at 703-767-0676; or, e-mail: Ellen.Hilert@dal.mil; and,
Ms. Mary Jane Johnson at 703-767-0677; or, e-mail: Mary.Jane.Johnson@dla.mil.

DONALD C. PIPP
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment

DUSD(L&MR)SCI
Supply PRC Committee
Attendees

IN REPLY   DLMSO
REFER TO

NOV – 6 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee
(PRC) Meeting 07-02, October 9-11, 2007

Purpose: Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) hosted the subject
meeting at the DLA 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 Char, and Ms. Mary Jane
Johnson, MILSTRAP Administrator facilitated discussion.

Review of Meeting Topics:

a. Recap on action items from SPRC 07-01 Meeting. The specific action items and responses
below were provided by DAASC DAASC.

**(1) DAASC confirm that the Army ICP system is sending Pseudo Shipment Status
for Unconfirmed Material Release Orders (Document Identifier ASH) to ILCOs.** DAASC
indicated that 302 FMS ASH transactions were received between 1 June 2007 and 5 September, 2007.
All except 1 was from either DLA or Navy, 1 from the Army and none from the Air Force. Ms. Hilert
indicated that this action item needed to be looked into further. She requested that DAASC look at a
longer time frame. **ACTION:** DAASC look at a longer time period to confirm that the Army ICP
systems is sending ASHs to ILCOs

**(2) DAASC determine if they are able to provide a link on VLIPS to allow the reject
message to be displayed and provide current list of reject messages.** DAASC is researching how to
add the code and explanation to both VLIPS and the Logistics Data Gateway.

**(3) DAASC provide status and timeline for implementation of a new routing
process that will not require conversion of DLMS transactions to MILS.** DAASC is able to route
extended data through DAASC Micro Automated Routing System (DMARS) and perform edits based
on these data elements that are not in the MILS. An example of this is for PDC 275 where DAASC
terminates shipment status from CCP when it is going to MILS customers. Even though DAASC is
currently able to edit, route and display DLMS data elements not in MILS we are looking at alternative
internal processing of the DLMS transactions but implementation date is unknown at this time.

(4) DAASC and DOD EMALL team were to work together to review DAASC reject notices associated with EMALL requisitions to determine if systemic corrective action can be taken. EMALL reject messages are automatically transmitted to EMALL for corrective action. Additionally, DAASC is periodically notifying the EMALL PMO of repetitive rejects.

(5) The Marine Corps representative indicated that some raw data is currently downloaded from DAASC which may require some changes to this procedure when VLIPS is modified. DAASC will add new fields to the LOTS database for display into VLIPS as required by approved DLMS changes.

b. DOD EMALL. Ms. Amy Byers, from the DOD EMALL Program Management Office (PMO) provided a status update on changes to EMALL. **DISCUSSION:** The changes, which are version 8.1 were originally scheduled to be implemented in early FY 08, but are now scheduled for the 3rd quarter of FY 08. The modifications include:

(1) Customer Care Module – This is a Help Desk tool which will be used to document and record problems.

(2) Quantity Unit Pack (QUP) Warning for Advice Code 27 – This will provide the ability to change the quantity on a transaction when there is a problem with the requested quantity versus QUP.

(3) Pay.gov Changes for Charges over $99,999.99 – This change will prevent Pay.gov from processing charges over this amount in EMALL.

(4) Specialty Store Improvements to Support Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) – This is a new capability within EMALL to allow customers to set up specialty stores with items that are specific to their needs. This will provide an easier and faster shopping experience, allowing users to scroll through items of interest rather than the 31 million items currently in EMALL.

(5) Block all non-US Government Registrations from Using SP5200 – This change will block all non-US Government activities from using the EMALL DODAAC to place orders in EMALL. However, this change does nothing to prevent US Government customers from using the EMALL DODAAC. DLMSO does not concur with the use of SP5200 on DoD requisitions; customers must be directed to use their own authorized, assigned DODAAC when ordering from DoD sources of supply using EMALL. Having the EMALL DODAAC in the supplementary address field is not an issue, but using the DODAAC in the requisition document number is a violation of DOD policy/procedures. There is no way to tell who the real customer is and this leaves DOD vulnerable as anyone could have access to DoD inventories. Because the SP5200 looks like an actual DLA Government activity, these transactions by-pass required edits. Data provided by Ms. Byers revealed that during the past year, the EMALL DODAAC was used nearly 2,000 times by contractors, state, and federal government requisitioners. DLMSO's position is that all government activities and contractors should have (or be able to obtain) a valid DODAAC and should use it. The EMALL DODAAC could be used for read-only access and to order from the commercial catalogs, but customer must not be allowed to requisition from DOD Sources of Supply using anything except an authorized DODAAC.

Mr. Bob Vitko, DLMSO, recommended that DAASC reject all DoD requisitions using the EMALL DODAAC as the requisitioner. **ACTION:**   DLMSO will consider sponsoring such a change proposal.

(6) Material Receipt Acknowledgement. Ms. Byers presented a tutorial on how to complete the EMALL version of the Material Receipt Acknowledgement for DLA orders. The order may have been submitted via EMALL or any other ordering process. **DICUSSION**: It was decided during the discussion that the wording on the MRA request screen is confusing. The choices are: (1) No MRA action, (2) Complete, (3) Problem. The difference between (1) and (2) is unclear. Further discussion involved the choice of (3) Problem, since the drop down menu only listed five types of discrepancies: Other Discrepancy, Transportation Discrepancy, Quality Deficiency, Shortage and Non-qualifying Discrepancy. Ms. Johnson agreed to determine if more discrepancy types are identified under MILSTRAP MRA procedures. Subsequent to the meeting, the following MILSTRAP-authroized codes were identified:

CODE	DEFINITION
A	SDR being submitted (Excludes shortage and partial or total nonreceipt)
B	No record of requisition (Use in reply to DI Code DRB Follow-up if there is no record of the requisition and the material has not been received.)
C	Reserved for future DOD assignment
D	Transportation discrepancy report being submitted. (Excludes shortage and partial or total nonreceipt.)
E	Product quality deficiency report being submitted.
F	Shortage or partial or total nonreceipt. Quantity not received entered in record positions 25-29.
G-W	Reserved for future DOD assignment
X	Discrepant receipt, other than shortage and partial or total nonreceipt, which does not meet qualifying criteria for discrepancy report submission.
Y-Z	Reserved for future DOD assignment.

