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

October 5, 2021

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Supply Process Review Committee Meeting 21-1, August 25, 2021

This memorandum forwards the attached minutes of the Supply Process Review Committee 21-1 meeting for your information and action as appropriate.

The Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office points of contact are Mr. Rafael Gonzalez, e- mail Rafael.Gonzalez@dla.mil, Ms. Tonja Carter, e-mail Tonja.Carter@dla.mil, and Dr. Gail Fuller, e-mail Gail.fuller@dla.mil.

DELANEY.THOMAS.A.1084466987
Digitally signed by DELANEY.THOMAS.A.1084466987
Date: 2021.10.05 08:16:42 -04'00'

THOMAS A. DELANEY
Director, Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office

Attachment
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:
ODASD(Logistics)
Supply PRC
Attendees

MINUTES FROM SUPPLY PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING 21-1, AUGUST 25, 2021

1. General: The Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office (DEDSO) convened a virtual meeting of the Supply PRC via Microsoft Teams and a teleconference on August 25, 2021. Specific discussion topics are noted below. The meeting agenda, briefing materiel, and the Action Item Tracker are available on the Supply PRC web page: https://www.dla.mil/HQ/InformationOperations/DLMS/Archives/supply/.

2. Purpose: The intent of the Supply PRC meeting was to inform stakeholders of several ongoing initiatives that impact them collectively and elicit their input on the initiatives. The topics were:

1. Accountability Challenges in the Supply Chain for End Items under Contractor Repair
2. DoD Component Briefings DLA Pseudo Routing Identifier Codes (RICs)
3. Materiel Segregation in Storage by Purpose

Mr. Rafael Gonzalez and Ms. Tonja Carter facilitated the meeting discussions. The discussion topics and resulting action items are below. The Action Item Tracker contains the resulting action items which are due within 30 days from the Supply PRC 21-01 meeting minutes publication unless otherwise stated.

3. Opening Remarks: Mr. Gonzalez provided opening remarks and introduced Mr. Tad DeLaney, Director, Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office, who welcomed participants and talked briefly about the mission and recent name change. Mr. DeLaney introduced DEDSO, previously the Enterprise Business Standards Office, and discussed the ongoing organizational changes towards DoD data standards and future initiatives.

4. Meeting Topics:

a. Agenda Topic 1 – Accountability Challenges in the Supply Chain for End Items under Contractor Repair. Ms. Carter, DEDSO, led the discussion about accountability challenges with materiel in maintenance and to understand the challenges with maintaining accountability of end items while under contractor repair.

Ms. Jackie Moore, AMC J4, and Mr. Jeff Collins AMC G3 (Contract Support), briefed the current Army initiative within the Army Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) and how accountability was achieved by implementing an Army-internal web portal called Total Asset Visibility - Contractor (TAV-C). TAV-C allows Army contractors to provide asset visibility data to LMP when Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) transactions are not an option. The portal is intended for Class IX materiel under repair contracts but can also be used for any contracts involving government furnished property (GFP). Ms. Moore stated several larger contractors with major equipment successfully transitioned to TAV-C and now have the capability to send receipts and receive other DLMS transactions. Army leadership is currently addressing other challenges regarding preexisting contracts and contractor compliance with DLMS transactions.

Administrative note: Mr. Dennis Bryant, AMC G3, will take over for Ms. Moore who is retiring in September 2021.

Ms. Tiffany Dew, Army AMCOM S&D Deputy, added that for repair contracts, Army implemented a TAV-C solution to utilize subcontracting purchase orders associated with asset visibility. Currently, the contractor has two options to provide a materiel receipt acknowledgement (MRA). Contractors can provide the MRA via a DLMS transaction or use the TAV-C portal. Army also stated that use of the TAV-C does not impact the contractors internal accountable property system of record (APSR), but rather, provides a portal for contractors to report visibility to LMP in real-time.

Ms. Tina Lundy and Mr. Bob Johnson, Air Force representatives, expressed interest in how the Army's TAV-C application functions and the current contractor frequency of reporting. Army explained that the current pool of assets included in the TAV-C program focuses on high dollar assets with the main larger vendors and not smaller vendors yet. Air Force contacts Mr. Todd Moore and Mr. Stan Hale, Air Force Class V (Global Ammunition Control Point), also expressed interest as they do not have direct connections with vendors. As part of the action items, Army will share their Concept of Operations (CONOPS) documentation for the TAV-C portal with the Supply PRC group. Mr. Hale asked if Army could provide a sample of the data set and Ms. Moore suggested that Mr. Collins work with Mr. Bryant to get data samples from Army TAV-C. Ms. Moore stated the Army TAV-C CONOPS was developed prior to the rollout and included the DLMS compliant data. Ms. Bernace Collier and Mr. Pablo Gomez from DAAS were identified by the Air force as support resources for the Theater Integrated Combat Munitions System (TICMS). Mr. Moore stated the Air Force had their program executive office (PEO) notify the contract leads to update contracts and provide the requirements for the contract where the transactions are to be sent. Mr. Moore stated the Air Force only did this for six large primary contractors as the smaller contractors may not have the transaction capability.

