IN REPLY
REFER TO   DLMSO

November 25. 2009

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Supply Process Review
Committee (SPRC) Meeting 09-01, October 28-29, 2009

The attached minutes of the DLMS Supply PRC Meeting (09-01) are forwarded for your
information and appropriate actions. 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@dla.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

DLMSO

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Supply Process Review
Committee (SPRC) Meeting 09-01, October 28-29, 2009

Purpose: Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) hosted the subject
meeting at the KGS Office in Fairfax, Virginia. Specific discussion topics are noted below. A list of
attendees is shown at Attachment 1. All meeting handouts and briefing material are available on the SPRC
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 Chair and Ms. Mary Jane
Johnson, MILSTRAP Administrator facilitated discussion.

Review of Meeting Topics: Action items specified below are due <u>14 days from the date of the
memorandum unless</u> otherwise indicated.

      **a. Status Update on Defense Logistics Manuals (DLMs) and combining Defense
Logistics Standard System (DLSS) and Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Manuals.**
Ms. Johnson briefed the committee on two separate DLMSO initiatives to publish both the DLSS and
DLMS manuals as DLMs and to combine DLSS and DLMS. The draft Department of Defense Instruction
(DoDI) 4140.1 designates publication of the DLSS/DLMS manuals as DLMs. Once the DODI is staffed
and approved, the DLSS/DLMS manuals will be sent to publications as DLMs and will be available on the
DLMSO website as drafts pending final publication. Once approved and signed, the final DLMs will also
be available on the website. Ms. Johnson said that the DLMs will incorporate numerous ADCs not yet
published.   It is anticipated that the new DLMs will be finalized and published within 180 days. Ms.
Smith, OSD, Supply Chain Integration, emphasized that changing DLSS/DLMS manuals to DLMs does not
change the authority of these manuals; they are applicable DoD wide and compliance is required. Ms.
Johnson also discussed the initiative that will combine the DLSS and DLMS. She said that the
DLSS/DLMS procedures are covered by multiple sets of manuals and that DLMSO no longer has the
resources to maintain separate sets, which is resource intensive, duplicative in nature and no longer
practical. DoD 4140.1-R mandates the move to DLMS procedures and the Components are migrating to
the DLMS. Based on this rational, DLMSO will move toward combining DLSS manuals with the DLMS
manual. This will be a multi-step process which will maintain visibility of DLSS peculiar terminology
where applicable and better align DLMS Volume 2 chapter structure to that of the present DLSS chapter
structure.   The appendices covering DLSS codes and formats will be removed from manuals and will
reside on the DLMSO website.

      b. Monitoring for Requisition Priority Abuse. Ms. Hilert provided the committee with copies
of the Logistics Reports that are available via the DAASC Web under Logistics Reports. These reports
allow the Components to monitor their activities for requisition priority abuse. Components are required to
review these Priority Designator (PD) reports periodically to monitor those activities that are assigning
Requisition PDs that they are not authorized, and to assign and take corrective actions as appropriate.

ACTION: All Components review reports and contact those activities who are using requisition PDs for which they have no authority. In addition, All Components are requested to review current downgrading rules at DAASC and offer any additional methods by which requisitions could be systemically downgraded (e.g., by the structure of the DoDAAC). This includes GSA, who is responsible for all the numeric DODAACs. In reviewing the reports there appeared to a problem with the totals in the Summary Report. **Subsequent to the meeting** Air Force reported that investigation into the top two activities misusing Requisition Priority Designators indicated that they were Air Force ROTC units which had already been cautioned not to use PD 01 for their requisitions. In addition the Air Force will determine if there is a systemic edit that will reduce the misuse of PD 01 assignments. **ACTION: DAASC** review the reports and determine if corrections are required in the totals column. In addition, Major McGuire, the representative from the Joint Staff who called into the meeting was requested to provide the Components points of contact within their Service who work with the Joint Staff on this issue. **ACTION: Major McGuire** provide a list of Component POCs. Also discussed was ADC 279 that established procedures for GSA compliance with MILSTRIP business rules for requisition priority validation for Force or Activity Designator I (F/ADI) activities on requisitions submitted directly to GSA for purchase of GSA managed items. GSA anticipates implementation by the end of 2009. **ACTION: Ms. Hilert** will re-staff a proposed DLMS enhancement, previously coordinated as PDC 29, which will address requisitioning in support of deployed or off-station F/AD I units which allows for identification of the authorized activity by DoDAAC when it is not carried in the document number or supplemental address.

