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

December 6, 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee (PRC) 16-1 and Joint Physical Inventory Working Group (JPIWG) Meeting 16-3, October 19, 2016

The attached minutes of the Joint DLMS Supply PRC Meeting 16-1 and JPIWG Meeting 16-3 are forwarded for your information and action as appropriate.

The Enterprise Business Process 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, and Mr. Rafael Gonzalez, (717) 770-6817, DSN 771-6817, or email rafael.gonzalez@dla.mil.

DAVEREDE.HEIDI.M.1120053600
Digitally signed by DAVEREDE.HEIDI.M.1120053600
Date: 2016.12.06 17:08:43 -05'00'

HEIDI M. DAVEREDE
Program Manager
Enterprise Business Process
Standards Office

Attachment
As stated

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

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

December 6, 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee (PRC) 16-1 and DOD Joint Physical Inventory Working Group (JPIWG) Meeting 16-3, October 19, 2016

Purpose: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office 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: http://www.dlmso.dla.mil/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. Ellen Hilert, (Supply PRC Co-Chair/DOD MILSTRIP Administrator), Ms. Mary Jane Johnson (Supply PRC Co-Chair/DOD MILSTRAP Administrator), and Mr. Rafael Gonzalez (JPIWG Chair) facilitated the discussion. The Action Item Tracker contains the action items for the meeting and the most recent version will be posted to the Supply PRC webpage. Action item due dates are identified in the Action Item Tracker.

All action items from Supply PRC 16-1 and JPIWG 16-3 are due by January 30, 2017 unless otherwise indicated.

Review of Meeting Topics:

a. Agenda Topic 1 – End of Day Processing/Inventory Reconciliation – Procedural Gaps. Mr. Rafael Gonzalez, provided an overview briefing comprised of two flow diagrams and the accompanying process narrative illustrating current DLMS physical inventory processes. The first flow diagram depicts the Materiel Release Order (MRO) life-cycle transactional flow between the storage activity and the owner of the inventory. The purpose is to establish a baseline understanding of the daily transactional exchanges between the storage activity and owner and the transactional effect on the inventory record balances of the storage activity and of the owner. The flow diagram begins with the owner system sending an MRO (DLMS 940R (Military Standard Requisitioning and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP) legacy Document Identifier Code (DIC) A5_) to the storage activity requesting shipment of the quantity to the customer and ends when the available quantity of materiel is picked, packed, and shipped. The storage activity sends a Materiel Release Confirmation (MRC) (DLMS 945A (MILSTRIP legacy DIC AR_)) to the owner indicating that the materiel was shipped and is no longer in the physical custody of the storage activity. The second flow diagram depicts the end of day processing and inventory reconciliation transaction process flows. The purpose is to provide a common understanding

baseline and identify any disconnects or gaps between the storage activity and the owner information. Following the meeting, several key points in the flow diagram were refined to better distinguish among the conditions where no, partial, and full quantity on hand storage activity stock levels were determined, based on the storage activity record or location quantities. The revised flow diagram is linked to the meeting agenda on the Supply PRC and JPIWG webpages.

Observations during the brief:

- Mr. Gonzalez noted that most Component owner systems are using the MRC to drop their owner inventory balance by the quantity in the MRC. The single exception is the Navy, which currently uses the DLMS 867I Issue transaction to reduce its balance; the Navy also uses the Issue transaction as part of the end of day reconciliation process. The storage activity creates the Issue at the time the storage activity reduces its on hand available for issue inventory balance, prior to actual pick. The storage activity only sends Navy the Issue transaction at the time it is generated; however, the storage activity sends the Issue transaction to all owners as a part of the end of day transaction count, inventory balance, and in response to a reconciliation transaction history request. Mr. Jim Weiner, DLA Distribution emphasized that while the storage activity sends Navy the 867I Issue, the storage activity also sends Navy the DLMS 945A MRC.
- Mr. Dave Childress, Navy, expressed concern that steps are not taken to ensure that the storage activity on hand available-for-issue balance match the actual storage location balances prior to confirming MRO with the Issue transaction. Mr. Tony Scherm, USAF, responded by explaining that DLA Distribution Standard System (DSS) will use denial management codes on the Materiel Release Denial (DLMS 945) when systemic and bin stock balances do not match and a materiel pick cannot be accomplished.
- The storage activity generates and sends the Issue transaction when the record balance is dropped, which is earlier than the MRC. Timing of the transactions is key to understanding end of day processing and inventory reconciliation results.
- The Air Force stated that when they send an MRO to DSS, they establish a promised inventory balance, which should match the storage activity available-for-issue balance as decremented upon generation of the Issue transaction. Ms. Hilert emphasized that reconciliation must be based upon the owner balance being decremented either by each MRO sent or by each Issue transaction received, depending upon the Component process, as compared to the on-hand available-for-issue balance reported by the storage activity.

Ms. Hilert recommended enhancements to the end of day (EOD) process to increase the accountability of materiel. Some of the changes included adding a transaction count and history of DLMS 945A to the EOD Transaction Count and Transaction History Request DLMS 846P. Additional details on the recommended enhancements can be found under Topic 1 of the Agenda.

In conclusion, the Enterprise Business Process Standards Office will schedule additional targeted meetings as needed to further research potential process disconnects and gaps and to resolve them.

Action Item 1 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office will update flow diagrams and repost. This action is complete, the updated flow diagrams are available using the link on the meeting agenda.

Action Item 2 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: DLA Distribution (Mr. Weiner) will confirm if Navy currently receives the MRC transaction from DSS for each Issue.

Action Item 3 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: Services (except Navy) confirm whether their systems can receive and process DLMS 867I Issue transactions.

Action Item 4 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: All DOD Components to evaluate proposed enhancements to the end of day/reconciliation process and determine whether the Services can benefit from it.

b. Agenda Topic 2 – Air Force Contractor Supported Weapon Systems (CSWS) and Government Furnished Materiel – Accountability (GFM–A**) Capability Initiative**. Mr. Jack Dillon contractor support to Air Force GFM–A, presented on behalf of Mr. "Quitty" Lawrence (HAF/A4PT). Air Force-owned materiel managed by Air Force contractor inventory control points (CICP) must be recorded in an accountable property system of record (APSR). The term CICP is used to represent a contractor assigned the primary responsibility for the materiel management of a group of items either for a particular Military Service or for the Department of Defense as a whole. In addition to integrated materiel manager (IMM)/ICP functions, a CICP may perform other logistics functions in support of a particular Military Service or for a particular end item (e.g., centralized computation of retail requirements levels and engineering tasks associated with weapon system components.) GFM–A Air Force chartered the Government Furnished Materiel - Accountability (GFM–A) Capability Initiative to provide property accountability/control of contractor managed and possessed Air Force-owned materiel through implementation of standard and integrated Air Force logistics and contractor processes to address a material weakness on the Air Force financial statements. This capability will establish and maintain accountable inventory records for Air Force GFM–A inventory that accurately reflect current quantity, status, location, condition, and authorizing contract as well as establish an audit trail to update and track end-to-end logistics and financial transactions, currently not recorded in an acceptable APSR. Noteworthy comments raised during the briefing were:

- Recently the Air Force identified nearly 13 billion dollars in inventory unaccounted for on financial statements and expects this number to go up. Ms. Jan Mulligan (office of the Deputy Under Sectary of Defense (ODUSD) Supply Chain Integration (SCI)) requested that the Air Force clarify the dollar value and types of materiel included. Air Force responded that wholesale O&MS spares are included, but equipment is not.

- Air Force selected the Defense Property Accountability System (DPAS) (See Topic 4), as the Accountable Property System of Record (APSR) for the GFM–A Capability Initiative. Using DPAS, the CICP will manage materiel using standard logistics transactions such as receipt, issue, shipment, condition code changes, physical inventory and will exchange the requisite transactions and financial data with the Air Force financial system. CICP use of DPAS will eliminate the existing use of spreadsheets.