Ms. Pam Rooney, Defense Pricing and Contracting (DPC) support, asked whether the TAV-C capability was intended exclusively for repair contracts. Mr. Collins stated the portal can also be leveraged for non-repair contracts to exchange data between customer and supplier. Ms. Rooney stated the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Government Furnished Property (GFP) Module is available for all vendors and complies with all regulatory requirements identified in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS). Ms. Rooney stated the GFP Module has been operational since 2018 and advised the need to stop contractors from submitting transactions in multiple systems. Other gaps exist in GFP and logistics systems because all transactions are not part of the PIEE, GFP Module, and these must be addressed.

Conclusion: There seems to be numerous initiatives related to contractor repair visibility. The DEDSO team will follow up with the Army to get more details on the TAV-C portal. Additionally, DEDSO and DPC teams will meet to re-establish discussions regarding logistics property transfer gaps between PIEE GFP and DLMS transactions. DEDSO requests information from Navy and Marine Corps regarding contractor accountability challenges.

Action Item 1. Army provide CONOPS for LMP TAV-C to DEDSO.

Action Item 2. Navy and USMC to provide information on their contract repair visibility processes or applications.

Action Item 3. DPC to brief on the PIEE GFP Module capabilities.

Action Item 4. DEDSO and DPC to assist the Services on property transfer gaps that support DFARS requirements and GFP logistical requirements

b. Agenda Topic 2 – DoD Component Briefings DLA Pseudo RICs

Mr. Gonzalez, DEDSO, and Ms. Tanya Green, DLA J345, led the discussion on eliminating the use of pseudo RICs. DLA will no longer be able to support pseudo RICs after DLA Warehousing Management System (WMS) launch. Target launch for each of the DLA Distribution sites was provided by DLA during the discussion. The Services will be required to remove pseudo RICs, change, re-warehouse or dispose items stored under invalid pseudo RICs. The Services will need to identify contacts to work with DLA and take appropriate disposition action on pseudo RICs.

Ms. Green stressed all materiel stored by DLA needs to be accounted for under a valid materiel owner RIC and DLA can no longer afford to have materiel that is stored under pseudo RICs. Ms. Green stated Mr. Gonzalez is correct in the initial assessment and referenced the Supply PRC 20-1 meeting held in April 2020 that identified the initial pseudo-RIC problem. We need to ensure proper materiel accountability between DLA and Service systems. In a recent review of storage agreements with DLA, the DLA Team uncovered site-specific agreements that allow use of pseudo RICs. Materiel in DLA's possession must be recorded in the proper Service APSR, to do this, DLA requires a valid materiel owner RIC. Ms. Green stressed the need for a broader awareness to ensure DLA does not have push back on the existing agreements.

DLA provided a list of national stock numbers (NSN) and local stock numbers stored under pseudo RICs and included the number of pseudo RICs assigned. Ms. Green stated DLA is reaching out to the respective program managers and requests senior leadership as points of contact (POC) to help resolve the issue. She also referenced correspondence from DLA Senior Leadership sent to the Services to ensure management is aware of the issue.

Ms. Rooney, DPC asked whether there is a requirement to move away from RIC assignment and use the DoD activity address code (DoDAAC). Mr. Gonzalez stated there was some effort to look at the one-to-one RIC to DoDAAC relationship, however there are no immediate plans to transition from RIC to DoDAAC to identify the materiel owner at this time. The RIC to DoDAAC relationship needs to be fully established for this to work before we can move away from using the RIC.

Ms. Carter, DEDSO, asked the Components how significant the RIC is in their respective systems and processes, responses included:

- Army (Ms. Dew). Yes, the RIC is relevant and used in Army LMP.
- Army (Mr. Hanson, Defense Integrated Business System (DIBS) Contractor Support). LMP uses the inventory control point RIC, Army Class Management Activity (ACMA) RIC, and other global materiel master data elements to identify Army Working Capital Funds (AWCF) funds and financial ownership. LMP does not use the DoDAAC to determine the financial owner. The Military Standard Requisitioning and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP)/Interfund determines the customer's fund code based on

document number DoDAAC, or Ship-To DoDAAC along with signal code. The DoDAAC is for routing shipments, billing, and not to determine financial ownership.