c. **Logistics Reassignment and GSA (MILSTRAP DZC/DZD Process).** This discussion involves items which were involved in the Logistics Reassignment (LR) Program which changed ownership from the Navy and Air Force to GSA. There appears to be some problem with how the LR process was accomplished because GSA does not have valid RICs for the location of the material and therefore couldn't send MROs to attrite the stock. GSA has been working with the Services to determine where the material is located and ensure it is in GSA ownership so MROs can be sent to the proper location. There was also a question on how the material is processed at the DLA depots where most of it is located Discussion regarding the storage activity RICs which GSA indicated were involved, revealed that this seemed to be a problem related to assets stored at Air Force and Navy depots rather than DLA. **ACTION: DLA** to document the process currently performed at the DLA depots with regard to LR. **GSA** (Mr. Chuck Garvey) to provide Air Force (Mr. Tom Frantz) and Navy (Ms. Emily Burt-Hedrick) with the list of their Service storage activity RICs involved, and to work with them to resolve this issue.

d. **LASE Update.** The Army's response to PDC 301, Alternative to Logistics Asset Support Estimate (LASE) Process for the DLA Managed Assets Using DoD EMALL Supportability Analysis Stock Out Report Tool, indicated that their Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) would not use the LASE process but did not indicate an alternative. Ms. Johnson noted that LASE is a DOD requirement documented in MILSTRAP/DLMS. Army cannot unilaterally stop supporting a DOD requirement. If Army's modernized system will not support LASE, Army must submit a PDC to request elimination of the DOD LASE process or provide an Army alternative process. **ACTION: ARMY** to provide status on how the LASE process will be supported in LMP and if Army does not plan to support LASE in their modernized system, Army to submit a PDC requesting LASE process be eliminated, or identifying an Army alternative to LASE.

e. **Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Retail Supply, Storage and Distribution (SS&S)/Inventory Management and Stock Position (IMSP).** Ms. Annette Spry, DLA J-337 provided the committee with a briefing on the DLA and Navy implementation of BRAC at the Shipyards and Fleet Readiness Centers (FRCs). As a result of the BRAC, retail supply, storage and distribution functions and associated infrastructure support, Service industrial/maintenance sites will transfer to DLA. The intent of the decision is to significantly improve combat effectiveness while reducing costs by developing a world-class, cost-effective supply chain focused on readiness by eliminating waste, reducing touches, cost and

improving readiness. Several PDCs and ADCs have been submitted to document the new procedures and in some cases provide new DLMS transactions. Several action items resulted from the meeting and are outlined below: **ACTION: DLA:**

       (1). ADC 340, Catalog Data Exchange. Provide updated procedures to include a request for a waiver from the DoD requirement to use the unit of use stock number vice NSN for items identified to an NSN but issued in less that the unit of issue.

       (2). PDC 366, Requisition Advice Code Mission Support Material (MSM). Provide updated PDC that changes "Demand Signal" to "Requisition Alert" to comply with the DoD standard definition. This action is complete; refer to ADC 338.

       (**3) Draft PDC on New Code on Requisition for Support after Product Quality Deficiency Report (PQDR).** Provide updated PDC that includes DoD wide implementation. This PDC requests the assignment of a new Advice Code on a requisition that identifies a request for a replacement part after the submission of a PQDR. This would allow new material to be procured, rather than stock being issued from on hand quantities which could be defective. The PDC pertains to the Navy BRAC sites only. Ms. Hilert indicated that this could be a universal problem and may need to be available on a DoD-wide basis. Mr. Vitko, DLMSO, recommended use of a management code vice advice code as originally proposed. This action is complete; refer to PDC 380.

       (4) Virtual Receipt. Describe the process of what a virtual receipt is and how it will be utilized. **Subsequent to the meeting** DLA provided a description of the Virtual Receipt Process. There are two types of receipts this process will be used for. One is a receipt received into the Shipyard/FRC from the co-located DSS depot. A copy of the MRO confirmation (945A) produced by DSS will be sent to Shipyard/FRC Systems (MAT/MRP II) which will convert the confirmation into a "receipt" that will be processed in MAT/MRP II, a receipt confirmation send to the ICP and financial transactions will be sent to supporting Navy financial systems. The second type of receipt is material requisitioned by the Shipyard/FRC, but shipped from a non co-located site. In this case, the material is physically received by the DSS depot and transshipped to the Shipyard/FRC using a DSS Local Manifest. The information on the Local Manifest will be used to create the same transactions as described above. **ACTION:** DLA to prepare PDC documenting procedures.