EMALL uses all the codes, except B (no record of the requisition). Recommend the definition used in EMALL mirror those in the DOD MILSTRAP Manual. While Code "B" would not apply to requisitions initiated in EMALL, they could apply to those received via on-line feeds from EBS. During addition discussion, it was determined that these MRA requests only go to the "orderer," who may not be the actual customer/ship-to. The technique used by the "orderer" to contact the actual customer is unclear. The Committee requested that EMALL procedures be documented in MILSTRAP/DLMS Manuals. In addition, Ms. Johnson requested EMALL use the 527R vice the 861, which is not a DOD recognized use for the MRA. This change would require systems changes in EMALL and would require coordination with EBS and the Business Transformation Agency (BTA). **ACTION:** EMALL PMO is to document the EMALL MRA procedures and forward to DLMSO as a PDC for staffing and inclusion in the MILSTRAP/DLMS Manuals. Also, provide a list of all document identifier codes which may be input via EMALL.

(7) FMS EMALL PILOT. Ms. Linda Kimberlin, DLA J-3, provided a briefing which described an initiative the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) community is undertaking to allow FMS customers to use EMALL. **DISCUSSION:** Currently no foreign customers use EMALL for ordering; however there are 6-8 that use it to obtain status on their requisitions. Ms. Kimberlin explained that the

proposed concept to allow FMS customers to use EMALL is still in draft and should be finalized at an FMS meeting in November 2007. At that time Ms. Kimberlin will document the procedures in a proposed DLMS change.

(8) Direct Commercial Sales (DCS). Ms. Linda Kimberlin outlined the policy addressed in Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) Policy Memo 06-4 which appears to authorize DOD support for direct commercial sales (i.e., sale to a U.S. commercial entity in support of an FMS customer where there is no contract with the U.S Government). However, after review of sections 30, 38 and 39 of the Army Export Control Act, it was verified that there is no exception allowed for such a sale to contractors under contract to the FMS country. A DOD sale to a U.S. company may occur only when the company has a contract with the U.S. Government. System changes in support of DCS will not be pursued.

c. **Monitoring for Requisition Priority Abuse**

(1) Draft PDC 280, GSA Priority Abuse Downgrade and Report Procedures. BACKGROUND: During the last Supply PRC in May 2007, Mr. Garvey, GSA, agreed to develop a proposed DLMS change to bring GSA in line with Services/Agencies with regard to downgrading and reporting priority abuses on requisitions. This draft PDC documents GSA's proposal which will require access to the Joint Staff (JS) approved list of DODAACs qualifying for FAD I use. **DISCUSSION:** The complexities of this were discussed, not the least of which is the classified nature of the basic information associating the name of the activity and it's location with the F/AD I authorization.   The current PDC suggest that DAASC provide a list of DoDAACs to GSA via a secure file transfer process. No Joint Staff representation was present during the discussion; however, it was agreed that the process would be better if the JS provided direct update to both DAASC and GSA concurrently.   Ms. Hilert requested that DAASC assist in determining the best technique to use to communicate to DAASC that GSA downgraded the priority on a given requisition and how to include that particular requisition in the DAASC Logistics Reports database. Since GSA already provides to DAASC the CHA/CH1 transactions for each order which bypasses DAASC, it was suggested that a way to identify which of these orders have been downgraded be considered. Multiple techniques were discussed. **ACTION:** Ms. Hilert requested that DAASC provide their recommendation for reworking the PDC.

(2) Force Activity Designator (FAD) Validation for EMALL Customers. BACKGROUND: Current DOD policy regarding Priority Designator (PD) 01 use for DODAACs which are not authorized for FAD I use, is to post these requisition to the DAASC Logistics Reports database by Service, but not to downgrade the requisition, except for Coast Guard or FMS. No pre-validation occurs in EMALL. **DISCUSSION:** DLMSO proposed the following business rules regarding "non-standard" ordering; e.g., EMALL, GSA Advantage, or GSA Global Supply**:**

▪ PD 01 orders using non-standard requisitioning methods must have an authorized valid FAD I DODAAC in either record position (rp) 30-35 or 45-50. If not DAASC and/or GSA will downgrade.

▪ If the EMALL DODAAC (SP5200) appears as the requisitioner (rp 30-35) in the PD 01 requisition, DAASC and/or GSA should automatically downgrade. (If the recommendation discussed above to have DAASC and/or GSA reject all orders with SP5200 as the requisitioner is adopted, then this edit becomes unnecessary.)

▪ As an alternative to automatic downgrading, EMALL could challenge use of PD 01, PD 04, or PD 11. A "pop up" box might ask "In accordance with DOD policy, are you authorized to use a priority which is reserved for F/AD I activities only?"

ACTION: PRC members are to provide preliminary feedback within 15 days from distribution of these minutes on whether this practice would negatively impact EMALL capability to support critical ordering practices. Based upon feedback DLMSO will decide whether to proceed with developing a DLMS change proposal for automatic downgrading. The **EMALL PMO** is to provide feedback on the feasibility of adding the pop-up challenge (as a DoD requirement without funding support from DLMSO).

d. Military Assistance Program Address Directory (MAPAD) Re-engineering Initiative. Mr. Bob Hammond, DLMSO, discussed changes planned for the MAPAD. These changes, funded by BTA, are intended to mirror the technique currently used for updating the DODAAD. Today, a change to the MAPAD (whether a country, a freight forwarder, or an International Logistics Control Office (ILCO)) requires contact with DAASC to request the change. There is no automated process and no DAASC edits on the change. This re-engineering proposal includes development of input screens to be used only by the ILCO. It requires DAASC edits on many of the entries, e.g., State, and it adds points of contact information (organization, phone number, FAX number). The updates will be disseminated using a replicated data base to insure everything is synchronized. The draft functional requirements document is currently out for comment. The design review is planned for November 2007. System development and testing with the Central Service Points and Distribution Standard System (DSS) is expected to be completed in June 2008. Initial operating capability with DSS is scheduled for July 2008.

e. Wide Area Work Flow (WAWF) and Standard Transactions – Phase I. Ms Kim Pisall, BTA, provided a briefing on the rationale and policy for standard transaction processing and compliance requirements for WAWF She described the steps necessary for proper implementation of standard transactions. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Pisall outlined the benefits of standard WAWF transactions as follows:

▪ Enables systems requiring a WAWF interface to come on-line outside of a WAWF release by working with the Global Exchange (GEX) to determine mapping needs.