- Air Force (Mr. Todd Moore, AF Class V). Yes, many of the Air Force Systemic DLMS transactions today are routed by RIC.
- DLA (Ms. Erin Fowles, DLA WMS). Only two or three of our systems are using a DoDAAC today. DLA would really need to look at the capability within the implementation convention (IC) for the transaction to send the DoDAAC in lieu of the RIC and make sure we have ONLY a one-to-one relationship between the DoDAAC and RIC. (DEDSO Note: Most transactions are currently configured to enable use of the DoDAAC or RIC)
- Army (Mr. Collins, AMC Support). Some items are categorized under Army, AMC incorrectly.
- There is nothing currently in LMP to determine financial ownership based on the DoDAAC. Mr. Collins also stated that moving away from a RIC would be a challenge for the Army.

Ms. Penney Robertson, Army, asked DLA if they could get a crosswalk from the four-position DLA Site Identification to the Army three position RIC's. The RICs are identified as:

HEAA - Anniston BA4

HETP - Tobyhanna BY6

HEWG - Warner Robins SDD

HWC1 - Corpus Christi B52

HWRT - Red River BR4

Mr. Weiner stated that materiel in location HETP was part of an effort between Army and DLA to mitigate pseudo RICs.

Mr. Collins stated LMP uses plant codes and asked if DLA would accommodate their use in WMS. Ms. Fowles, DLA stated that Army has a plant code, RIC/DoDAAC cross walk with owners associated with RICs/DoDAACs. Mr. Weiner responded that the Longbow Engine Program was managed through a pseudo-RIC of 11P created to segregate the T-700 engines and containers.

Ms. Green stated that each Service has a global distribution e-mail managed by DLA Distribution to facilitate and support reconciliation scenarios. The e-mail addresses are, reconarmy@dla.mil; reconairforce@dla.mil; reconmarinecorp@dla.mil; reconnavy@dla.mil. During the meeting, Ms. Green e-mailed the DLA distribution list to Mr. Collins.

Conclusion: The use of pseudo-RICs is not an authorized process. Service leads need to collaborate with DLA (Ms. Green) to address the assets under pseudo RICs stored at DLA Distribution Centers. Services must be aware of the WMS schedule and eliminate any existing pseudo RICs prior to go-live.

Action Item 5. Services to provide POCs and appropriate disposition action for materiel currently under pseudo RICs stored at DLA Distribution Centers.

c. Agenda Topic 3–Materiel Segregation in Storage by Purpose

Mr. Gonzalez facilitated the discussion with the problem statement to better understand the need for segregation of materiel beyond the line item (NSN, supply condition code, and materiel owner). DEDSO volunteered to develop the baseline requirements and expand the current purpose code. Mr. Gonzalez stated segregation by purpose could replace pseudo RICs. Back in 2018, Air Force previously requested a new supply condition code to segregate materiel by program, however the concept ultimately was not supported or approved by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) Logistics(L) and DEDSO.

Mr. Gonzalez provided an overview of the current and proposed future design for use of the purpose code. Expanding the existing purpose code would enable all DoD storage activities to segregate materiel beyond the materiel owner. The purpose code would be assigned by the materiel owner without impacting any financial responsibilities. The storage activities will report and reconcile inventory records with the materiel owner for the total quantity regardless of the purpose code(s). A materiel owner may use a purpose code to physically allocate/segregate materiel to identify a purpose, secondary ownership, or a program/initiative. Materiel owners could assign a new purpose code at time of receipt via the pre-positioned materiel receipt (PMR) transaction. The proposed changes to the purpose code will also include a process to assign a purpose code to materiel already in storage.

The proposed changes to the purpose code will not affect how Services use it today. Instead, the expanded process will use positions 2-6 to segregate materiel at storage activities across Components. Mr. Gonzalez advised the next Supply PRC meeting scheduled for October 27, 2021, will address this topic in greater detail.