       (5) DLA registered user for other Service NSNs. Determine how to become a registered user of other Services' NSN. This will be needed under the Navy BRAC implementation whereby DLA will requisition from the Military Service Source of Supply to obtain needed support for the BRAC industrial sites. **ACTION:** Services to provide response or POC for clarification of procedures.

     The following PDC s were discussed, but required no action by DLA at this time.

       (1) Draft PDC, Revise DS 846A Asset Reclassification. DLMSO does not agree with the use of the 846A to trigger movement of material within the warehouse. Further discussion with the BRAC team to consider another transaction failed to resolve the issues. Meetings will continue in the future. In addition, there was a discussion on the use of the 846A to change such data elements as Job Order Number, and Unit of Issue. This is a DLMS enhancement and should be considered by other Components for use in their systems. **ACTION:** DLMSO to finalize PDC for use of 846A for changing data elements such as Job Order Number.

       (2) Picklist. DLA/Navy has proposed a new process with unique data elements on a Picklist to be used by DSS. Ms. Hilert said that DLMSO has some concerns with the use of non standard data format.

f. ERP Status Update of Global Combat Support System (GCSS) Army.   Mr. Michael Kelley, Contractor Support for Army provided an update on GCSS development from a DLMS perspective. GCSS will provide tactical support to the Army replacing legacy systems such as the Standard Army Retail Supply System (SARSS). Implementation will be a phased approach with DLMS compliance by the 3rd quarter FY 10. Full deployment at all Army sites will be completed by FY 15. DLMSO provided DLMS training in May 2009 for 35 Army personnel. Monthly meetings continue as DLMSO, DAASC, and the Army continue to work together to identify required transactions and submit DLMS change requests. Ms. Hilert emphasized that GSCC Army should ensure DLMS enhancements are included in the design and development wherever feasible. Ms. Hilert requested that Navy provide a briefing on their ERP implementation at the next meeting. **ACTION: Navy** provide an update on their ERP implementation.

g. Customer and Ship-to Identification via EMALL and GSA Internet Ordering.   DoD policy requires the ability to determine which specific activities are buying material with purchase cards which requires the use of their own DODAAC.   DLMSO and DLA HQS requested business rule changes within DoD EMALL that would require use of a requisitioner DoDAAC (specific to each customer) to replace the use the generic EMALL DoDAACs. A partial solution was implemented in February 2009, to prohibit the use of the EMALL DoDAAC (SP5200) as the requisitioning DoDAAC for on-line ordering by contractors. However SP5200 could still be used by Government customers using credit/purchase cards. As of October 2nd, 2009,   a change was made so that SP5200 can no longer be used on EMALL as a requisitioning DODAAC. However, the Air Force requires that all their activities use an Air Force generic DODAAC (FA4440) when ordering from EMALL, which presents the problem of not being able to determine the activity that actually placed the order. No changes have been made to correct this problem. **ACTION: Air Force, EMALL, DLMSO and OSD** pursue corrective action based on OSD guidance.   An additional issue was discussed regarding the use of clear text addressing for internet ordering. Although DoD EMALL was previously authorized the use of clear text addressing for purchase card customers, the use of a DoDAAC is an essential element for Military Shipping Labels and the lack of a ship-to DoDAAC has proved problematic when these orders flow into the Defense Transportation System (DTS) resulting in frustrated freight at the ports. Mr. Bruce Propert, DoD OSD Project Management Office for Purchase Cards, said that the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) and Procedures, Guidance, and Information (PGI) 253.213-70 require the use of a DoDAAC versus a clear text address for material entering the DTS. Ms. Hilert requested verification of the procedures used by the DLA Call Centers when entering requisitions into EMALL to ensure use of valid customer DoDAACs. **ACTION: DLA/DoD EMALL** review call center procedures. **SUBSEQUENT to the meeting** DLA reported that the standard operating procedure used by the DLA Customer Interaction Center when creating EMALL orders for customers, is to use the customer DoDAAC, rather than a generic DoDAAC.