- Approximately 20 existing programs are designated as CICPs. Many more programs are working through the process to be designated. Ms. Mulligan noted the CICPs are required to do the full range of capturing data using the standard range of logistics and finance transactions and noted that DODM 4140.01 Volumes 6 and 10 are updated to reflect government inventory management by contractors. Ms. Mulligan noted that Volume 6 requires that the DOD Components assign a materiel manager to provide oversight of government inventory managed by contract.

- Routing Identifier Code (RIC) and DOD Activity Address Code (DoDAAC)

o Brief discussion of the Air Force lack of RICs was deferred until Agenda Topic 6 – Transitioning from RIC to DoDAAC. Ms. Hilert noted that each new contract requires a new contractor DoDAAC under supply chain policy, although the Air Force does not current apply this requirement. Ms. Hilert commented that this was not being enforced but that was only temporary pending ODUSD SCI and DPAP agreement on policy..

o Mr. Bob Hammond (Enterprise Business Process Standards Office) pointed out that at least one Service allows assignment of contractor DoDAACs using the Service/Agency code intended for Government use, and when this happens it is not possible to determine whether the bill-to is a contractor or Government entity. The Air Force participants were not aware of any billing issues as described by Mr. Hammond.

- Ms. Hilert noted that to make the CICP process work, there are a number of DLMS changes needed, and the Enterprise Business Process Standards Office is working closely with the Air Force GFM–A team to review and update the Air Force's proposed DLMS changes.

c. Agenda Topic 3 – Defense Property Accountability System (DPAS). The Supply PRC team requested the DPAS presentation because of the expanded capability for DPAS to have the accountable record for materiel in the hands of contractors. The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office noted that DPAS might be a potential option for maintenance contractors that do not have an internal inventory system capable of complying with the required transaction exchange for accountability of materiel undergoing maintenance.

Mr. Joseph Stossel, DPAS Program Manager, provided an overview on the DPAS system and engaged in a discussion with the Supply PRC on several items related to the Air Force GFM–A. The DPAS is a suite of three applications hosted in a single environment. The three applications are:

(1) Property Accountability – Account and Fiduciary Report and Real Property,

(2) Maintenance/Utilization – Warranty Tracking, Preventative Maintenance Scheduling, Work Order Management, Equipment Pool and Utilization Reporting, and

(3) Warehousing – Bulk/Serial Management Items, MRP/Unit/Individual, Warehouse Hub/Spoke Replenishment, Shelf Life/Care of Supplies in Storage (COSIS).

The Air Force GFM–A will use the Warehousing application, which is based on DLMS transactions, and will be able to roll up totals to see inventory from a corporate level. Mr.

Stossel noted a key feature is the capability to calculate moving average cost (MAC) for stock numbers and the ability to do financial accounting and reporting functions. The DPAS is being modified to incorporate Air Force GFM–A requirements pending approval of several proposed DLMS changes for numerous changes the Air Force GFM–A team requested.

- Ms. Hilert asked whether the DPAS team is receiving DLMS changes from the Services or do we need to have a separate meeting to keep them up to date with current changes? Mr. Stossel noted the Services are coming to them with changes and also his contractor team is getting the ADCs when published. Mr. Stossel suggested meeting with the Enterprise Business Process Standards Office offline to review ADCs relevant to DPAS.

Action Item 5 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office will coordinate a meeting with DPAS (Ms. Hilert–Primary), and will add Mr. Stossel to the distribution lists.

- Ms. Hilert asked if DPAS supports preparation of the DD Form 1348-1A continuation page under ADC 399A. This change requires inclusion both 2D and linear bar codes for serially-tracked/managed materiel. Ms. Hilert also pointed out that ADC 1009A included new formatting requirements for the DD 1348-1A associated with inclusion of the Mark-For Address.

Action Item 6 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: Mr. Stossel (DPAS) will confirm with his technical support to ensure that ADC 399A and ADC 1009A requirements are met.