▪ Functionality is build once and any new system requiring WAWF data can utilize existing data sets to "plug and play".

▪ Provides DOD the ability for enterprise level decision making through aggregation of acceptance data.

▪ Interim environment has the ability to post accounts payable in accordance with GAAP until the full capability is available in the target ERP environment.

Ms. Pisall also discussed the tasks required for WAWF implementation to include determining data format. During this discussion, she indicated that systems that are able to receive DLMS X12 data sets

will be able to implement the WAWF interface with a minimum of time and no cost to the interface partner. For those systems that that can't send or receive X12, GEX mediation will be required and a cost to interface will be incurred and will require at least 90 days for implementation. Ms. Pisall also indicated that new systems may be able to receive and send data via the DLMS compliant ebXML schemas. In this case, no system specific mapping will be needed. GEX will exchange data directly with the external system using compliant XML schema transactions.

       (1) Mr. Tommy Lyons, DLMSO, stated that DLMSO has not approved any ebXML schemas; furthermore DLMSO provided comments to WAWF. The comments that DLMSO provided stated that the schemas provided by WAWF did not follow ebXML naming and design rules, were not based on UN/CEFACT Core Components and were not correctly mapped to DLMS Data Elements. WAWF stated that it has already implemented the changes and that they would provide a copy of the resultant schemas and mapping to DLMS Data Elements (the WAWF POC is Geoffrey Ames).   Ms. Hilert will look providing access to WAWF manuals/implementation guides via the DLMSO web site. A question was asked regarding the costs for non DOD activities interfacing with WAWF. Ms. Pisall indicated there could be a DISA usage fee for those activities. Ms. Beverly Simons is the Program Manager at BTA and may be contacted for more information. Ms. Pisall also presented the WAWF Implementation Plan which listed the planned WAWF implementations. There were several questions regarding the activities listed and she indicated she would provide an updated version with more current information.

       (2) Mr. Virostko, DLA, initiated a discussion regarding the Air Force wanting to use the Material Receipt Acknowledge (MRA) (527R) as an acceptance document. Ms. Hilert and Ms. Johnson explained that the MRA does not meet the requirements of acceptance as defined by the Defense Acquisition Regulations System (DFARS).   The MRA merely acknowledges receipt to the source of supply and may include indication of a discrepancy, but it is understood to be systemically triggered by the receipt process, and, therefore, may not be associated with true acceptance by a Government person. The receipt acknowledgement represents physical custody and is not recognized as an acceptance report. She also said that a transition to using the MRA as acceptance would require a DLMS change. Mr. Virostko indicated he would take the lead on further discussions on this issue.   **ACTION:** BTA is to provide an updated WAWF Implementation Plan and a definition of acceptance versus acceptance notification.

     f. DLA Receipting Way Ahead Integrated Process Team (IPT). Mr. Don Virostko, DLA, briefed on the IPT tasked by DLA HQ to analyze receipt related processes and recommend short and long term solutions for obtaining timely receipt/acceptance as prerequisite for vendor payment and interfund billing. The members of the team are from DLA HQs, the DDC, DLMSO, DORRA and representatives from all the DLA ICPs. Some of the issues/concerns that the team is working on include: lack of timely destination acceptance/receipt acknowledgment resulting in late payment and interest penalties; lack of timely receipt acknowledgement on shipments accepted at origin; delays in customer billing for reimbursement on vendor-filled requirements; and lack of implementation of WAWF within the Services pending deployment under ERP/modernization. Variations in WAWF implementation by Services requires coordination with the ship-to to assure a destination acceptor will be available.   The IPT reported that 10% of the customer direct shipments do not have MRAs. There are multiple causes and contributing factors to include the lack of standard processes for notifying receipt /acceptance where material is obtained through non-standard ordering methods (e.g., DoD

EMALL and DLA Prime Vendor).   Some MRAs are not posting in EBS due to EBS error processing and some MRAs are being directed to the shipper vice the source of supply.   **ACTION:** The IPT will develop a proposed DLMS change to document DOD procedures for reporting receipt/acceptance of material obtained through non-standard ordering processes and explore the feasibility of incorporating Services receipt/acceptance reporting in Performance Based Agreements (PBA). In addition, they will continue to identify customers that are not providing MRAs and work together to resolve the issues.

g. Material Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA).

(1) Preliminary question/findings from DAAS draft MRA query report review. **BACKGROUND:** DLMSO has reinvigorated review of the draft MRA report with a goal toward identifying any needed changes and/or improvements and finalizing the report for SPRC use. **DISCUSSION:** Mr. Bob Vitko and Ms. Brenda Meadow, DLMSO, are conducting an in-depth review of the report and presented preliminary findings to the committee. They recommend:
- General restructuring of the Summary Report and the inclusion of dollar value data.
- Collection and display of data under the Service of the ship-to DODAAC not the Service of the requisitioning DODAAC, with the exception that when a DSS depot is the ship-to DODAAC the data would be collected under the Service of the requisitioning DODAAC.
- The "No MRA" Report for DVDs and Stock Shipments is incorrect, recommend two separate reports, general report restructuring and the inclusion of dollar value data.
- Provide an ad hoc query capability; delete Special Reports and MRA by Discrepancy Indicator Report in favor of using ad hoc query.
- DODAAC validation be performed prior to a DoDAAC being identified in the report as a ship-to DODAAC. The draft report identifies 'Y' series supplementary data and other invalid entries as ship-to DODAACs
- A review of the technique used to identify CONUS versus OCONUS orders be undertaken by DAAS. The draft report contained CONUS ship-to and requisitioner DODAACs in the OCONUS portion of the report. Having an accurate manner to identify this is relevant to both data display and data collection as the timeframes allowed for MRA submission are different for CONUS and OCONUS activities.