h. Standard Financial Information Structure (SFIS) DLMS Transactions. Mr. Cory Cunningham, BTA, and Mr. Bob Hammond, DLMSO briefed the committee on the implementation of SFIS. SFIS is way to define the process and the appropriate data elements to enable efficient exchange of financial information to support a common understanding across Supply Chain Management and Financial Management functional areas for ERP systems. The objective is to reduce manual reconciliation efforts between billing and ordering components in an interoperable environment. Within the draft proposed DLMS change, there are two alternative business processes outlined for consideration. One is to pass delineated SFIS data elements in the required transactions and the other is that SFIS required content applicable to the billed/credit account will be maintained on an SFIS Compliant Reference Table (Centralized Registry) with trading partners identifying accounts using a short-key (the Fund Code).   Mr. Hammond asked that all Components review the proposed options for exchanging information and the DLMS transactions requiring SFIS data so that a SFIS PDC can be finalized.   **ACTION: All Components** review and provide comments on the proposed options to exchange information.   Also review DLMS transactions requiring SFIS data, as well as the transactions identified as requiring no SFIS

data to verify the accuracy and provide comments to DLMSO. There was also a discussion regarding additional data elements applicable to FMS that may need to be identified in the PDC. **ACTION: The Security Cooperation Enterprise Solution (SCES) Program Office** provide additional data elements for incorporation into the PDC.   Next steps include identifying additional exchange processes; determining preferred exchange process; agree on the required SFIS data, and exchange business rules, and formal coordination of these via SFIS PDC with Supply and Finance PRC.

   i. Material Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA). DLMSO presented a demonstration of the On-Line Material Receipt Acknowledgement Report (MRA) tool at the DAASC website, and briefed the status of their effort to review and improve current MRA reports developed by DAASC based upon requirements in MILSTRAP, DOD 4000.25-M, Chapter 6. These reports are intended to be a tool used by the Services/Agencies to evaluate MRA submissions and ensure compliance with the DOD MRA requirements.

  DLMSO discussed several changes made to the reports based upon their review, to include:

   (1) Data collection errors which have been corrected.
   (2) Percentages and dollar values which have been added to Summary and Detail Reports.
   (3) Separation of the NO MRA report into two separate reports - by stock shipment and by direct vendor delivery shipment.
   (4) Discontinuing the requirement for supplemental MRA reports by commodity.

 Future report revisions include:

   (1) Development of HELP screens to the on-line reports at DAASC.

   (2) Changes to data collection logic to:
    (a) count all MRA data in the Service report of the ship to DODAAC, vice the Service report of the requisitioner, unless the ship to DODAAC is a DSS depot.
    (b) count all MRA data in the Service Report of the requisitioner's DODAAC if the signal code points to an invalid ship to DODAAC.
    (c) Amend eligibility business rules to require a requisition to, or material release order from, a wholesale Inventory Control Point.

   (3) Possible development of additional standard reports, such as:
    (a) The full suite of MRA Reports by Service.
    (b) A new NO MRA report which consolidates stock shipments and DVD shipments into a single TOTAL NO MRA report in the new format.

Although work with DAASC to improve these reports will continue, the new reports described in the DLMSO briefing are expected to be available on-line in early 2010.

By email dated 9/24/2009, DLMSO asked each SPRC representative to confirm their ability to access LOGREPORTS within DAASC (confirmed by Navy, Army, and DLA), and to analyze the August 2009 MRA Reports and be prepared to discuss the results of their analysis. This discussion was to include each Services' assessment of their MRA response rate and corrective actions planned where shortfalls exist. This should include assessment of your Service's implementation of the MRA process within your current Service system(s).   Only the Navy was prepared to discuss this in detail. Completion of the Navy effort is on-going, with a final response back to DLMSO by February 15, 2010.   Also address any transactions which the Services believe are incorrectly captured in the NO MRA reports, such as the requisitioning scenario

employed which requires the accountable receipt from other than procurement to go back to the Service ICP in lieu of the MRA. Include the key to identifying these orders, based upon information contained in the transaction, which can enable DAASC to systemically eliminate them from the reports. Except as documented here, **actions required by the 9/24/2009 DLMSO tasking REMAIN OPEN FOR ALL OTHER Components with status due November 30, 2009. ACTIONS:**

