



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

August 5, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting 15-02, Focused on Materiel Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA), June 24, 2015

The attached minutes of the DLMS Supply PRC Meeting 15-02 are forwarded for your information and action as appropriate.

The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office points of contact are Ms. Ellen Hilert, (703) 767-0676, DSN 427-0676; or email ellen.hilert@dla.mil, Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, (703) 767-0677; or email mary.jane.johnson@dla.mil, Ms. Heidi Daverede, (703) 767-5111 or email heidi.daverede@dla.mil.

DONALD C. PIPP
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:
ODASD (SCI)
ODASD DPAP (PDI)
Supply PRC
Attendees



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

August 5, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting 15-02, Focused on Materiel Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA), June 24, 2015

Purpose: The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) hosted the subject meeting at DLA Headquarters and via Defense Collaboration Service (DCS) for remote participants. A list of attendees, the meeting agenda, and briefing materials are available on the Supply PRC webpage: www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/Programs/Committees/Supply/supplyPRC.asp. Meeting related material is hyperlinked to each of the topics in the meeting agenda file.

Brief Summary of Discussion: Ms. Mary Jane Johnson (Supply PRC Co-Chair/DOD MILSTRAP Administrator), Ms. Ellen Hilert (Supply PRC Co-Chair/DOD MILSTRIP Administrator), and Ms. Heidi Daverede (Supply PRC Co-Chair/DOD MILSTRIP Alternate) facilitated discussion. The Action Item Tracker contains the final approved action items for Supply PRC Meeting 15-2 and the current status of action items for Supply PRC (MRA Focus) Meeting 13-3. The Supply PRC 15-2 action items start at **Action Item 22** on the tracker. The most recent version of the Action Item Tracker will be posted to the Supply PRC webpage. Action item due dates are identified in the Action Item Tracker. During the review of open action items, the Components were requested to provide status of all open action items from Supply PRC 13-03 by July 15, 2015. **See Action Items 1 - 21.**

All new action items from Supply PRC 15-02 are due by September 1, 2015 unless otherwise indicated. **See Action Items 22-41.**

Review of Meeting Topics:

a. Agenda Topic 1 - Open Action Items from Supply PRC Meeting 13-03.

Components were requested to provide status of all open action items from Supply PRC Meeting 13-03 by July 15, 2015 as these items are almost two years old.

(1) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 6. DLA presented a briefing during the SPRC 15-2 update on processes with known MRA Gaps which DLA is working to close (gaps initially addressed at Supply PRC Meeting 13-3, include, but not limited to, DLA Maintenance Repair and Operations (MRO) and DLA Industrial Prime Vendor (IPV)).

(2) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 7. Navy identified a new MRA gap. When an out-of-scope (external to Navy ERP) customer orders a DLA-managed item (9 COG) that is sourced from Navy assets (via Real-time Reutilization Asset Management (RRAM), Naval Air Station (NAS) or co-located DLA distribution center), Defense Automatic Addressing System (DAAS) logic cannot determine which activity issued the materiel; and; therefore, sends the MRA to DLA (source of supply (SoS)), which did not issue the material. When this occurs, the shipping activity does not have a record of the MRA and will continue to send follow-up transactions. Next step is to consult R-Supply and DAAS subject matter experts to assess the possibility of removing the DAAS logic.) **See Action Item 22.**

(3) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 8. The Navy provided input that the Navy Single Supply Baseline initiative is discontinued and replaced with the Naval Operational Supply System (NOSS), which is a component of Navy Operational Business Logistics Enterprise (NOBLE) and will fix the known MRA gaps by including the capability to release MRA actions automatically. Planned implementation by FY20. This Action Item is closed but a new action item is opened to address whether the New MRA Gap identified in Action Item 7 and the existing issue identified in the new Action Item 23 are included in the NOSS solution. **See Action Item 22.**

(4) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 9. The Navy provided input that the Routing Identifier Code (RIC) XZZ is not a pseudo RIC but is a pseudo SoS in the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) per DoD 4100.39-M. DLMSO agrees with the DoD 4100.39-M discussion of a the RIC XZZ being used as a pseudo SoS, but did not see where this was relevant to the action item as addressed in the Supply PRC 13-03 meeting notes. The Supply PRC 13-03 meeting notes identified this was an issue related to an R-Supply afloat system not putting the correct RIC-To in their MRA transactions. The system was picking up the depot RIC versus the inventory control point (ICP) RIC. Navy indicated they will reevaluate the response to this action item after reviewing the discussion from Supply PRC 13-03. Action Item 9 is closed and a new action item opened for the additional review. **See Action Item 23.**

(5) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 10. The Navy noted a system change request was in the works to remove the “No MRA Required” policy programmed into their enterprise resource planning (ERP) system. The Navy agreed to provide an updated defect number and HEAT tracking number used to document this change and an estimated implementation date. **See Action Item 24.**

(6) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 11. The Army confirmed that the follow-up for a delinquent MRA was not being sent from their Logistics Modernization Program (LMP). Army will provide the system change request number and the implementation status. Action item 11 remains open to provide the response regarding remaining MRA gaps. **See Action Item 25.**

(7) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 12. Approved DLMS Change (ADC) 247 transportation control number (TCN) discussion – no update from Army on implementation of ADC 247. ADC 247 adds the TCN for the shipment unit TCN from the shipment status to the DLMS 527 MRA and receipt transactions.

(8) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 13. Navy continues to evaluate this action item for implementation of ADC 247, which adds the TCN to the MRA and receipt. The Navy raised a question regarding whether inclusion of the document number suffix (if provided) is required

when sending the MRA (DLMS 527R, 1/BR02/020, TH, legacy DIC DRA). Ms. Johnson clarified that the TCN and suffix must be used in the receipt when available, and should be perpetuated to the MRA (See DLM 4000.25 extract below). Navy will take an action to address ADC 247 at their next Supply Council Meeting. **Action Item remains open.**

DLM 4000.25, Volume 2, Chapter 10, paragraph "C10.2.6. Acknowledgement of Split or Partial Shipments. When a shipped line item (requisition document number and suffix code) is consigned as a split or partial shipment, submit an MRA, for the shipment segments as they are received. The split or partial shipment codes are part of the transportation control number (TCN) structure in accordance with DTR 4500.9-R, DoD Transportation Regulation". Accordingly, reporting activities will include the TCN in the MRA transaction when it is available. If the total quantity for the shipped line item is not received by the due-in date, report the missing quantity, citing Discrepancy Indicator Code F, in accordance with the guidance in the MRA transaction."

(9) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 14. Air Force noted that the implementation status to eliminate the MRA workaround process on the retail side is scheduled for August 2016 with the rest of the Air Force intransit requirement package. Air Force will provide the updated ADC 247 implement status for the wholesale side and provide the change number for both sides. DLMSO took an internal action item to ensure the DLMS Status Review is updated for ADC 247 as the Components provide system change numbers and related implementation info. **See updated Action Item 14 (USAF) and 26 (DLMSO).**

(10) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 15. The Marine Corps is working to provide an implementation schedule for ADC 247 and will advise.