Ms. Johnson indicated she agreed with the recommendations and asked the SPRC to review the recommendations and provide their concurrence, or non-concurrence with comments and suggestions, prior to the requirements being provided to DAASC.   **ACTION:** All Components provide concurrence/comments on the MRA Report recommendation within 30 days from the date of these minutes.

(2) Navy SPRC 07-01 ACTION. BACKGROUND: The Navy was requested to provide by July 31, 2007 a list of legacy systems that have implemented the MRA process as well as those that should be generating MRAs, but do not. This was originally a tasking from Ms. Deb Bennett, DUSD(L&MR)SCI at the SPRC Meeting 05-01**. DISCUSSION:** Mr. Michael Morra, Navy SPRC representative, indicated that he was unable to provide a list of the systems because the Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP) Central Design Agency (CDA) is only responsible for part of the Navy systems. Ms. Hilert indicated that as the Navy SPRC representative he was obligated to provide an overall Navy answer. **ACTION:** Navy to provide requested information. DLMSO will look into having SCI follow-up formally to the Navy if Mr. Morra is unable to provide a response within 30 days from the date of these minutes.

(3) Pseudo Receipt SDRs. BACKGROUND: This issue, first reported in 1999 and discussed at several SPRC meetings, is related to the Army implementation of the MRA which included automatic generation of SDRs for non-receipt or shortage (based on MRA with discrepancy code F). The Army system fails to recognize a partial shipment (indicated by the 16th position of the TCN) and identifies a shortage and systemically generates the SDR. Many of these SDRs are prepared while shipment is intransit or without knowing the material has been received after the SDR was generated. These pseudo receipt SDRs may then be submitted by hard-copy without research. These SDRs result in significant unnecessary workload for the action activity. The Army agreed during the SPRC Meeting in May 2002 that SDRs triggered by pseudo receipts would be verified by the submitting activity and those believed to be valid would be annotated as "Verified as true SDR (ROD)." DLA ICPs, the DDC and GSA were to look for trends by originating activity and notify the Army so corrective action can be taken by the Army to ensure the proper research is accomplished prior to submission. **Discussion:** The Army recently informed DLMSO that there is no longer a Pseudo Receipt SDR problem. However, GSA reports that they continue to receive a high volume of unverified SDRs related to partial shipments. DLA reported that they are getting a small number. Ms. Hilert reiterated that these SDRs are not considered valid and will not be worked unless they are verified by the submitting activity. **ACTION:** DLMSO to research specific SDR examples and provide feedback to the Army. DLA/GSA to report trends as identified.

h. DLMS Related Passive Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Implementation Status

(1) USMC Pilot. Mr. Donald Cooper, USMC AIT, briefed the committee on the Marine Corps pilot project to implement passive RFID. The Marine Corps pilot uses the DLMS Bridge (middleware) to receive and translate Advanced Shipping Notifications (ASNs). The DLMS Bridge has been incorporated into the EasyRFID (RFID edgeware) software and Alien RFID technology solution to communicate passive RFID visibility data from Camp Lejeune to DAASC. OSD had suggested using a commercial product such as GlobeRanger which performs most middleware and edgeware functions, but without the DLMS transaction capability. A combination of DLMS transactions (856S and 856A) and RFID tag data is used for the USMC pilot to create the Optical Memory Card (OMC) file format needed at Lejeune. This solution provides the needed data from the DLMS transactions in a format that eliminates the requirement to alter the Automated Manifest System – Tactical (AMS-TAC) system. The Visibility Transaction from ADC 219 will be used for the II Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) implementation. The plan is to use a phased approach; in Phase I the DLMS Bridge will pass the Visibility Transactions to DAASC after reading tagged shipments from the dedicated truck deliveries. Phase II will incorporate ASN data with transportation data that the DLMS Bridge will translate for use with AMS-TAC. The Marine Corps selected Northrup Grumman to develop and implement future enterprise solutions (currently considering Globe Ranger) for passive RFID technology for the I and II MEF. The Marine Corps is currently evaluating how to proceed with the implementation at Camp Lejeune -- go with the available value-added DLMS Bridge and EasyRFID solution or implement another enterprise solution selected by MARCORSYSCOM.

(2) DLMS Bridge. BACKGROUND: Mr. John Schwartz, DLMSO, provided a briefing on the DLMS Bridge. The DLMS Bridge addresses the problem of how new business systems using DLMS data enhancements (such as Passive RFID) can exchange data with legacy systems. The Bridge allows transaction data to flow between incompatible DOD systems by "translating" the data for

use between these systems without significant effort or cost. It handles Passive RFID registration and visibility transactions, supports DLMS transactions such as the 856S and 856A.   It also connects Passive RFID tag reads and legacy systems such as AMS-TAC, Cargo Movement Operation System and Standard Army Retail Supply System (SARSS). In addition, it will accommodate user output requirements other than DLMS or MILS (e.g.., flat files data sets, user defined files, XML OMC files etc.). It is simple, flexible architecture with central configuration management. The bridge supports a variety of functional areas including supply finance, transportation, and provides support at no additional expense (no programming costs, transactions mapping costs or help desk costs) and is available for tailoring for specific system integrations. The DLMS Bridge can support non-RFID DLMS transactions and so could also be of benefit to legacy systems that are trying to become DLMS compliant. **ACTION:** DAASC to provide a briefing on the RFID (R)-Table, which is where the passive RFID-related information is stored at DAASC.