- Mr. Ben Breen (Enterprise Business Process Standards Office) asked about an interface with Defense Automatic Addressing System (DAAS) for discrepancy reporting via DLMS 842A/W so that a contractor using DPAS will have an integrated, automated capability to submit a supply discrepancy report (SDR). DPAS may also want to consider developing capability to support DLMS stock readiness procedures once the planned transactional enhancements are implemented at DAAS (ADC 1045).

Action Item 7 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: Mr. Stossel (DPAS) will consider developing an SDR interface. Ms. Hilert identified a potential issue for implementation of GFM–A supporting serially-managed materiel. Current requirements for communication of item unique identification (IUID) content under the DLMS is synchronized under the IUID Integrated Requirements Set (IRS) maintained by the DOD IUID Working Group. The IRS does not address contractors reporting receipt, issue, or inventory gains/losses of serially-tracked materiel to the APSR via DLMS transactions containing IUID. If the Air Force wishes to pursue inclusion of IUID content in the CICP interface with DPAS, the Enterprise Business Process Standards Office recommended that the Air Force submit a requirement to the DOD IUID Working Group.

- CICP Internal Balance. After the AF CICP allocates the physical materiel to fulfill a request, the CICP available for issue balance is decremented however the materiel is still in process and has not left the warehouse. The Air Force believes this information is not relevant to them as the materiel has not left the warehouse. The Air Force is looking to monitor inventory once the materiel is shipped (once the AF CICP generated the DLMS 945A Materiel Release Confirmation) by adding the DLMS 945A to the end of day/reconciliation count and history. Ms. Ellen Fisher (Air Force) noted they also need to know the total quantity of what is in the warehouse, not just what is available for issue. Their process needs to show what is in transit and

still on the Air Force accountable records, which is driving the requirements for the inclusion of the materiel receipt acknowledgement (MRA) and turn-in receipt acknowledgement (TRA) transaction to the EOD process

- IUID Working Group (WG) and Serialization Efforts. Commenting on the DPAS warehousing charts, Mr. Weiner said DSS implementation of serialized item tracking encountered a problem due to the lack of a UII/ serial number for kits (the kit may contain serially-tracked items, but the assembled kit itself does not have its own UII/serial number. Mr. Stossel noted that DPAS has a capability to identify a serial number at the kit level. Ms. Hilert noted the DLMS does not support tracking of imbedded serial numbers. Ms. Mulligan suggested that DLA address this issue with the DOD IUID WG, so a formal requirement is established and a PDC is staffed.

- **Contract Related**

  - **Contract Number**. Ms. Hilert noted a process gap related to tracking the contractor managed materiel to the correct procurement instrument identifier (PIID) (contract number) when the original contract expires and the contractor is awarded CICP responsibility under a new PIID. Ms. Hilert also noted the best way to transition to materiel from one DoDAAC to another without physical movement is to issue the materiel under "ship in place "procedures. This would require inclusion of both the losing and gaining contract numbers and could involve a significant transaction volume for the Air Force. After further study, DLMS anticipates that the Air Force will submit an additional GFM–A PDC to document this process.

  - **Logistics Reassignment.** When GFM contractors change, Air Force updates the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) to identify the new CICP as the IMM. Air Force CICPs process Logistics Reassignments with either Air Force or DLA ICPs. Ms. Mulligan noted the CICPs are in FLIS and part of the new policy for the contractor is to report an organic ICP in FLIS and requisitions would have to be referred. It was not clear at the time of the discussion how the new policy will impact the Air Force CICP process. Ms. Hilert noted that iRAPT has transactional capability for property transfer from one contract to another contract with materiel moving or staying in its current physical location.

Action Item 8 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: Enterprise Business Process Standards Office to review latest policy applicable to contractor-managed ICPs and discuss further with ODUSD(SCI) and Air Force as needed based upon impact.