(11) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 16. DLA is looking for additional financial justification to assign a higher priority to their implementation of ADC 247 which is assigned under RFC# BOF-C15-0020. The DLA implementation of ADC 247 has not gone forward to the alignment group and DLA has been unable to identify a financial justification to support ADC 247. DLA questioned when the Services would implement ADC 247 in their systems, and should DLA implementation wait until then. DLA needs to be able to track partial shipments based on Services providing the TCN per ADC 247, if the full quantity shipped is not acknowledged. DLMSO noted that DLA should not be dependent on the Services for their own implementation.

Mr. Pete Talamonti, Air Force support contractor for AFMC/HAIR, asked if the Follow-up for Delinquent MRA (Legacy DIC DRF) will be done by TCN. Ms. Johnson noted that legacy DIC DRF (Follow-up for Delinquent MRA) requires the shipment unit number (shipment unit number to be interpreted as TCN). The requirement was not added by ADC 247; it was an existing legacy DRF requirement. The TCN is also identified as required in the corresponding DLMS 527R Follow-up for Delinquent MRA.

The Army commented that they only retain the last received TCN. The TCN would be on the shipment status, and the receipt would be done on the lower level TCN. Army would have an issue if a non-receipt situation arose. Ms. Daverede commented that it sounds like the Army does not track the partial TCN and the benefit associated with retaining the partial shipment information will help track what is received and not received. If a shipment was partial, users should be able to address each TCN that was partial. Both Ms. Hilert and Ms. Johnson noted

the intent of ADC 247 was to put the TCN on the receipt when it is available, and perpetuate to the MRA.

Background: In the legacy DIC DRF, Shipment Unit Number, rp 60 – 76 indicates “Duplicate from the MRC or DIC ASH Shipment Status”.¹ While this does not specifically state the TCN, the TCN is required by Revised Addendum to Approved MILSTRIP Change Letter (AMCL) 138, dated May 30, 1996. Also, the legacy DIC AR_ Materiel Release Confirmation, rp 60 -76, clearly stipulates that this field is the TCN.

New action for DLMSO to review and clarify, as needed, the business rules for TCN on the Follow-up for Delinquent MRA (legacy DIC DRF) and the MRA Reply to follow-up.

See Action Item 27

(12) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 17. DLMSO requested the Services feedback on their procedures to ensure that the proper suffixes are identified in the MRA transactions to align with the suffixes identified in the corresponding shipment status.

(13) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 18. The Marine Corps noted that the support currently provided by the contractor logistics support (CLS) RIC LA9 (Oshkosh Truck), is transitioning to DLA in the near future and will make this issue obsolete. Marine Corps will provide target date. **See Action Item 18.**

(14) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 19. Navy response on June 16, 2015 noted the two examples provided identify that the site/user copied the last transaction they received (AE1 status) and changed the DIC to DRA. In doing this, the structure/record positions (RP) did not match the DRA layout. This was an isolated error with two manually generated transactions and does not represent an ongoing programming problem. Action Item is closed.

(15) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 20. GSA was requested to provide an update to the results of their internal analysis of why some shipment status transactions are not being sent and remedy to be consistent with MILSTRIP procedures.

(16) SPRC 13-03, Action Item 21. Army was requested to provide an update on Army-directed shipments that result in MRA transactions with no corresponding shipment status. Shipment status and MRA are mandatory if coming from wholesale asset

b. Agenda Topic 2 - MRA Report Overview and Demonstration. Mr. Paul Jensen, DLMSO Contractor Support, provided an overview of the MRA requirements to include applicability, MRA submission, follow-up, follow-up response timeframes, and exclusions from MRA reporting. He also explained the MRA Report criteria used to determine whether an MRA was received or not received. Component Supply PRC representatives, or designees, are required to analyze the MRA Report on a monthly basis to identify potential deficiencies in their Service or Agency MRA procedures that contribute to breakdowns in internal controls for in-transit wholesale stock and coordinating corrective action with delinquent/non-reporting activities. Three MRA-related ADCs were released in the past year and are available on the ADC page of the DLMSO Website www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms0. Formal Change 5 to DLM 4000.25,

¹ Based on November 1993 implementation of MILSTRIP AMCL 138; otherwise priority is entered in record positions 60-61.

DLMS, Volume 2, and DLM 4000.25-2, MILSTRAP, were posted to the DLMSO Website publication page on June 16, 2015. Formal Change 5 updates the publications with numerous ADCs, to include the following related to MRA. Formal Change 1 to DLM 4000.25-4, Defense Automatic Addressing System (DAAS) was also published and incorporated the MRA ADCs.

- ADC 1086 – Create New MRA Source of Supply Report, Create Requisition/Initial Supply Transaction Download File and Eliminate Shipment Discrepancy Report by Depot.
- ADC 1087 – Revise MRA Report Selection Criteria to Reflect the MRA Process Exclusion for Receipt Transaction Reporting.
- ADC 1088 – Joint Supply/Logistics Metrics Analysis Reporting System (LMARS) Changes to the MRA Report Criteria and Documentation of MRA Report Business Rules.

Mr. Jensen briefly described the eleven MRA Reports, including the three new Source of Supply MRA Reports established by ADC 1086, and then used the on-line Transaction Services MRA Reports tool to demonstrate the reports. The demonstration included a typical MRA Stock Shipment scenario and several scenarios using the new MRA Source of Supply (Stock) report to show how MRA reports can be viewed from the perspective of the source of supply. Additionally the new ADC 1086 MRA Report download data capability was demonstrated and the following items were specifically noted:

- Emphasis on downloading the report regularly. The report is stored for 12 months, but detailed transaction history data is only available for 2 months.
- Initial Transaction column identifies the first relevant transaction available to DLA Transaction Services which may not always be the requisition.
- The Communications Routing Identifier (COMMRI) data was requested in the download file by the Army to help pinpoint issues from a particular system. COMMRI data will begin to populate after the MRA Report changes go into production starting with the June 2015 data as the MRA Reports cannot backfill the transaction history to obtain the COMMRI values. The three COMMRI values identified are:
 1. System originating the requisition (A0_, AT_, AM_ or other initial supply transaction)
 2. DoDAAC in the document number
 3. Where the Follow-up for Delinquent MRA transaction was sent

The following discussion was captured during the MRA Report Overview and Demonstration:

- Shipment status triggers the MRA process.
- DLA Transaction Services is working to address security issues with getting the Logistics Data Gateway (LDG) to be Common Access Card (CAC) enabled. Once this is resolved, then a future capability may be to put a link in WebVLIPS to take users to LDG for a more comprehensive review of transaction history.
- There is no enterprise level requirement to capture D-series (MILSTRAP) transactions other than DICs DRA, DRB, and DRF in WebVLIPS. Ms. Mary Maurer, DLA

Transaction Services contractor support, noted that there are Service-specific exceptions for other D-series transactions that are made available in WebVLIPS.