    (4) DRAFT ADC 257, DLMS Shipment Status Generated by the Consolidation and Containerization Point (CCP) (Staffed as PDC 275). BACKGROUND: This change documents the preparation of the DLMS Shipment Status by the CCP using the Distribution Standard System (DSS) in order to provide passive RFID information when not previously provided by the shipping depot. It also provides for a revision of the transaction format to clearly define this usage and distinguish it from shipment status transactions provided by the DSS on behalf of the shipping depot. **DISCUSSION:** Mr. Gene Bransfield and Mr. Larry Loiacono, DLA, provided a briefing on the 856S that will be prepared by the CCP during which it became clear that the documentation supporting the change was sufficient for the complexity of the business rules involved. Further clarification was requested. **SUBSEQUENT** to the meeting a phonecon has held with DLMSO, DAASC, and DLA during which procedures were explained in detail. Ms. Hilert updated the change to reflect agreements made during that call and the draft version of the approved change was provided for Component review.   The change now clarifies that the DLMS Shipment Status (856S) provided by the CCP will provide passive RFID information to the customer resulting from reconfiguration of the original shipment by the CCP, when the original shipper didn't provide passive RFID, or the original tag was not readable.. The CCP shipment status may reflect multiple levels of pack associated with the lead TCN. It may also update the shipment date or mode of shipment while providing visibility of additional passive RFID tag values associated with the original shipment as a result of reconfiguration. The CCP shipment status should not be used to overlay the original shipment status in the receiving application, as this may result in some loss of data content. A new Status Reason Code will be added to the 856S to distinguish it from shipment status transaction generated by DSS on behalf of the SOS. This distinguishing code will be used by DAASC to prevent conversion to MILSTRIP AS_ formats which drops the additional TCN and RFID content, but could easily cause confusion in the MILS environment. The new code allows DLMS receiving activities to properly identify and process the transaction. There was also agreement for DSS to specifically identify the ship-to DoDAAC as a DLMS enhancement. DAASC will modify their rules to route the CCP shipment status only to the ship-to, and not other status recipients. **ACTION:** Components to provide feedback per staffing of the draft ADC.

   i. Jump Start Update. BACKGROUND: The DLMS migration Jump Start Program is a BTA tool to motivate and assist Components to migrate to DLMS by providing "seed" money, program management and enterprise support. There are currently four systems that received Jump Start funding in 2007: The Army Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) which has completed two releases in 2007 and will be 100% DLMS compliant by the end of 2008; Navy R-Supply, which is migrating 2 transactions, the

856S and the 856A, but will also implement all the DLMS enhancements that go with those transactions; Air Force ILS/SBSS, which will be implementing most all of the DLMSO transaction; and Marine Corps MAISTER, which will implement all the DLMS transactions. **DISCUSSION:** Mr. Dale Yeakel, DLMSO, provided an update on the DLMS Jump Start initiative. He explained there is a one page nomination form available on the DLMSO web site: http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlmso/Programs/DLMS/jumpstart.asp. A question was asked about those systems that received funding in 2007 requesting additional funding in 2008. Mr. Yeakel indicated requesting additional funding was appropriate. The key milestones for FY 2008 are: September 10th – BTA solicitation of 2008 system funding nomination announcement; November 2nd – Component nomination due back to BTA; December 4th BTA review and selection of nominated systems; February 3rd – BTA transfer of funds to selected system program offices.

j. Jump Start Overview of USAF. Mr. Pete Talamonti, Air Force, briefed the group on the initiative to migrate the Integrated Logistics System-Supply (ILS-S) Program into a DLMS environment. ILS-S is the standard base level inventory accounting and ordering management system for the Air Force. Approximately 82 MILs (which represents most of those used by the system) transactions will be converted to DLMS by Feb/Mar 2008. Mr. Talamonti indicated that they were developing software to control conversion to DLMS by transaction and destination system. Mr. Strickler, DAASC, said that they didn't need to be concerned with where the transactions were going, as DAASC keeps track of systems that are DLMS compliant or still using MILs and translates appropriately. Mr. Talamonti indicated they would re-look at that requirement and determine if it was still needed.

(1) DLMS Changes Support Air Force DLMS Migration

(a) Air Force Draft PDC 278, Inclusion of Unit Price in Requisition Modification. This proposed change will add the price to the requisition modifier transaction (AM_/ 511M). Although not used by other Components, the information is required to be transmitted ILS/SBSS to the SoS. Ms. Hilert asked if the Air Force could update the PDC to better explain procedures for the use of the unit price (for possible identification of an "authorized DLMS enhancement) or if the changed should only be identified for intra-AF use. If the data could be used by other Components as an enhancement, the impact should be discussed in the PDC.

(b) Air Force Draft PDC Excess Cause Code. This proposed change will add an Excess Cause Code on all Requisition Cancellation Requests (AC1/869C). This is used by ILS/SBSS and correlates to the reason the requisition is being cancelled. Mr. Bob Vitko agreed this may be useful to DLA in determining if the demand should be cancelled. The Air Force will update and consider definitions that could be used on a DOD-wide basis and submit officially.

(c) Air Force Draft PDC Technical Order (TO) Number. This proposed change is to add the TO number to requisitions (A02/A0B/511R). The TO number relates to the part number of the item being requisitioned and is currently carried in rp 67-80 of the MILS transaction produced by ILS/SBSS which is not compatible with the standard MILS format. There was some discussion of the field size required and the Air Force will clarify when the change is submitted officially.

(d) Air Force Draft PDC Lateral Requisitions. This proposed change will add the From RIC and the SOS RIC to requisitions (511R) that are flowing between Air Force bases. This change will be for intra-Air Force only use.

k. Jump Start Overview for USA Logistics Modernization Program (LMP). Mr. Kurt Phoel discussed the LMP migration to DLMSO. LMP has completed two releases in 2007 of various migrated DLMS transactions and will be 100% DLMS compliant with the third release by the end of 2008. Ms. Hilert requested that the Army provide slides indicating which transactions are in the various increments. Mr. Phoel also indicated that Army unique transactions would be migrated after 2008. Ms. Hilert asked for status of RFID/UID under DLMS and Mr. Phoel said that technology would be implemented at a later date. **ACTION:** Army to provide list indicating which transactions are in the various increments.