- **Acceptance Date**. Air Force asked to include the acceptance date in the Receipt transaction so it can be recorded in DPAS. The Air Force clarified the materiel must be accepted as GFM prior to processing a receipt transaction. This raised a number of questions such as what procedures apply if the Government acceptor is off-site and takes several days to complete the acceptance; does the materiel remain "in-transit" even though it may be in the CICP's custody for several days? It is not clear when the five days receipt take-up date starts (date arrived or date accepted).

Action Item 9 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: ODUSD(SCI) to confirm whether the requirements to receipt materiel and update the accountable records within 5 business days documented under DODM 4140.01 Volume 11 applies to Air Force CICP.

Action Item 10 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: ODUSD(SCI) and DPAP will look into the scenario of receipt and acceptance at the contractor's facility, the timing issue of the receipt and who is accountable. (See PDC 1225 for background).

d. Agenda Topic 4 – Removed

e. Agenda Topic 5 – DoDAAD Overview – The Ongoing Evolution of the DoDAAD. Mr. Tad DeLaney, Enterprise Business Process Standards Office, provided an overview of the DOD activity address directory (DoDAAD) Committee activities and issues. Topics included DoDAAD PRC function and relationship to the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (DATA) and Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR). The brief also addressed GSA updates, recent DoDAAD changes, identification of several RIC related issues, and discrete and enhanced data

Specific discussion beyond what is on the briefing slides linked to the agenda.

Slide 15. Contractor Flag (ADC 1191). Ms. Hilert noted the next step in this process would be to issue a PDC to use the contractor flag in the DoDAAD. This would force the Services to process based upon the contractor flag and spell out the rules to move beyond the existing legacy record positon based data format.

Slide 16 – Funding Office Flag. The business rules are still being defined and the relationship between this flag and authority/fund codes has not been determined. Once those rules are defined, a PDC will be issued. Ms. Heidi Daverede, Enterprise Business Process Standards Office Program Manager, noted another scenario is the difference between a funding office and a Bill-To.

Slides 16 – 24 – Shaping the additional uses of the DoDAAC. Ms. Daverede commented that where we are heading is to add discrete information to the DoDAAC to make sure it is used with the proper authorities. Too much effort getting materiel to a correct location. Same with billing – more discrete and direct way for the systems processing the information are doing edits systemically.

Slide 25 – RICs. The RIC is being used for purposes well beyond the original intent– and the current ceiling on the number of RICs available (29,808) is not sustainable. (See Agenda Topic 6).

Action Item 11 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: Enterprise Business Process Standards Office to issue a PDC defining the business rules for the funding office flag.

f. Agenda Topic 6 – Transitioning from RIC to DoDAAC. Ms. Hilert provided an information brief on the potential way ahead for transitioning the DLMS to support the use of DoDAACs (rather RICs), recognizing that the existing method of using the RIC for identification of organizational entities, (e.g., owner, manager, storage activity) is not sustainable due to limited number of available three-position RIC combinations.

- Although considered an enhancement to the DLMS since inception, the desired transition is largely dependent upon universal DLMS implementation and substantial re-engineering of DAAS. Ms. Hilert requested feedback from the Services on the alternate approaches outlined and

projected impacts; if the Services have alternate approaches to addressing this issue, the Enterprise Business Process Standards Office is highly receptive to receiving those ideas. DAAS identified a significant impact on program logic due to the extensive volume of RIC-based business rules that DAAS applies to the transactions during processing. Tangential impacts anticipated include modification to FLIS, which uses the RIC to identify the source of supply and other entities. The Army Supply PRC Representative (Mr. Oliver Pryor), commented that this is a "mindset change" not just a system change. He asked if the transition process was socialized with leadership as the Army does not see the issue of running out of RICs. Ms. Hilert responded that this issue might be appropriate to elevate to the Supply Chain Executive Steering Group (SCESG). Mr. Bob Carroll, ODUSD(SCI) concurred. Mr. DeLaney reiterated that the use of a RIC as a location identifier is beyond the original intention of the RIC and that there are no data elements associated with the RIC that are not associated with the DoDAAC. The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office Team understands this is a high priority and has scheduled meetings with DAAS over the coming weeks to fully identify the issues and develop a way ahead. The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office also recently briefed ODUSD(SCI) team. DOD needs a single approach based on the input and consensus of the Services.