- During the MRA demonstration of the drill down link for WebVLIPS in the Stock Shipment Summary Report, MRA Not Received, Ms. Hilert asked about keeping history beyond the two months that show in the drill down data in WebVLIPS. Ms. Hilert did qualify the question as primarily related to using WebVLIPS data for SDR research and asked for additional time greater than two months for historical data. Ms. Maurer noted that WebVLIPS was never designed to retain a long history (retaining lots of old data creates a performance issue) and the production system is currently set for two months. Additionally the number of records in history was increased from 35 to 50. Additionally the purge date on all shipments was increased to 7 months past shipment receipt for SDR and all DRA/DRB data for is held for an additional 90 days after receipt by the customer. LDG does contain a greater range on historical data for the transaction history.
- Mr. Alexander (Archie) Morton, DLA J313M, commented on the new MRA by Source of Supply Report and asked about the view from DLA being just SMS and not by DLA supply chain. DLMSO noted this was just for the MRA perspective and the DLA requirement specifically noted it should be from SMS and not a view split out by DLA Supply Chains. Ms. Maurer noted that DLA Transaction Services used to publish a set of special reports for DLA called “Supply Chain Reports” but DLA cancelled the requirement. This report was unrelated to the MRA Reports. Mr. Morton was referred to Ms. Elaine Applegate, DLA Supply PRC representative, if he wanted to pursue the topic further.
- ADC 1087 (Ms. Hilert and Ms. Johnson). Army and Navy are not compliant with the process to follow-up for delinquent MRA, so Army and Navy are currently excluded from ADC 1087 implementation. Under ADC 1087, if an ICP does not follow-up for an MRA because their intra-Component business process requires submission of a Receipt transaction rather than an MRA, then that document number will not show up on the No MRA report. Army and Navy must be excluded from ADC 1087 until such time as they fully implement the Follow-up for Delinquent MRA process.

Subsequent to the Supply PRC Meeting, DLA completed their review the new SoS MRA Reports in the Logistics Reports test region and DLA Transaction Services put the changes into the Logistics Reports production system.

c. Agenda Topic 3 - Service Briefings on known Gaps in their MRA System Processes.

The following input was received from the Services noted:

- Army – Working on identifying gaps
- Navy – Working on identifying gaps
- Marine Corps – Working on identifying gaps
- Air Force – Asserts that they do not have any MRA gaps
- DLA – See Topic 4

Ms. Hilert noted that there is DASD (DPAP) interest in implementing ADC 390 which adds the contract number/call order number for GFP receipts. ADC 390 revised the DLMS 527R MRA and receipt functions to require the DOD contract number for transactions associated with government furnished materiel (GFM), and for MRAs associated with contractor furnished materiel (CFM). DLMSO is looking for implementation status of ADC 390 as the receipt

provides a good vehicle to update the GFP module of the Item Unique Identification (IUID) Registry. It is understood that DLA has completed the Enterprise Business Systems (EBS) programming to address ADC 390 requirements; however, it is not clear that the requirement has been incorporated in contracts and incorporation in all variations of FEDMALL MRA reporting must be confirmed. Input from the Services is required on their logistics systems ability to send/receive contract data for GFP on the receipt/MRA regardless of whether the receipt is done by the Management Control Activity (MCA), or a contractor system such as commercial asset visibility (CAV). **See Action Item 28**

d. Agenda Topic 4 - DLA Briefing on known MRA Gaps. Mr. Mark Lieberman, DLA J341, provided a summary of the DLA MRA gaps that included:

- Medical and Subsistence Prime Vendor programs are now doing MRAs (527R).
- Maintenance Repair & Operations (MRO) Program uses a tailored vendor relationship (TVR) type system that did not require an MRA via EDI when it was developed. DLA is working on an MRA solution using the 527R that will meet Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) requirements.
- Industrial Prime Vendor (IPV) Army and Air Force bin fill operations differ and DLA is working on draft PDC 1168 to develop a new DLMS 527R Source of Supply Delivery Acknowledgement (SDA) transaction in lieu of the MRA.
- Kentucky Logistics Center (KYLOC) is working to get shipment status from storage locations to enable DLA Transaction Services recognition of MRA applicability.
- ADC 199 – DLA is still looking for a method to address the requirement for an original document number (ODN) as the unique reference for each line under a single document number in a TVR scenario. See additional discussion in Topic 5 which addresses draft PDC 1170.

Ms. Daverede noted she is working with DLA J3 on a PDC to implement the authority code for some of these processes where the Services systems check up front whether the DoD activity address code (DoDAAC) is authorized to requisition, to act as a bill-to, or to act as a ship-to. Mr. Bob Hammond, DLMSO, Finance Process Review Committee Chair, noted the need to validate the fund code up front as well. Mr. Hammond commented that it is in the best interest of the provider to validate the authority code for the DoDAAC being used to help prevent unauthorized requisitions. Ms. Hilert noted that the DLA SMOK process could be modified to do the funds verification, which includes the DoDAAC authority code funds verification process as the intent is to do this systemically rather than using a manual process.

e. Agenda Topic 5 - Draft PDC 1170, Clarify DOD Military Standard Billing System Requirement for Detail Document Number in MRA for Tailored Vendor Relationship (TVR). Ms. Johnson provided the background for ADC 199, which allowed use of a contract number, call number and delivery order line item numbers with TVR MRA. She noted that DOD Interfund billing requirement for the TVR process was not addressed in ADC 199. DLA was to provide DLMSO with a DLMS, Volume 2 (Supply Standards and Procedures), chapter for the TVR process; however in the absence of a TVR chapter being provided, draft PDC 1170 updates the DLMS MRA chapter to address the billing requirement. PDC 1170 will clarify in DLMS Volume 2 and Volume 4 (Military Standard Billing System - Finance), the requirement to use individual document numbers with TVR MRA, in addition to the contract, call and delivery order line item numbers. The bottom line is to ensure the document number in the MRA

matches the document number in the order, by line item. This supports the existing DLMS Volume 4 requirements. Mr. Hammond emphasized that in processes, such as TVR, where orders are initiated outside of a Component's ordering systems, a mechanism is lacking to pass the obligation for each requisition to the Components' financial systems in order to clear detail Interfund bills at the line item level. In such cases, detailed bills may be "rolled up" into a single detail bill for multiple line items, which is not only an incorrect procedure, it inhibits the ability to perform a three way match between the obligation/order, receipt and bill and is a serious audit readiness issue for Components.

MILSBILLS states that:

C2.1.7. Obligations for Requisitioned Materiel. Establishing an obligation for the proper amount **under the requisition document number** is essential for the timely and automated processing of interfund bills. Failure to do so is a violation of financial management procedures and may delay processing and increase workload for both DFAS and submitting Component personnel. DoD Components that either (1) establish business processes for requisitioning outside their customer's Component sponsored supply system, (e.g., via internet ordering applications), or (2) authorize their own Component personnel to satisfy requirements through the use of external ordering processes, will support adherence to standard DoD financial business processes.