Ms. Fowles, DLA WMS, stated a concern that purpose code is not a standard SAP element and would require customization. Mr. Gonzalez advised requirements are still in the discovery phase and additional discussions will take place in the next Supply PRC meeting. He also stated, DLA plays a major role in developing these requirements as they store materiel for all services. DLA will review the final requirements to determine any additional cost to the Services.

d. Request for Information Feedback. DEDSO requested information from the Services to better understand the current use of the ownership/purpose code. Input received from the Services includes:

- Mr. Collins Army, AMC Support. Army uses ownership/purpose codes and raised some concerns regarding potential impact to existing functionality. Mr. Gonzalez acknowledged his concern and reiterated the proposed purpose code will not affect current use and functionality.
- Ms. Moore, AMC J4, coordinated an Army functional data call and provided the input to DEDSO. See Army feedback in Enclosure 1.
- Marine Corps, Ground Ammo stated transactions that are received from Navy in MILS format includes ownership and purpose code. Marine Corps agreed to provide a sample of document numbers relevant to their comments. See Marine Corps feedback in Enclosure 2.

- Mr. Robert Wicks, USAF, stated that AF Munitions (Class V) does not use purpose codes.
- Mr. Gonzalez asked whether Navy could explain how the ownership and purpose code is used today. NAVSUP 04 AMMO does not see the need for further segregation. Mr. Gonzalez pointed out the Navy uses pseudo RICs to segregate materiel. The Navy will need another way to achieve the same level of segregation. DLA will no longer support the use of pseudo RICs.

Split Valuation Discussion: Mr. Hansen, Army LMP stated logistics system for many asset owners use both the ownership and purpose code batch records. Mr. Collins stated SAP allows split valuation for the same stock based on supply condition code. There is a valuation type called "noVal" which is valued at zero and does not impact the financial side. Mr. Benjamin Breen, DEDSO, stated materiel valuation is based on the supply condition code.

Routing Identifier Code Segregation Related to Foreign Military Sales (FMS). Ms. Moore stated the Army currently uses RICs to segregate materiel in storage for Security Assistance/FMS and the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) alignment is crucial. Mr. Mark Seigan, Army TACOM C&D, explained issues found with tracking items for repair and returns using ownership RICs. The assets are owned by Army until they are released to the FMS customer freight forwarder. The Army found issues identifying what FMS case and line the assets belong to while stratifying the FMS lines. Ms. Julienne Jager, AMC in collaboration with Mr. Weiner, are working on establishing new FMS RICs to segregate materiel to address audit findings. Mr. Jim Weiner, DLA DSS, is working with Ms. Jager but stated that there are no current FMS RICs. Ms. Carter requested the Army clarify if this was only for FMS materiel and Army concurred. Ms. Carter requested a copy of the audit information for review. Mr. Hale, (Air Force), stated the purpose code is important for financial reporting rather than the RIC. The Air Force interfaces with the Services to report items to their respective financial systems.

Ownership\Purpose Code impacts with Logistics Reassignment: Ms. Fowles asked about the impact on logistical reassignment with the proposed changes to the purpose code. Ms. Fowles asked if the purpose code will play a factor in a logistics reassignment and whether the purpose code should be retained from the original Service. Ms. Carter asked if the ownership/purpose codes would be perpetuated during a logistics reassignment from one Component to another. Mr. Gonzalez clarified that the proposal is still in the discovery phase, but this can be part of the requirements if needed. Ms. Fowles also stated that DLA is interested in understanding if the purpose code is meaningful to a gaining and losing materiel owner during an ownership transfer. Ms. Dew, stated the Army does not logistically reassign inventory that is stratified by Ownership and/or Purpose Codes other than A.

Project Codes. One of the services raised the question about using project codes for materiel segregation. Ms. Carter stated project codes are used to distinguish requisitions, related documentation, and shipments, to accumulate Service/Agency performance and cost data related to exercises, maneuvers, and other distinct programs, projects, and operations. Projects codes as currently used, are not intended to segregate materiel in storage. Ms. Carter provided an extract from the project codes definition, "…*other than Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD)/Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) assigned codes, do not provide nor imply any priority or precedence for requisition processing or supply decisions. Project codes are not*

related to priority in any respect and, when used, do not alter nor override the priority assigned to a requisition or shipment. Requisitions containing project codes and shipments related thereto will be processed strictly under the assigned priority designator and implied/requested preferential treatment to the contrary will be disregarded."

Purpose Code Summary - Way ahead for the Next Supply PRC. Five topics for the upcoming Supply PRC, October 27, 2021:

1. Should purpose code be a pre-defined value, defined in the DLM (i.e., TPFBRC)?
2. Controls to prevent abuse of the purpose code.
3. Should there be a limit on the amount of purpose codes per NSN, supply condition code, materiel owner combination?
4. Would there be a cost associated?
5. Examples where a purpose code can be beneficial for DoD metrics.

Action Item 6. Air Force and Navy to provide DEDSO a summary of their procedures for the purpose and ownership codes.