(1) DLMS Changes Supporting Army DLMS Migration

(a) Army Draft PDC 269, DLMS and DLSS Changes to Support Army Exchange Processing. This proposed change will implement Exchange Pricing (EP) which is a business process improvement mandated by the OSD Comptroller to mitigate the financial problems the Army has experienced with granting excess credit through it's current supply practices. It allows credit for reparable items to provide incentive for organizations to turn-in unserviceable component parts that the Army Materiel Command repairs and returns to inventory to support unit readiness needs. In order to rectify this situation, the Army will convert to a dual pricing system. All Army managed items will have a standard price, which represents the acquisition cost plus a recovery rate. In addition, items that are on an existing or planned national repair program will also have an exchange price which represents the loaded repair cost plus a recovery rate. Those nationally repaired items will be issued at a discounted price based on an expected return. If the exchange price items are not returned with the established timeframe, a Delta Bill will be sent to the customer that will result in a net cost of the full standard price to the customer. The exchange price DLMS change will only be applicable to Army customers. All others will be charged the standard price. Ms Hilert is working some code issues with the Army. The PDC is close to being finalized.

(b) ADC 254, DLMS Mapping for Army Material Release Order Shipment Status, DI Code B99, and Administrative Updates for DLMS Mapping of the Unique Item Identification (UII). This approved change incorporates the inclusion of the Army unique DIC B99, Offline Material Release Order (MRO) Image, from the MILS to DLMS mapping maintained by DAASC. All data elements, with the exception of the DIC are identical to the already mapped MILS A5 transaction. Normally this transaction is systemically generated when the supply source requisition processing record reflects that an off-line exception data MRO has been sent to the storage site. The DIC B99 is a mirror image of the off-line MRO less the exception data.

(c) Army Draft PDC 273, Revise DLMS and MILSTRAP to Support Intra-Army Logistics Reassignment (LR) Data, DS 846D and 846S. Within the Army, in addition to the Primary Inventory Control Activity (PICA) and the Secondary Inventory Control

Activity (SICA), there are activities classified as an Army Class Management Activity (ACMA) which is the Army designated class managers of items assigned to DLA or GSA for integrated materiel management. The ACMA or SICA is authorized to stock materials based on usage, but is not the item manager. When a Army activity (PICA) is the Losing Item Manager (LIM) to another Army PICA, some assets are first transferred to the Army SICA to cover open requirements, second to the LIM retention quantity and last to the Gaining Item Manager (GIM). Ms. Johnson indicated this change was intra-Army, but may be useful to other Components. Ms. Johnson also pointed out that there are several administrative changes in the PDC to provide clarification and consistency.   She also said there are questions on the draft PDC that must be answered prior to formal staffing of the change. Specifically DLA is requested to determine what action the depot is currently taking for the requirement quantity the Army enters in the DZC, RP 51-55.   Mr. Vitko asked the Army whether the assets that are currently in DSS depots owned by the SICA or the LIM.   The Army is also requested to verify if project code is wanted at LQ in position 270 rather than position 376. **ACTION:** Army to verify whether assets are actually being changed from a LIM RI Code to a different SICA RI Code by this process; and DLA provide answers to the above questions regarding current process for the Army's third party (SICA) quantity. This is an Army-DLA change, however all Components are requested to determine during staffing, whether the change could benefit their modernized systems. **SUBSEQUENT to the meeting** the PDC was issued on October 25, 2007 for staffing with the Components.

(d) **Army Draft PDC 261, Migrate Navy Serial Number and Lot Number Transactions (NAVSUP P-724 BG1/BG2) to DLMS 527R Receipt, 867I Issue and 947I Inventory Adjustment (Joint Army-Navy requirement).**   Army has identified a requirement for using Navy DI Code BG1/BG2 transaction data in DLMS receipt, issue and inventory adjustment transactions to support an existing interface between Army and the Naval Operational Logistics Support Center (NOLSC) Ordnance Information Systems (OIS).   This change will allow Army to support the existing interface when LMP implements DLMS. Ms. Johnson indicated this PDC will be out for staffing soon and will impact the Army, Navy, and DAASC.

(e) **PDC 271, DLMS Mapping for Army Electronic Project Support (AEPS) Requisition Exception Data.** This proposed change accommodates the LMP requirement for receiving requisition exception data from the AEPS system. The change modifies the DLMS 511R (requisition) to transmit the data content of the AEPS generated requisition exception data and format. Inclusion of these data elements supports DLMS conversion for Army and AEPS unique data elements to the existing DLMS transaction. Ms. Hilert indicated that the ADC is on hold pending reconsideration of Army requested mapping which DLMSO requested. **ACTION:** Army to determine if LMP mapping of AEPS exception data can fall within exception data as already mapped for the DLA/DAASC/EMALL.

(f) **Army Other.** Additional DLMS changes supporting Army DLMS Migration were briefly discussed. These have not yet been formally submitted by the Army, but are under development: excess quantity business rules when over 5 positions (e.g. for ammunition); 3rd party billing; pseudo receipt; and decapitalization between funding types for repairables.