The preferred approach for passing obligation data from the source of supply to the Components' financial systems is the funds verification process developed initially for DOD EMALL and GSA Advantage that is addressed in MILSBILLS, Chapter 7. But, this process has currently only been implemented to Army and is not feasible for all business processes. Accordingly, a new DLMS 821 Financial Reporting Implementation Convention (IC) is being explored to provide a capability to pass obligation data from the source of supply to the Components' financial provide systems, including Standard Line of Accounting data elements. Once developed, the DLMS 821 procedures would be staffed as a PDC through finance, supply and other functional areas.

Mr. Chester Dabrowski, DLA Troop Support asked if planned enhancements for ensuring obligations are established assumes that we are getting unique document numbers on the customer orders? Mr. Hammond noted that in some cases the source of supply (e.g. DLA, GSA) would be creating unique document numbers on behalf of the Components, as is done in various business processes today.

f. Agenda Topic 6 - DLA MRA Exclusion for Immediate Issue Scenarios. Mr. Steve Loper, DLA is considering drafting a PDC to document an MRA exclusion for "Immediate Issue" scenarios (e.g., bearer walk-through or "over the counter" issues) where shipment status/materiel release confirmation is provided and an MRA would typically be expected.

g. Agenda Topic 7 - DRAFT PDC 1114 Change in timing to Follow-up for Delinquent MRA and for MRA Submission Based on Time Definite Delivery (TDD) Standards.

Mr. Steve Loper, DLA introduced the draft PDC 1114 and Ms. Daverede provided a briefing to explain how the TDD standards were used to identify proposed changes in MRA submission and follow-up timing. A key driver in this proposed change is that DLA, in their attempt to closeout receipts, is receiving less than 70 percent of MRAs for DVD materiel within 30 days and receiving less than 70 percent of Class II, IV and IX MRAs up to five months after shipment. The basis of DLA's concern is DODM 4140.01, Volume 5, Item Accountability and Control Policy for Materiel In-Transit, which states:

“The owning DoD Component directing materiel into an in-transit status will retain accountability within their logistics records for that materiel (to include resolution of shipping and other discrepancies) until the consignee or receiving activity formally acknowledges receipt.”

In draft PDC 1114, DLA proposes an automated follow-up for delinquent MRA transactions at a number of days beyond shipment that is aligned with the TDD standards.

DLA's proposed MRA follow-up timeframes, call for revised MRA submission timeframes that also consider TDD. Components should review draft PDC 1114, and the related DLMSO briefing, for a better understanding of how the revised MRA submission and follow-up timeframes based on TDD were derived. The end result was:

- CONUS (NORTHCOM). For a more consistent and reasonable MRA approach based on the narrow time difference for the three transportation categories in CONUS (NORTHCOM), the MRA timeframe for reporting non-receipt was revised to 12 days for all three transportation categories. For the MRA follow-up, three days were added to arrive at the CONUS Follow-up for Delinquent MRA timeframe of 15 days. The extra three days were added to allow time for processing a non-receipt MRA.
- OCONUS. The MRA timeframe for reporting non-receipt was revised to 26 days for both transportation category (TC) 1 and TC 2, and 76 days for TC 3. For the MRA follow-up, four days were added to arrive at the Follow-up for Delinquent MRA timeframe of 30 days for TC 1 and 2, and 80 days for TC3. The extra four days were added to allow time for processing a non-receipt MRA.

Benefits: The intent of this proposed change is for the customers and ICPs to execute the MRA process in a more timely, realistic manner, by factoring in the various TDD standards established by the United States Transportation Command in coordination with the Combatant Commanders that are used to optimize the overall supply chain. Aligning the follow-up timeframe with TDD timeframes will provide a more realistic MRA submission and follow-up timeframe based on negotiated TDD standards for when materiel should be received within a specific theatre. Based on the new follow-up timeframes, associated to TDD, ICPs should receive MRAs in a timelier manner in both CONUS and OCONUS, thus assisting DoD in avoiding additional costs (interest penalties).

On July 15, 20015, DLA concurred with the Draft of PDC 1114 that was provided by DLMSO prior to Supply PRC 15-02. DLMSO will finalize and staff PDC 1114 with the Supply PRC. **See Action Item 29.**

h. Agenda Topic 8 - DRAFT PDC 1168 (under development) New Source of Supply (SOS) Delivery Acknowledgement Transaction for Industrial Product-Support Prime Vendor (IPV) Program. PDC 1168 will document a new DLMS 527R SoS Delivery Acknowledgement (SDA) transaction to support DLA's Industrial Product-Support Vendor (IPV) program. DLA will use the new SDA transaction for posting goods receipt against wholesale materiel provided to retail customers, similar to the manner on which the DLA uses MRA transactions. Under DLA's IPV programs, the Military Services position is that the materiel is expensed when the bins (bench stock) are filled, and, therefore, the Services do not need to process a Receipt transaction to post the assets on their accountable property record. Since the Services are not processing a receipt, the Services also do not submit MRAs. The Services own the expensed materiel in the bin, but never record the materiel on their accountable record. Since there is no MRA transaction to document the receipt of wholesale materiel under the IPV program, DLA is developing new procedures to obtain the missing receipt acknowledgement by enabling DLA personnel to input an SDA via FEDMALL, based upon supporting shipping documentation and random sampling.

DLMSO will ensure that Ms. Jan Mulligan and Mr. Bob Carroll, ODASD(SCI) are notified when PDC 1168 is released for Component review/input as there is a possible policy gap under this process where the Services are billed for materiel that is never put on their accountable property record.

Several comments were made relative to this topic:

- Ms. Hilert noted that from the ODASD(SCI) perspective there are some policy concerns. When DLA took over the Service support they removed some of the existing procedures. In the IPV programs the bin (bench stock) replacement materiel is never picked up on the Services record. Ms. Hilert noted that prior to the implementation of the IPV programs, the Services initially had the bin replacement type materiel on their records and expensed the materiel when it was put in the bin. Under the new process, the contractor is delivering material for bin replacement and the materiel is never on the Service's record but the Service is billed.
- DLMSO has concerns for the overarching program and while the proposed process will be an improvement, there is still concern that there is no DoD level policy to support the revised business process. Ms. Daverede highlighted the materiel sampling controls that are being put into place with the IPV program and that there is an ongoing effort to address the related financial obligation piece of this process. Between DLA and the affected Services, a concerted effort is being made to improve processing and document the shared responsibility for the materiel accountability and the obligation on the finance side.

i. Agenda Topic 9 - Draft PDC 1089, Create Help Screens for MRA Report. This PDC is under development and is targeted for release in the first quarter of fiscal year 2016. DLMSO will draft either a PDC or administrative ADC for help screens for the on-line MRA Reports that will help users navigate the MRA Reports and:

- 1) explain the report options,
- 2) explain the report selection criteria, and
- 3) explain the data portrayed in the report.