              1. DUSD(L&MR)SCI tasking: All Components must confirm that all ERPs are including MRA functionality into new system development - both wholesale and retail, and that all Service ERPs are including the ability to carry the Transportation Control Number (TCN) in the MRA (DLMS 527R) per the ADC 247 requirement. **NOTE:** Confirmed by Navy, so this action is complete for Navy only**.**

              2. DUSD(L&MR)SCI tasking: It was reiterated by OSD that the status of the MRA process within all Service legacy systems is **still required.**

              3. All Components are to report any problems encountered using the On-Line MRA Reports, as well as any additional enhancements desired. **NEGATIVES ARE REQUIRED.**

              4. All Components are required to identify how each Service uses record position 7 (rp 7) of the MRA transactions (MILSTRAP DI Code DRA/DRB) for U.S. forces shipments. This information is critical for DAASC mapping to the DLMS 527R MRA - especially if rp 7 is being used for something other than a partial or split shipment code.

              5. Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard and GSA provide status of DAASC LOGREPORTS inquiry capability

       j. Material Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA) Passive radio frequency identification analysis. Ms. Kathy Smith, OSD, SCI briefed the committee on a study to compare pFRID tag reads at receiving locations in Hawaii versus MRA submissions. The comparison was done to determine the cause of MRAs not being submitted as required by policy within 24 hours of recording receipt. All shipments going from Defense Depot Pearl Harbor to customers on Hawaii were analyzed from January 1st through June 30th, 2009. Of the 45,000 shipments made (99.9% of which had pRFID tags), 5,600 had a read at destination, but no MRA. Ms. Smith said that the scope of this issue warrants attention. Several efforts are underway to resolve this issue which includes the MRA process being discussed at the quarterly 0-6 level Partnership Agreement Council (PAC) meetings at DLA; DLA continues to work with DAASC to ensure MRA transactions are being passed correctly and the SPRC is working with the Services on specific examples to resolve systemic errors. A review of MRA business rules may be required to document when MRAs are not required due to the use of an accountable receipt. Results of these efforts will be reported back to the SCCG at a future meeting. There was a discussion regarding ERP's ensuring appropriate MRA functionality. Ms. Smith directed the Components to provide this information. **ACTION: ALL COMPONENTS** provide information regarding the availability of MRA functionality in ERPS currently and if not when it will be available. Also provide information as to the capability of the systems to properly recognize document number suffixes and Transportation Control Numbers (for partial shipments) in the MRA process.

       k. Item Unique Identification (IUID) OSD Workshops/JLB Task Force. Ms. Kathy Smith provided an update on the IUID Workshops/JLB Task Force. The OSD/SCI Workshops were established to identify requirements that can be used as the framework for detailed business rules to enable the use of IUID in logistics transactions/processes. The workshops were held with the DoD Components during the first half of CY 09 to develop requirements/ business rules to be finalized and socialized via an iterative, collaborative DLMS Process Review Committee/Proposed DLMS (PDC) process. The workshops were

held on receipt and discrepancy reporting, issue, inventory and potential levels of management intensity. Final policy and business rules are being held in abeyance as the JLB Task Force validates the IUID implied value. The task force products include a validated value proposition for key value chains across all applicable logistics notes; a set of integrated, prioritized and time-phased requirements for IUID marking, tracking and use across the value chains; recommended policy and guidance adjustments and an action briefing for the JLB.

l. PDC 331, Procedures for Pre-positioned Materiel Receipt (PMR) and Shipment Status for Retrograde and Directed Discrepant/Deficient Materiel Returns. This change provides notification of the shipment (via shipment status) of a returned/retrograde item of supply and an establishment of an appropriate pre-positioned materiel receipt (PMR). It proposes modification of the DLMSO Supplements 856R and 527D and associated business rules to discretely identify a reason for materiel return and provide a matching PMR and materiel returns shipment status to the receiving activity. This PDC was sent out to the Components and several comments were received by DLMSO. The documentation will be updated and distributed as a DRAFT ADC for coordination of comment resolution and enhancements prior to formal publication. Ms. Hilert asked that two specific areas be addressed by the committee. **ACTION All Components** verify that the cross-reference number for the original requisition number when it differs from the turn-in document number will be used on the PMR and review the list of code values on chart 8. In a related discussion, Mr. Vitko, KGS support to DLMSO, suggested that a return associated with the transaction FTA should be added to the list and Ms. Hilert agreed to consider that addition. Discussion regarding comments provided by the Army resulted in questions as to specifically which system within the Army will provide PMRs. **ACTION:** Army verify that PMRs will be provided by all systems, to include LMP, for all applicable receipts, not just those directed by returns of discrepant material.

m. DLMS Changes recently approved, in staffing or under development and old Requests for Implementation (RFID) need a fresh look.