l. Approved MILSTRAP Change Letter (AMCL) 15, New Ownership Code 0 (Zero) to Identify Special Operation Forces (SOF) Ownership. **BACKGROUND:** This approved change, which had an implementation date of December 2004, added a new Ownership Code to identify assets owned by DOD Special Operations Forces. The Army had previously reported that they had not implemented the change. **DISCUSSION:** Mr. Dan Collins, Navy, outlined a problem with material owned by the Navy Special Warfare Command (NAVSPECWARCOM) being intermingled with assets belonging to the Army, regular Navy, and other Services being stored at Army sites. This inability to readily identify and provide SOF assets in a timely manner poses a threat to NAVSPECWARCOM readiness and affects the ability to respond to fleet requirements. There was some discussion regarding whether the Army had implemented this change and it was reported that, although it had been implemented in the Commodity Command Standard System (CCSS), it was not being used. The Army also reported that it had not been implemented in the Army Standard Depot System (SDS). However, it appeared from the discussion that Army considered visibility of SOF materiel to be available in SDS though non-standard implementation of ownership codes which are intended for other purposes. Ms. Johnson requested that the Army provide a formal response as to which Army systems have implemented AMCL 15. She also asked them to document current procedures on how this type of material is stored and issued and how it will be handled when LMP is implemented. **ACTION:** Army to provide official status of the implementation of AMCL 15 and document current and future procedures to store and issue Ownership Code 0 material. Request Army provide the information within 30 days of the date of these minutes.

m. Additional DLMS Changes recently approved, in staffing, or under development or old Requests for Implementation Dates needing a fresh look.

(1) Request for Implementation Date of ADC 38, Special Program Requirements (SPR) Process Minimum and Maximum Quantity Checks and New SPR Status. **BACKGROUND:** This approved change allows ICPs to determine the forecasted requirements acceptability in terms of the risk of long supply being generated. This measurement requires consideration of the size of the forecasted quantity in relation to the normal demand estimated for the items being forecasted, the value (cost) of this quantity, the supply status of the items being forecasted, funding capability of the IC,P accuracy of past forecasts and the degree of assurance that requisitions will follow. ICPs may perform a minimum quantity check and reject SPR requested, using SPR status Code PG when the required quantity is so low that the IMM can support the requirement from its current stockage level without an SPR document. **DISCUSSION:** DLMSO originally released a Request for Implementation Date in August of 2000. However, only the Navy and GSA responded. DLA asked, in 2006, that the request for implementation date be reissued and provided their implementation as CY 2007 for EBS. This requirement was originated by DLA in 2000, and Mr. Steve St. John, DLA, indicated he would review ADC 38 to verify that it is still valid. **ACTION:** DLA advise if ADC requirement is still valid. If DLA determines the requirement is valid, Ms. Johnson will ask the Services to provided updated implementation date information.

(2) Request for Implementation Date for ADC 39, Special Program Requirements (SPR) Process Use of Reject Status Codes and Review of Alternative if not being Implemented in Legacy Systems. BACKGROUND: Currently, upon receiving SPR transactions with DI DY_, DLA processes the transaction and generates replies using either DI Code DYK, SPR Status transaction or DI Code DZG Transaction Reject. While DOD Components legacy systems can electronically process DYK transactions, DLA understanding for the SPR process is that the DZG transactions are printed and distributed hard copy for manual

processing. Problems occur when DZG Rejects for SPR transactions are not processed or not processed in a timely manner. It may not be practical for the Components to change their SPR legacy system to automate the DZG process, accordingly this change, originated by DLA, provides for reject advice codes on a DYK in response to a DYJ follow-up. A request for implementation date was released for this approved change in August 2000. The only response received was from the Navy indicating that implementation was held in abeyance until their ERP replaced their legacy systems. In 2006, DLA advised that they had implemented the approved change in their legacy system and provided an estimated implementation date for EBS of 2007. In May of 2006, DLMSO requested that if Components will not implement this change in their legacy systems that the alternative identified in the change be evaluated for implementation in ERPs and ADC 39 withdrawn. The alternative would use the DLMS 824R Reject Advice transaction in lieu of the DZG rejects. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Johnson indicated that since she had no implementation dates for Service legacy systems, she was proposing ADC 39 be withdrawn. **ACTION:** Ms. Johnson will develop a memorandum for withdrawal of ADC 39.

(3) PDC 255, IUID and RFID in Shipment Status Material Returns.
BACKGROUND: This proposed change updates the DLMS 856R, Shipment Status Material Returns to carry IUID information and passive RFID tag information. The PDC is a planning tool for establishing techniques for accommodating IUID and RFID tag data within transactional exchanges under the DLMS to support business process improvements. The change also adds administrative notes to clarify usage and further identify specific DLMS enhancements. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hilert said she had only received comments from DLA and that since this change has implications for the Jump Start Program she will move forward with an approved change. **ACTION:** All Components provide comments/concurrence with 15 days of the meeting.   Pending receipt of comments, DLMSO will publish the ADC.

(4) PDC 264 Revise DS 867I and MILSTRAP Issue Transactions to Support Navy Requirements for Reason for Reversal Code (Draft ADC 259). BACKGROUND: This proposed change affects Navy and DLA only and adds a "Reason for Reversal Code" to the 867I (D7_ Issue Transaction). **DISCUSSION:**   Ms. Johnson indicated that this PDC will become an ADC however she has some concerns over the Navy use of issue reversal code "R" which is used when material returned by the customer to the distribution depot on the original document number due to a discrepancy in the item received such as the condition or a shortage, etc. Her concern is that the use of the R issue reversal code may circumvent the intent of the Supply Discrepancy Report process. Consequently, the change will document the concerns and be approved for use in existing Navy legacy system interface with DLA DSS so that DLA DSS can implement DS 867I Issue transaction without breaking the existing Navy interface, but not for future use with Navy ERP. Ms. Hilert indicated that she was recently advised the Air Force would like to implement a similar process.   DLMSO does not support this process for use with discrepant materiel, which is currently under review by the DDC. **ACTION:**   The ADC will be provided with a caveat for limited use of 867I Reversal Code R by Navy, and only for the existing Navy legacy system interface. Code R will not be authorized for use in modernized systems.

(5) Draft ADC 258, DLMS Enhancement – Addition of Project Code field to Disposal Release Order (DRO) (Staffed as PDC 223). BACKGROUND: This draft approved change is a DLMS enhancement to include the Project Code on the 940R (Disposal Release Document). **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hilert would like the PRC representatives to concur with this ADC as an

authorized DLMS enhancement. The ADC has minor changes from the PDC version, but should be reviewed by the committee members.   It is understood that this could become a conversion issue, but it makes sense to add the Project Code to the DRO as it is only missing from the current A5J due to a limited MILS record positions. The qualifier is already on the DLMS 940R (for use in other types of material release orders). **ACTION:** Pending receipt of Component comment within 15 days of the meeting, DLMSO will plan to publish the ADC.