See Action Item 30.

j. Agenda Topic 10 - MRA Exclusion for the Army and Air Force Exchange Service (Exchange). Ms. Johnson, briefed the background on this topic and DLMSO facilitated the follow-on discussion with the Supply PRC members and several individuals from DLA Troop Support who support the Exchange. Following an extensive review of the MRA Business Rules (including MRA exceptions) when developing ADC 1088, DLMSO recommended that DOD reconsider the MRA exclusion for the Exchange.

Current DLMSO Position – The policy in the DoDM 4140.01, DoD Supply Chain Materiel Management Procedures, February 10, 2014, Volume 5 – Delivery of Materiel, Enclosure 3, Paragraphs 8.a(3) and 8.b(5) requires processing of MRAs for receipt of all shipments of DOD wholesale materiel, whether requisitioned (pulled) or pushed to them, from any supply source, (e.g., issues from stock; or direct or prime vendor deliveries). MRA is emerging as a tool to support Audit Readiness, and is receiving focused attention from OSD, DLA and the Services.

After reviewing the basis for the original exclusion, DLMSO questioned the rationale for the 1988 MRA exemption and recommended that DOD reconsider this exclusion. An exemption based on the type of funding used by the Exchange does not seem to justify an exclusion from the MRA process. Further, the Exchange should not be treated as a non-DoD government agency. MRAs are under a great deal of scrutiny in DLA's Audit Readiness initiative and serve as evidentiary matter.

In-Transit Accountability Policy and Transporter Proof of Deliver impact on the Exchange – This topic morphed into a broader discussion of in-transit accountability policy and transporter proof of delivery as related to the Exchange scenario with significant input provided by DLA Troop Support participants.

In Ms. Johnson's briefing, slide 4 raised the question whether the Exchange MRA exclusion is still valid. The discussion highlighted the new in-transit accountability policy in DODM 4140.01, Volume 5, which mandates the seller maintain property accountability for in-transit materiel until the receipt of materiel is acknowledged. The DLA Troop Support Comptroller, Ms. Mary Anne Gardio, favors removing the exclusion based on accounting policy guidance from July 8, 2013 that requires customers post goods receipt. She noted the change in DLA policy to implement the defacto receipt that will automatically post the goods receipt from the customer 180 days after they receive the goods if an official receipt/receipt acknowledgment is not posted. This policy was based on the transporter proof of delivery (TPD). Ms. Ellen Hilert, DLMSO, noted that this process is not documented under the DLMS and that DLMSO expressed strong concerns when the topic of TPD and defacto receipt were first discussed. Mr. Carroll noted that all aspects of this need to be looked at.

Ms. Daverede noted that the scenario with the defacto receipt, if approved, needs something in OSD policy that authorizes it and limits the scope. This would give DLA top cover and support drafting a PDC to incorporate specific procedures in the Defense Logistics Manuals. The following points were made during the discussion of the DLA goods receipt policy:

- Mr. Loper noted this was a relatively tight policy that applied to a restricted population. Mr. Jim Weiner, DLA Distribution, noted the system change was not completed and said it was only for customer direct sales orders. Mr. Loper noted more specifically it was only those orders that are destination inspection and destination acceptance and over \$10,000. Ms. Gardio asked whether the Exchange was going to be excluded from this policy because in the draft policy she reviewed, there was an exclusion for the Exchange.

DLMSO noted that any exclusion was likely based on the current MRA procedures which excluded the Exchange.

- If a decision is made to remove the MRA exemption, a PDC will be staffed, and the implementation date will be a mutually agreed upon date such as the 2019 DLMS compliance date, the Exchange DLMS modernization date, or other date to be published in the ADC.
- Mr. Gary Colello, DLA Troop Support, Director of Customer Operations (C&T) asked whether the existing policy now shows a requirement that would remove the exception based on Audit Readiness (FIAR) and other policy. Mr. Colello felt the policy supports MRA, and DLA needs to go back to the Exchange and tell them that they need to be compliant and find a way to process the MRA.

Subsequent to the Supply PRC Meeting, Ms. Gardio forwarded a copy of an email from Mr. Tony Poleo, (DLA Finance) to the HQ Executive Board Principals on November 10, 2013 regarding the TPD policy discussion with OSD.

“Transporter Proof of Delivery (TPD) ... Ms. Reba, along Mr. Hobby and Mr. Beebe, met with Mr. Ginman [DPAP] and Mr. Peters [L&MR] regarding DLA proposal to incorporate TPD as a "de-facto" receipt when the customer does not provide materiel receipt acceptance. They approved concept and indicated we should move out while they address any associated policy changes. We'll discuss this concept in more detail at the next AR update on December 6th.”

See Action Items 31, 32, 33 and 34.

DLMS 856 Shipment Status and the EXCHANGE Migration to DLMS and Requisition

Closeout – Mr. Colello noted the Exchange has 180 clothing stores with about 300,000 requisitions per year and the MRA could be a tremendous burden as some of the stores are lightly staffed and many of the orders are for single items because the store may not carry a wide range of items due to space limitations. Ms. Hilert noted that the Exchange asked DLA to provide shipment status and resulted in the DLMS 856S Shipment Status being mapped into a format the Exchange could accept in their modernized system. This should pave the way to pick up the data in the MRA.

Mr. Carroll summarized that it appears there are multiple options to consider as a better understanding is gained regarding the review of the current/future architecture and options presented. The environment has changed, with the 180 day, "defacto receipt" and the new intransit accountability procedures, and we have to sort out all the pieces and determine whether additional DODM 4140.01 policy needs to be updated. **See Action Items 35, 36 and 37.**

k. Agenda Topic 11 - Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the MRA Exclusion for Shipments to Federal Agency Activities. FAA follows MILSTRIP guidance, so it logically follows that DOD customers should be generating MRAs to FAA. While FAA is modernizing to DLMS, will it be feasible to have FAA address MRA requirements in their modernized system? Mr. Ken Hatchel, FAA Supply PRC representative, noted the FAA's Logistics Center Support System (LCSS) is experiencing difficulty in coming online. LCSS is having some issues and a projected implementation data is not currently available. The FAA does not currently track out going shipments. Ms. Hilert asked whether the FAA ordering sites receipt materiel, and if receiving is centralized making it possible for FAA to submit the MRA as a by-product of the receipt

process. The FAA system does not accept an MRA today, but he felt the FAA should accept MRAs from the Services when the FAA is acting as a source of supply. On the customer side, the FAA does not generate MRAs, but he thought that they should. If DLMSO were to submit a draft PDC for FAA to review, Mr. Hatchel would forward it to the LCSS team for review and comment. The existing DOD policy indicates MRA is required for shipments out of DoD wholesale stock and would need to be modified to include GSA, FAA (and possibly others). Ms. Hilert noted that while we have had contact with FAA, we have not been able to contact NOAA to determine their position on the MRA issue. The key point made in the MRA discussions is, if FAA activities are authorized to requisition materiel from DOD sources, they should be required to submit an MRA. **See Action Items 38, 39 and 40.**

I. Agenda Topic 12 - USMC Receipt and TDD Timeframes (USMC issue with 5-day receipt vs TDD). In response to PDC 1124, which aligned the MILSTRAP/DLMS wholesale receipt processing timeframes with the DODM 4140.01, Volume 5, policy requirement that receiving activities will record receipts no later than 5 business days from date materiel received, Marine Corps questioned how the 5-day timeframe related to the TDD standards, which are also addressed by DODM 4140.01.