(1) AMCL 5 (MILSTRAP) and 13 (MILSTRIP), Date Packed/Expiration Date for Subsistence Items. The request for implementation date is on hold pending DLA validation of the requirement. **ACTION: DLA to** validate the requirement. **Subsequent to the meeting**, DLA indicated that the requirements outlined in AMCL 5 and 13 are no longer valid. The AMCLs will be cancelled.

(2) Draft PDC 374, Add Contract Number to MRA for Government Furnished Materiel (GFM). This PDC will require that contractors receiving GFM from a DoD supply source acknowledge receipt of the GFM by providing an MRA which contains the contract number that authorized the contractor to receive the GFM. During the discussion, Navy indicated that under the Navy Commercial Asset Visibility (CAV) system, an accountable receipt is sent to the ICP by contractors receiving GFM. In those cases no MRA is required, however, the contract number should be provided on the accountable receipt. Ms. Johnson, will modify the draft PDC accordingly and release for staffing.

(3) Open Requests for Implementation Dates. The process for establishing implementation dates for approved DLMS changes with the Components is normally done after resolution of the comments on PDCs with a letter from DLMSO requesting a preferred implementation. DLMSO would then announce a DoD implementation date through dissemination of an ADC. For the past few years DLMSO has gotten away from this process because many of the Components were in the process of developing ERPs, not making changes in legacy systems and were unable to provide projected implementations. Since some of the

Components have now implemented ERPs or will be shortly, it was determined that coordinating implementation dates has again become an important planning tool to assist in implementing changes. Unfortunately, the use of a separate request to obtain implementation dates has not been very successful. There are several ADCs with open implementation dates that require Components action. Ms. Johnson provided a handout addressing some, but not all, of the approved changes with open request for implementation date actions for some or all Components. The handout also addressed an open action for DLMSO on ADC 12, Revised Logistics Reassignment (LR) Procedures. ADC 12 approved a major revision to the LR process and a request for implementation date was released in 1998. In 2002 the SPRC concluded that the request was premature as Components were unable to establish an implementation date for modernized systems at that time. It was agreed that Components must assure modernized systems were aware of the ADC 12 requirements, and need for joint implementation when applicable. DLMSO will update ADC 12 for consistency with current MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP manuals numbering, and reissue as a new request for implementation date. In the interim, the current RFID for ADC 12 is available for Component review/consideration on the DLMSO website at: http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlmso/eLibrary/Changes/rfid.asp. **ACTION: (1) ALL Components** provide updated implementation dates, as noted on the meeting handout, for **AMCL 13,** Partial Reversal of Select MILSTRAP Transactions; **ADC 38,** SPR Process Minimum and Maximum Quantity Checks and New SPR Status Codes, and **ADC 313**, Revise DS 527R to Add Code for MILSTRP DRB Functionality and to Address Enhancement for Advice Codes Used with 527R Receipt and Response to Inquiry for Materiel Receipt.   These responses should be directed to Mr. James Galloway, DLMSO. **Subsequent to the meeting** DLA provided a response to ADC 278 and the Navy reported that there is a moratorium/blackout on changes to Logistics IT Systems, and responses to RFID requests cannot be provided at this time.   **(2) DLMSO** to update ADC 12 and reissue as a new request for implementation date within 6 months of the date of these minutes.

(4) Draft PDC 377, Linear Bar Coding to Automate Data Capture for Serialized Item Shipments (Addendum Page/Container-Packing List).   DLMSO is evaluating restructuring this PDC to fulfill IUID requirements by including linear bar code for the UII in addition to the serial number and potentially using PDF 417 2D symbol in addition to the linear bar code. Ms. Hilert asked for unofficial emails from the Components to help in shaping the direction of the PDC. The PDC will be released for official staffing in the near future.

_____/signed_____   Approved:_____/signed_____
ELLEN HILERT   DONALD C. PIPP
Supply PRC Chair   Director
                                                                       Defense Logistics Management
                                                                       Standards Office