- Ms. Hilert identified two potential approaches to consider:

Approach 1 – Eliminate Reliance on RICs Within DOD Transaction Processing

(1) Implement DAAS functionality to support transaction routing by DoDAAC and use the DoDAAC for all entities currently configured for a RIC. This would affect DMARS, WebVLIPS, LMARS/MRA Reports, LOTS, LDG, and WebSDR.[1]

(2) Based on DAAS' ability to support the use of a DoDAAC, authorize early implementation on an intra-Component basis or within pre-coordinated trading partner systems (e.g., Air Force GFM–A Capability Initiative)

(3) Authorize DAAS conversion from RIC to DoDAAC for predesignated early implementers (e.g., by Component or system/COMMRI)

(4) Authorize DAAS conversion from DoDAAC to RIC for legacy users. Methodology for conversion alternatives:

- Components ensure one-to-one relationship - one RIC per DoDAAC
- Build a conversion table at DAAS to identify a "lead" RIC to be applied when converting from DoDAAC to RIC (applicable to DoDAACs associated with multiple RICs)

(5) Establish mandatory requirement for transition to DoDAACs by DLMS users as soon as feasible based upon DAAS programming plus lead time for Component programming time - target date between January-December 2018

[1] DMARS – DAAS' Micro Automated Routing System, WebVLIPS –Web Visual Logistics Information Processing System, LMARS – Logistics Metrics Analysis Reporting System, MRA – Materiel Receipt Acknowledgment Reports, LOTS – Logistics On-Line Tracking System, LDG – Logistics Data Gateway and WebSDR – Web Supply Discrepancy Reporting system.

Approach 2 – Implement "Bilingual" DLMS Transactions to Facilitate Transition

(1) DAAS logic update per Approach 1

(2) Authorize early implementers per Approach 1

(3) Modify DLMS transactions to include multiple occurrences of the Address Loop (N1) requiring the originator to identify organizations by both RIC and DoDAAC. RIC will be universally identified as future "streamlined" data element

(4) Establish mandatory requirement for transition to DoDAACs to align with the full DLMS compliance

- Target date for bilingual capability: December 2019
- Target date for removal of RICs: December 2020

The benefit of the "bilingual" method of using the RIC and DoDAAC is that it eliminates the need for DAAS to use a lookup table for conversion. However, this bilingual approach would only be temporary and might not be the best use of programming resources.

The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office is working with the Air Force GFM–A team on several DLMS changes and will continue to use the RIC for routing transactions. The goal is to authorize use of DoDAACs for the program manager account in DPAS requiring DAAS to support routing by DoDAAC. Discussions are ongoing with DAAS to determine if this will be feasible. Ms. Hilert noted that issues will exist with Security Assistance, Navy Afloat Retail, and Air Force Wholesale, all of which have a long timeline for transition to DLMS.

Action Item 12 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: Services to review the two approaches and/or provide other alternative to the two approaches outlined, particularly on the methodology for conversion from RIC to DoDAAC. Will it be feasible to eliminate the one-to-many relationship that presents a problem for simple conversion? Response requested by December 16, 2016 to facilitate ongoing discussion with DAAS.

Action Item 13 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office to coordinate with DAAS to assess impact and develop detailed requirements.