Marine Corps concern was the appearance of a conflict between the TDD standards and DODM 4140.01, Volume 5, 5-day timeframe for recording receipt since the TDD standards do not allow the 5-days for processing receipt. Ms. Daverede noted that while OCONUS TDD standards did not specify a receipt take-up timeframe, the CONUS TDD standard did specify receipt take-up timeframes as short as 1-2 days. The CONUS TDD standards for 1-2 days receipt take-up timeframe appear to conflict with 5-days allowed for receiving activities to process a receipt. Clarification is needed regarding the maximum timeframe to process a receipt, as it related to TDD. Ms. Johnson noted that the PDC 1124 alignment of MILSTRAP/DLMS wholesale receipt processing timeframe with the DODM 4140.01, Volume 5, policy would move forward as it was a necessary update to support existing DOD policy. Mr. Carroll offered to review DODM 4140.01 from a policy harmonization perspective. **See Action Item 41.**

Subsequent to the Supply PRC 15-2 Meeting, a meeting was held on July 13, 2015 that included ODASD(SCI), DLMSO and Marine Corps to discuss this issue. Ms. Hilert provided input to ODASD(SCI); the concept for the DoDM 4140.01 update is to leave current wording as is, but include an additional sentence for cross-reference to TDD, thus retaining the emphasis on timely processing imposed by TDD and clarifying that the 5 day maximum may not be the goal for all types of shipments. The suggested clarification would read something like this: “Record receipts no later than 5 business days from date materiel received. *More expeditious receipt processing may be required under negotiated TDD standards.*”

Next Meeting: The DLMSO committee chairs thanked all attendees for their participation, enthusiasm and continued support. The next Supply PRC meeting date has not been set.

MARY JANE JOHNSON
Supply PRC Co-Chair

ELLEN HILERT
Supply PRC Co-Chair

HEIDI DAVEREDE
Supply PRC Co-Chair

Approved: _____
DONALD C. PIPP
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Enclosure

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
1	Minutes § b.(4) Page 3	Navy provide additional information if there is a specific MRA Report requirement relating to part numbers.	Navy	30 Jan 2014 19 SEP 2014	Closed	8/20/2/14 – No additional input. The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) will close Action Item if no input by 9/19/2014. 11/10/14-DLMSO closed Action Item; no additional Navy input was received.
2	Minutes § c.(3) Page 4	DLA Transaction Services review requirement for adding the three data pattern COMMRIs and identify any issues with the requirement.	DLA Transaction Services	18 Nov 2013	Closed	10/11/13 – Initial response from DLA Transaction Services indicates the three data pattern COMMRIs are feasible. Multiple issues/questions raised that will be addressed in PDC 1086. 6/18/2014 – DLMSO released ADC 1086.
3	Minutes § d Page 5	Supply PRC representatives to review the examples of the receipt scenario cited for each Component in draft PDC 1087, and provide language to include in PDC for their Component.	All Supply PRC Representatives	12 Nov 2013	Closed	11/5/13 – DLMSO followed up for responses. 11/12/13 – Interim Navy explanation of MRA & Navy ERP. 11/17/13 - Army provided response. 1/7/14 - PDC 1087 released for 30 day staffing. 6/12/2014 – DLMSO released ADC 1087.

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
4	Minutes § d Page 5	Identify if your Component is compliant in generating MRA follow-ups under MILSTRAP rules, and if not, provide the anticipated timeline for implementation.	Army Air Force Marine Corps	Provide in response to PDC 1087	Closed	11/12/13 – Navy Response: Navy not sending follow-ups for delinquent MRA. 12/20/13 – DLA Response: DLA is compliant with MRA follow-up process. 6/12/14 – Army confirmed not sending follow-ups for delinquent MRA. Pending corrected logic in LMP 3/14/14 – Air Force response confirmed they are compliant with MRA follow-up process using MILSTRAP legacy DIC DRF 2/11/14 – Marine Corps response confirmed they are compliant with MRA follow-up process 6/12/2014 – DLMSO released ADC 1087.
5	Minutes § h Page 6	Air Force and Navy Supply PRC representatives provide input on the pending questions identified on the MRA Report business rules decision tree.	Air Force Navy	30 Jan 2014 22 Jan 2014	Closed	12/4/13 – Received Air Force Response. 1/10/14 – DLMSO response to Air Force for clarification of several Air Force responses. 1/28/2014 – Received Air Force clarification 1/10/14 – DLMSO follow-up on the 9/10/13 response DLMSO set to Navy to clarify the Navy MRA questions. 1/30/2014 and 1/31/2014 – Received Navy response/ clarification

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
6	Minutes § i Page 7	DLA provide a periodic update to DLMSO regarding the status of implementing an MRA solution for the processes identified in this section addressing known MRA gaps.	DLA	Ongoing	Open	8/21/14 – DLA noted that as of April 2014, EMALL uses the 527R, instead of the incorrect 861, for the MRA transaction. The MRO program is an ongoing major effort by DLA to get it to comply with various Audit areas, one of which is MRA. Until MRO is complete, Medical or Subsistence probably will not get touched. IPV is another audit focus area that is ongoing, with that program looking for options for MRA generation in light of the fact that the Army does not submit requisitions, nor receive due-ins, and thus cannot generate receipts/MRAs for these items. The KYLOC gap is not recognized as an audit-related impact and thus will not get worked anytime in the near future.

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
7	Minutes § j Page 7	Navy update the status of known MRA gaps.	Navy	Ongoing	Open	6/16/15 – Navy identified a new MRA gap. When an out-of-scope (external to Navy ERP) customer orders a DLA-managed item (9 COG) which is sourced from Navy assets (via RRAM, NAS or co-located DD), DAAS logic cannot determine which type of activity issued the material and therefore sends the MRA to DLA (source of supply), which did not issue the material. When this occurs, the shipping activity does not have a record of the MRA and will continue to send follow-up transactions. Next step is to consult R-Supply and DAAS SMEs to assess the possibility of removing the DAAS logic.
8	Minutes § j Page 7	Navy research and confirm whether the Navy Single Supply Baseline initiative will fix the MRA gaps that exist with R-Supply.	Navy	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Closed	6/16/15 – The Naval Operational Supply System (NOSS), which is a component of Navy Operational Business Logistics Enterprise (NOBLE) (formerly Navy Single Supply Baseline), will fix the known gap by including the capability to release MRA actions automatically. Planned implementation by FY20.