> **(6) PDC 274, Establishment of Borrowed Codes for DLMS Unit of Material Measure (Unit of Issue/Purchase Unit) Conversion Guide. BACKGROUND:**   This proposed change would revise the DLMS Unit of Material Measure Conversion Guide to include new borrowed/substitute codes to provide DOD equivalent codes for conversion processing at American National Standards Institute (ANSI) ASC X12 Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) version 4010 or higher, up to the version at which the correct X12 code becomes available. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hilert indicated she has received limited comments from the Components and would like feed-back as this has Jump Start implications. **ACTION:** All Components provide comments/concurrence by 15 days from the date of these minutes.

> **(7) PDC 277, Deleted DODAAC Cited on Open Orders. BACKGROUND:** This proposed change will require supply sources to automatically initiate cancellation action for unfilled quantities of materiel obligations or open requisitions upon deletion of a DODAAC identified as requisitioner, ship-to or bill-to activity from the DODAAD. Applicable supply and shipment status will be furnished to authorized recipients and in the event DAAS does not have a recorded DODAAC, the status will be disposed of. **DISCUSSION:** Ms. Hilert indicated this change had been signed out for staffing. **ACTION:** Comments are due to DLMSO by November 26, 2007.

> **(8) PDC 279, Administrative Update to Address Field Size Restriction for Transportation Related Data Elements.**   This change was not discussed and Ms. Hilert indicated it she is working with USTRANSCOM to determine correct field size and best approach for implementation.

> **m. Logistics Asset Support Estimate (LASE) and Proposed DLA Alternatives to LASE. BACKGROUND:** The LASE procedures are found in MILSTRAP chapter 14 (with corresponding DLMS procedures in Volume 2 of the DLMS manual). LASE provides for an automated process for Services to submit transactions to IMM to determine their ability to support contingency, operation plans, projects and other programs. The automated replies to those transactions provided general estimates of the type of supply support that could be anticipated and also provided on-hand and due-in data. **DISCUSSION:** Mr. Jim Fazzio, DLA J-33, provided the PRC with a briefing on DLA recommended alternatives to LASE. He indicated that when DLA implemented EBS, the LASE functionality was not included in the design. Mr. Fazzio said that the only Services submitting LASE transactions to DLA are Army, and to a much lesser degree, the Navy. DLA has not responded to LASE transactions submitted to EBS (Routing Identifier Code SMS). DLA has made efforts to reach out to the Services to determine if these transactions are still needed, but no responses have been received. A draft PDC has been sent to DLMSO outlining alternative options to LASE. These alternatives include a Supportability Analysis Tool and Stock Out Report available in EMALL. These reports are scheduled to be merged into a single report. Ms. Kara Cronin, EMALL PMO, provided a demonstration of these alternatives. For the Stock Out report, the Weapon System (WS) option was demonstrated. It displayed all NSNs associated with a selected WS and highlighted each "stock out" or "nearing stock out" NSN

and provided its projected get well date. The Supportability Tool was demonstrated using a single NSN inquiry, but it can be inquired by a multiple NSN technique. This tool displayed data pertinent to the NSN, including its essentiality code, monthly consumption rate, lead times and backorders. It was suggested that when these reports are combined that a summary capability by various keys be added in order to enhance its usefulness, e.g., ability to provide summary totals of all NSNs for a specific WS with stock out or near stock out conditions by selected essentiality code(s). **SUBSEQUENT** to the meeting Ms. Cronin provided screen shots of both the Supportability Analysis Tool and the Stock Out Report. These are available on the Supply PRC Web page (refer to the meeting agenda). Other alternatives to LASE include Integrated Data Exchange (IDE) and extensive data feeds provided by DLA that include information on individual NSNs. It was requested that DLA provide a description of each of the data feeds. There was also discussion that some data that was available in the LASE process may be missing from the proposed alternatives, to include, but not limited, to war reserve material. The draft PDC needs to be updated and submitted to DLMSO for staffing. Also, DAASC was asked to determine if the Asset Support Request (DIC BTA) were currently being sent to other systems not just EBS. **ACTION:** DLA to rewrite the PDC outlining alternatives to LASE, to include identifying LASE data that is missing from the alternatives, and provide a write-up on the data feeds currently being sent to Services. DAASC determine if LASE transactions are being sent to other systems within DOD.

   n. Requisitioning in Support of Performance Based Logistics (PBL). This is an on-going issue from previous Supply PRC meetings. Refer to SPRC Meeting 07-1 minutes for background. Ms. Hilert informed the group that she had attended a July meeting on this topic with DLIS and Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program Office. A copy of the draft DLMS change proposal for requisitioning and establishing multiple sources of supply previously prepared and discussed with the Supply PRC was provided to DLIS. **ACTION:** Ms Hilert will link a copy of the DLIS/JSF meeting minutes to the SPRC 07-2 agenda.

   o. Mode of Shipment Code Conversion Table. Ms. Hilert reported that she is working on a project to identify problems with implementation of the Mode of Shipment Code Conversion Table. This table supports compliance with the ANSI X 12 standards for transmission of transactions, while maintaining DOD codes for internal use. Recent updates to the table authorized by the Defense Transportation E-Business (DTEB) Committee and the USTRANSCOM were not fully communicated or adopted resulting in communication problems for WAWF and possibly for other DLMS users. **ACTION:** DLMSO is working with USTRANSCOM under a BTA tasking to clarify implementation status, issues, and the best way forward. The SPRC will be included on distribution of a survey being prepared to obtain more information from the Components.

_____   Approved:_____
ELLEN HILERT   DONALD C. PIPP
Supply PRC Chair   Defense Logistics Management
                                         Standard Office

Enclosure