Action Item 14 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office will document the consensus approach in a proposed DLMS change.

g. Agenda Topic 7 – Depot Inter-Service Maintenance Agreement (DMISA) Update. Mr. Carroll, ODASD(SCI) provided an update on the ongoing DMISA effort. He informed everyone that this is a high visibility effort that will be briefed to the Supply Chain Executive Steering Committee (SCESC) on a recurring basis. Mr. Carroll noted that with the DMISA effort there were efficiencies gained with single repair sites that allowed the Service organic depots to be more competitive with private industry. System support to communicate the necessary data between the Services' systems was not there and numerous workarounds were done to provide the necessary data. FIAR issues are now driving the necessary attention to push for compliance with DOD supply policy and MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP procedures for proper accountability of materiel in maintenance.

h. Agenda Topic 8 - Item Unique Identification (IUID) Update. Ms. Hilert and Ms. Johnson provided an update on a number of IUID related items. Specific areas to note:

- ADC 1198, Establishing and Maintaining Accountability for Service Owned Capital Equipment Stored at DLA Distribution Centers, was approved by DASD(SCI) on October 6, 2016. This change defines procedures to exchange serial number, and UII when available, to support FIAR compliance and accountability over Service-owned capital equipment stored at DLA Distribution Centers.

- Draft PDC 1244 (under development) – The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office is developing PDC 1244 to revise DLMS business processes supporting management of controlled cryptographic items (CCI) and radiation testing and tracking system (RATTS) items under DOD IUID Policy. The PDC will generally leverage the procedures and transactions identified for capital equipment in ADC 1198. The initial draft is targeted for completion for DASD SCI review in December 2016.

- Item Owner for Legacy Items. Ms. Hilert briefed the challenge for legacy items and the item owners where IUID Registry records often do not identify the asset owner, making it difficult to determine IUID populations by Service/Owner. The field already exists in the IUID Registry, and the DOD IUID Working Group is considering moving forward with revisions to iRAPT to support populating the data field.

- Serial Number – A number of issues related to serial number field length and characteristics were identified recently during design review for implementation of iRAPT revisions (ECP 0796) to capture and transmit multiple serial numbers for property transfers involving non-UII marked, serially managed GFP. Lack of overarching guidance from an authoritative source has resulted in inconsistency for the field length and characteristics across DLMS and iRAPT transactions. The original iRAPT requirement called for a 50 character serial number and allowed all special characters and spaces. That is consistent with the IUID Registry marks section, which allows for inclusion of a human readable serial number. However, it would conflict with the current DLMS process, which generally applies serial number requirements based upon the IUID pedigree data restrictions, allowing only 30 positions and including only special characters of hyphen and slash. Further complicating the procedures for use of serial numbers, the DLMS Small Arms/Light Weapons (SA/LW) procedures impose a much smaller legacy MILSTRIP field length and Component SA/LW Registries are inconsistent regarding special character edits. The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office asked the DOD IUID Working Group to review policy and provide guidance. Pending a DOD policy determination, iRAPT design will apply the general DLMS length and special character rules.

i. Agenda Topic 9 – Materiel Receipt Acknowledgment (MRA) D6S Update. Ms. Johnson presented an information brief on the resolution of a longstanding MRA issue. Approved MILS Change Letters (AMCL) 11 and 15 (July 1996) revised MRA procedures to include eliminating MILSTRAP DIC D6S for MRA and replacing it with the DIC DRA MRA transaction. To accommodate staggered implementation of the revised MRA procedures from 1997-1999, DAAS provided a temporary conversion of DIC D6S to DIC DRA (MRA). This interim procedure was to be used until full implementation of MRA procedures in the late 1990s, however, a monthly DAAS D6S report revealed the Servicers continued to generate a significant number of D6S transactions into the early 2000s. In early 2016, analysis of the monthly D6S

report revealed that most of the remaining D6S transactions were associated with Army and were generated from the Communications Routing Identifier (COMMRI) RUSAEIK/ HQ, Joint Munitions Command Rock Island, to COMMRI RUSAHRU/ Army LMP. In the June–July 2016 timeframe the affected Army system(s) stopped producing the D6S transactions while a system change to produce the appropriate MRA transactions could be implemented. As a result, starting in July 2016, the D6S report has shown no additional D6S transactions. The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office will submit a PDC to eliminate the longstanding DAAS interim conversion of obsolete D6S transactions to DRA functionality.