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
9	Minutes § j Page 8	Navy verify if the RIC "XZZ" is a pseudo RIC used as a null value in transaction processing.	Navy	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Closed	<p>6/3/15 – Navy input noted XZZ is not a RIC; it is a Source of Supply (SOS) in FLIS. DoD 4100.39-M, Volume 6, Section 6.7.8 (Source of Supply Inactivation and Deletion) describes when XZZ is assigned as SOS.</p> <p>DLMSO Response: Navy input at SPRC 13-3 noted, "The rule was created in the 2003 time frame because RSupply Afloat was having problems putting the correct RIC-To in their MRA transactions where the system was picking up the depot RIC vs the ICP RIC. This resulted in the ships receiving numerous Follow-up for Delinquent MRA transactions for the ICPs and creating a significant manual workload." This may relate to the FLIS usage of a pseudo SoS but we do not see where the Navy tied the two together in their response. Is the use of XZZ tied to the FLIS documented use of pseudo SOS or is it a coincidence that it was used by DAAS as part of a workaround for R-Supply MRA processing?</p> <p>6/24/15 – Navy will reevaluate the response to this action item after reviewing the discussion from Supply PRC 13-03.</p> <p>See new Action Item 23 for Supply PRC 15-2.</p>

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
10	Minutes § j Page 8	Navy provide an update on their “No MRA Required” policy that is programmed into Navy ERP, and ensure their procedures are consistent with DOD MILSTRAP/DLMS MRA guidance.	Navy	Ongoing	Open	11/12/13 – Navy email provided interim explanation for absence of DOD MRA requirements in Navy ERP. 6/16/15 – Navy business rules with respect to the use of MRAs have not changed. Navy needs to prepare an Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) to require these transactions. Navy will submit a trouble ticket/Change Request to require these transactions in ERP. See new Action Item 24 for Supply PRC 15-2.
11	Minutes § k Page 8	Army provide a response to identify any known MRA gaps and answer the question whether the MRA transaction (generating and follow-up) is implemented in LMP.	Army	19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	6/12/14 – Army confirmed <u>not</u> sending follow-ups for delinquent MRA. Pending corrected logic in LMP. 6/24/15. See new Action Item 25 to provide system change request number and status.
12	Minutes § m Page 8	Army provide input on implementation of ADC 247 (Use of TCN in MRA and Receipt Transactions).	Army	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	No updates received
13	Minutes § m Page 8	Navy provide timeline for working ADC 247 in to Navy ERP (e.g., development of an SCR or a scheduled implementation timeline).	Navy	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	6/16/15 – Navy continues to evaluate this action item. A future Navy ERP change Request may be required.

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
14	Minutes § m Page 8	Air Force report on implementation status to eliminate the workaround process and provide a timeline for the retail side (to include in the PDC). (Reference ADC 247)	Air Force	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	12/4/13 – CAV-AF – ADC 247 in place waiting for DLMS implementation. Retail – Tracking requirement but is only doing FIAR changes. 6/23/15 - AF Retail (ILS-S) reply: – ADC 247 is part of AF In-Transit requirement, ILS-S v 4.7.13 scheduled for release Aug 2016. Wholesale – CSRD written for D035 to do DLMS, no implementation date. 6/24/215 – Air Force provide the updated ADC 247 implement status for the wholesale side and provide the change number for both wholesale and retail sides
15	Minutes § m Page 8	Marine Corps provide input on implementation of ADC 247.	USMC	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	No updates received

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
16	Minutes § m Page 9	DLA Headquarters provide input on implementation of ADC 247.	DLA	30 Jan 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	<p>1/28/14 – DLA confirmed this is not implemented in EBS as intended. EBS may recognize TCN as part of transaction, but does not use it to perform validations/duplication checks.</p> <p>4/17/14 – RFC submitted on 11/18/14.</p> <p>3/16/15 – Revised RFC justification sent on 3/16/15.</p> <p>8/21/14 – DLMSO noted if ADC 247 (add TCN to MRA) was written today, it would have been noted as Audit Readiness and FIAR impact. Absence of the TCN and associated split/partial shipment information was a procedural and systemic gap in the MRA process. One of the reasons for ADC 247 was increased use of partial shipments in DLA DSS, which resulted in considerable DOD processing problems when receipt and MRA systems/procedures were not considering the TCN partial and split shipment codes. As multiple Shipment Status (AS_) transactions are received with the same document number/suffix, but different TCNs due to partial shipments, when the first shipment processes, lack of due-in for subsequent shipments could result in associated SDRs. There may be a similar problem with trans-shipment activity split shipments.</p> <p>6/24/15 – RFC # BOF-C14-0020.</p>

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
17	Minutes § n Page 9	Services review procedures to ensure that the proper suffixes are identified in the MRA transactions to align with the suffixes identified in the corresponding shipment status.	All	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	6/16/15 – When Navy ERP generates an outgoing requisition (A0_) to DLA, and DLA splits the order, Navy ERP should send corresponding suffix-coded MRA transactions. Navy will submit a trouble ticket/Change Request to require these transactions in Navy ERP. 6/23/15 – AF Retail (ILS-S) reply: ILS-S MRA programs generate accurate DLMS 527Rs with the correct suffix code contingent upon base user entering correct value on REC input.
18	Minutes § n Page 9	Marine Corps to research why MRA transactions are being sent to the RIC – LA9 (Advanced Military Packaging – MILSTRIP Orders, Oshkosh, WI. LA9 is not a valid wholesale ICP RIC per LMARS business rules and confirmed during the staffing of ADC 1025. If LA9 is in fact a wholesale ICP RIC, then Marine Corps needs to submit PDC to update LMARS business rules to reflect that change.	USMC	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	6/24/15 – LA9 (Oshkosh Truck) is transitioning to DLA in the near future and will make this issue obsolete. Marine Corps will provide target date.
19	Minutes § n Page 9	Navy submit a PDC to define and document their Service unique data requirement for RP 77-80 (Service-use field) in the MRA legacy transaction (DRA) and clarify the procedures being used.	Navy	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Closed	6/16/15 – Navy noted they are not using this as a Navy unique data field and a PDC is not required. The two examples provided identify that the site/user basically copied the last transaction they received (AE1 status) and changed the DIC to DRA. In doing this, the structure/card columns did not match the DRA layout.

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
20	Minutes § n Page 10	GSA provide feedback on the results of their internal analysis of why some shipment status transactions are not being sent and take action to correct processing issues where not consistent with MILSTRIP procedures.	GSA	30 Jan 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	8/21/14 – GSA did not comment on the results on the analysis on the 100 document numbers, but it appears the problem was related to issues out of GSA distribution centers. GSA is closing their two distribution centers by 31 Dec 2014, and implementing a DLMS compliant Order Management System (OMS). The next OMS release is planned for July 2015 which should address this issue.
21	Minutes § n Page 10	Army research Army-directed shipments that result in MRA transactions with no corresponding shipment status. (If from wholesale assets, both a shipment status and MRA are required.)	Army	30 Jan 2014 19 Sep 2014 10 Dec 2014	Open	No updates received
Action Items for SPRC 15-02 Start with Number 22						
22	Topic 1	Navy identify whether New MRA Gap identified in SPRC 13-3, Action Item 7 , and the existing issue identified in the new Action Item 23 are included in the NOSS solution to fix the known MRA Gaps. Additionally clarify the comment in the previous response to Action Item 7 relating to RRAM that noted “the shipping activity does not have a record of the MRA and will continue to send follow-up transactions”. Note the “shipping activity’ would not send an MRA Follow-up; it would come from the ICP.	Navy	1 Sep 2015	Open	

Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
23	Topic 1	DLMSO questioned the initial Navy response to SPRC 13-3, Action Item 9 which noted the “XZZ is not a RIC; it is a Source of Supply (SOS) in FLIS and referenced DoD 4100.39-M, Volume 6, Section 6.7.8 (Source of Supply Inactivation and Deletion) describes when XZZ is assigned as SOS.” DLMSO noted that the meeting notes for SPRC 13-03 indicated the use of XZZ was used by DAAS as a workaround for R-Supply MRA processing. Is the use of XZZ tied to the FLIS documented use of pseudo SOS or is it a coincidence that it was used by DAAS as part of a workaround for R-Supply MRA processing? Navy will reevaluate the response to this action item after reviewing the discussion from Supply PRC 13-03.	Navy	1 Sep 2015	Open	Refer to Action Item 9 and SPRC 13-03 Minutes paragraph j, page 8 for additional details.
24	Topic 1	In SPRC 13-03, Action Item 10 , the Navy noted a system change request was in the works to remove the “No MRA Required” policy programmed into their enterprise resource planning (ERP) system. The Navy agreed to provide an updated Defect Number and HEAT number used to document this change and an estimated implementation date.	Navy	1 Sep 2015	Open	
25	Topic 1	Reference SPRC 13-03, Action Item 11 . Provide the system change request number and status for the LMP system logic to be corrected to send the follow-up for a delinquent MRA.	Army	1 Sep 2015	Open	
26	Topic 1	Reference SPRC 13-03, Action Item 14 . DLMSO update the DLMS Status Review for ADC 247 when Components provide system change numbers and related implementation information.	DLMSO	Ongoing	Open	

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
27	Topic 1	DLMSO will review and clarify, as needed, the business rules related to the TCN requirement on the Follow-up for Delinquent MRA and the MRA Reply to Follow-up.	DLMSO	1 Sep 2015	Open	
28	Topic 3	Services provide implementation Status of ADC 390, specifically whether their logistics systems are able to send/receive contract data for GFP on the receipt/MRA.	Army Navy Air Force Marine Corps	1 Sep 2015	Open	
29	Topic 7	DLMSO will finalize PDC 1114 for staffing with the Supply PRC.	DLMSO	30 Sep 2015		
30	Topic 9	DLMSO Create Help Screens for the MRA Reports.	DLMSO	20 Nov 2015	Open	
31	Topic 10	Ms. Mary Anne Gardio, DLA Troop Support Comptroller to provide a copy of the July 8, 2013 Goods Receipt Accounting Policy document she referenced that requires all DLA customers to post a goods receipt.	DLA Troop Support Comptroller	Completed.	Closed	6/24/15 - DLA Troop Support Comptroller provided a copy of the July 8, 2013 Goods Receipt Accounting Policy document.
32	Topic 10	DLA Troop Support provide documentation about how the defacto receipt and how the transporter proof of delivery (TPD) was actually programmed work in relation to the aforementioned July 8, 2013 goods receipt accounting policy document.	DLA Troop Support	1 Sep 2015	Open	
33	Topic 10	ODASD(SCI), Mr. Bob Carroll will identify if any OSD action has taken place to address associated policy changes related to incorporating TPD as a “de-facto” receipt since the November 2013 policy discussion between ODASD(DPAP) and (L&MR). What are the procedures/limitations or defacto receipt and role of TPD?	ODASD(SCI)	1 Sep 2015	Open	

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
34	Topic 10	Upon receipt of updated formal OSD TPD policy resulting from Action Item 33 and additional input from Action Items 31, and 32, DLMSO will determine if a PDC is required to incorporate specific procedures in the Defense Logistics Manuals and draft accordingly.	DLMSO	120 days after receipt of updated OSD policy	Open	
35	Topic 10	Ms. Daverede will review her notes to identify the contact at NEXCOM who previously worked on their initial DLMS implementation effort and send the contact information to the Navy Supply PRC representative.	DLMSO	1 Sep 2015	Closed	6/25/15 – Ms. Daverede provided the NEXCOM contacts to the Navy Supply PRC representatives
36	Topic 10	DLA Troop Support to identify what the status of the re-systemization for the AAFES and Exchange, and what is the future system architecture for AAFES, Navy Exchange and MCX with regards to how they are linked for requisitioning, and particularly their plans for receipt processing and whether an enterprise or decentralized solution is being developed. Also identify the where they are on the implementation path regarding the DLMS transaction discussions over the past few years.	DLA Troop Support	1 Sep 2015	Open	
37	Topic 10	DLMSO research if documentation can be found about the point where the Exchange went to ODASD(SCI) and wanted to avoid implementing DLMS and Ms. Kathy Smith at ODASD(SC) said DLMS compliance applied to AAFES. DLMSO will try to find the letter and also identify if there is a similar letter from ODASD(SCI) on reversal of the DLMS mandate.	DLMSO	1 Sep 2015	Open	

**Action Item Tracker – MRA Focus Supply PRC Meeting 13-3 (September 19, 2013) and 15-02 (June 24, 2015)
Current as of August 5, 2015**

No	Reference	Action Item	Responsibility	Target Due Date	Status	Notes
38	Topic 11	DLMSO to work with DLA Transaction Services to identify the transaction volumes for FAA (customer and SoS) and NOAA (assume just customer)	DLMSO	1 Sep 2015	Open	
39	Topic 11	NOAA – DLMSO to research this issue further and discuss the MRA requirement NOAA.	DLMSO	1 Sep 2015	Open	
40	Topic 11	DLMSO draft PDC to have FAA accept MRAs from customers when acting as a Source of Supply and to have FAA customers generate an MRA to DoD Sources of Supply as a byproduct of the receipt process when FAA customer sites receive material from DoD Sources of Supply additional input from the Action Item	DLMSO	15 Sep 2015	Open	
41	Topic 12	ODASD(SCI), Bob Carroll review/address the possible conflict between the DoDM 4140.01, Volume 5, 5-day receipt processing timeframe, and the TDD where you have standards less than 5 days.	ODASD(SCI)	Completed	Closed	7/13/15 – Meeting between ODASD(SCI), DLMSO and Marine Corps to discuss issue. Ms. Ellen Hilert provided the following input subsequent to the meeting. “The concept for the 4140.01 update is to leave current wording as is, but include an additional sentence for cross-reference to TDD thus retaining the emphasis on timely processing imposed by TDD and clarifying that the 5 day maximum may not be the goal for all types of shipments. The clarification would read something like this: “Record receipts no later than 5 business days from date materiel received. More expeditious receipt processing may be required under negotiated TDD standards.”