Action Item 15 SPRC 16-01/JPIWG 16-03: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office to draft a PDC to (1) eliminate the longstanding DAAS interim conversion of obsolete D6S transactions to DRA functionality and (2) discontinue producing the monthly D6S transaction report. After the established cutoff date, any obsolete DIC D6S transactions that the Services may generate will no longer be counted as MRA transactions.

j. Agenda Topic 10 – Update Uniform Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID). Ms. Samantha Mosser (Enterprise Business Process Standards Office) presented an information brief update on the PIID. The Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014 (DATA Act) requires information on federal expenditures be more easily accessible and transparent. This led to changes in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation (DFAR) to implement a more standardized procurement instrument format to ensure uniformity and consistency of data. For the DOD, PIID format remained the same, but with more emphasis on the Position 9 – Instrument Type. In the example below, note that the call or order number was typically carried in DLMS transactions in a four position number usually associated with a parent contract number.

Pos 1-6 DoDAAC	Pos 7-8 FY of Award	Pos 9 Instrument Type	Pos 10-13 Serial Number
SP4705	16	F*	1234

*Instrument Type F: Calls against blanket purchase agreements and orders under contracts (including Federal Supply Schedules, Government-wide acquisition contracts, and multi-agency contracts) and basic ordering agreements issued by departments or agencies outside DOD.

Under the PIID rules the call or order number will be a standalone 13 position (17 for Federal) PIID. The revised implementation date is March 31, 2017. Ms. Mosser noted several impacts:

- The PIID of the ordering instrument (base contract number) and delivery order may appear in two separate fields on contract-related documents, such as standard form (SF) 1449, and DOD form (DD) 1155. Under the current policy and guidance from OUSD (DPAP) PDI, only the delivery order PIID should be tracked in the Component applications and transmitted in DLMS and legacy formatted transactions.

- DOD will continue to use the legacy Procurement Instrument Identification Number (PIIN) and legacy four-position Call/Order Number pending transition to the PIID.

- If vendors provide both the PIID Base Contract Number and Delivery Order Number in iRAPT, iRAPT will move the Base Contract Number to the Reference Procurement Instrument Number field, and the Delivery Order Number will be in the Contract Number field.

- The Reference Procurement Instrument Number allows iRAPT to query and link both the Base Contract Number and Delivery Order Number; however, this option is not available in the DLMS transactions.

- Upon transition to the PIID, WebSDR lost visibility of the PIID base contract number, since the discrepancy is reported at the PIID delivery order number level. The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office is working with the DPAP and the EDA Program Office to add the Reference Procurement Instrument Number to the standard EDA data call that is used by WebSDR to populate contract information in SDRs.. This will allow WebSDR to restore capability to track/group SDRs by the base contract number.

Next Meeting: The Enterprise Business Process Standards Office committee chairs thanked all attendees for their participation, enthusiasm, and continued support. The next Supply PRC meeting will be announced at a future date.

JOHNSON.MARY.JANE.1228703342
Digitally signed by JOHNSON.MARY.JANE.1228703342
Date: 2016.12.06 11:03:41 -05'00'

MARY JANE JOHNSON
Supply PRC Co-Chair

HILERT.ELLEN.S.1229139424
Digitally signed by HILERT.ELLEN.S.1229139424
Date: 2016.12.06 10:31:32 -05'00'

ELLEN HILERT
Supply PRC Co-Chair

GONZALEZ CASTRO.RAFAEL.1283378957
Digitally signed by GONZALEZ CASTRO.RAFAEL.1283378957
Date: 2016.12.06 10:39:01 -05'00'

RAFAEL GONZALEZ
Joint Physical Inventory Working Group Chair

Approved: DAVEREDE.HEIDI.M.1120053600
Digitally signed by DAVEREDE.HEIDI.M.1120053600
Date: 2016.12.06 17:07:44 -05'00'

Heidi M. Daverede
Program Manager, Enterprise Business Process Standards Office

Enclosure