Action Item 7. Services to provide potential implementation impacts on logistic reassignments when inventory is segregated by program/purpose for upcoming October 2021 Supply PRC.

Action Item 8. Services to identify the need to segregate FMS assets/cases.

Action Item 9. Army to provide documentation regarding audit finding on FMS materiel.

Next Meeting: The Defense Enterprise Data Standards team thanked all attendees for their participation, enthusiasm, and continued support. The next Supply PRC meeting is scheduled for October 27, 2021.

Enclosure 1

Request for Information – U.S. Army Feedback

LMP PMO:

- Who has implemented the purpose code and ownership code and how it's been used today? We also need to understand any negative impact to this approach.
  - LMP uses the purpose code and ownership code for inventory stratification and valuation;
  - OP code is used in Logistics functions: Planning, Acquisition, IMWM, Distribution, MRM, Returns Management and Disposal functions
  - LCMCs, Depots, PMs/PEO, Financial, FMS communities would all be impacted
  - Significant effort to make this change in LMP; if possible this might make better sense to incorporate into EBS-C
- Any negative impact if we sunset the Ownership Code data element? This means that upon approval of the change, the ownership code will no longer be available and will get discontinued as part of this effort.
  - Yes, the above mentioned areas would all be impacted, unless the current capabilities are redesigned
- DEDSO would like to make the implementation of this effort as simple as possible. We believe the Services will greatly benefit from this. **For those who have implemented the purpose code**, we would like to understand the level of impact that would take to modify the current business rules and attributes of the purpose code. This will help us determine if the best route is to create a new data element or expand the existing purpose code.
  - The effort would need to be determined based on a better understanding of the requirements; based on the information currently provided, the effort would be significant
    - Effort would depend on many factors, to include how the business intends to use the code to support business processes
      - Effort to implement – this is the system requirement
      - Effort to clean-up existing data (i.e., inventory) – system and business impact / effort

Supply Chain BTL:

1. LMP currently utilizes both Ownership and Purpose Codes. Ownership codes are used to identify if inventory is owned by a specific entity (i.e., PM, Air Force, DLA, etc.). They are all numeric characters. Purpose codes are used to identify a specific purpose that the inventory is set aside for (i.e., War Reserve, GFM, etc.). These are all Alpha characters. Both Ownership and Purpose Code is used in conjunction with Project Codes, which better define the purpose that the material is to be used for.
2. We have a lot of logic in LMP based on the Ownership/Purpose Code field. Eliminating the Ownership Code and only using a 5-character purpose code would require major system changes for LMP. We have specific logic around Ownership Codes forcing inventory to not be valued in our system since these materials would be owned by a non-AWCF entity.

3. I’m not sure I understand the need for an expanded purpose code field when we utilize an Owner RIC which identifies the owner of the material. Expanding the purpose code field would appear to be a duplication of the Owner RIC and Project Code fields.

JMC:

1. LMP currently utilizes both Ownership and Purpose Codes. Ownership codes are used to identify if inventory is owned by a specific entity (i.e., PM, Air Force, DLA, etc.). They are all numeric characters.

Purpose codes are used to identify a specific purpose that the inventory is to set aside for (i.e. War Reserve, GFM, etc.). These are all Alpha characters. Both Ownership and Purpose Code is used in conjunction with Project Codes, which better define the purpose that the material is to be used for.

2. We have a lot of logic in LMP based on the Ownership/Purpose Code field. Eliminating the Ownership Code and only using a 5-character purpose code would require major system changes for LMP. We have specific logic around Ownership Codes forcing inventory to not be valued in our system since these materials would be owned by a non-AWCF entity.

3. I’m not sure I understand the need for an expanded purpose code field when we utilize an Owner RIC which identifies the owner of the material. Expanding the purpose code field would appear to be a duplication of the Owner RIC and Project Code fields.

4. Other Service customers utilize multiple Ownership codes to delineate owner within a given Owner RIC (i.e., NCB (Navy) utilizes 0, 5, 7, 8). Any change to this data structure would require their concurrence, and updates in their APSR and the interfaces between their and Army systems.

TACOM:

1. Can purpose codes be 1-5 characters or will they be a standard 5? Language states, "up to" implying the length can vary. If the character length can vary, it will most likely lead to more errors (system and human).

-What will be considered legacy systems?

-How will a 5-character purpose code transmit electronically in the supply systems and interfacing systems (LMP, GCSS-Army, DSS, DAAS, AESIP)? Will MILSTRIP 80 cc formats require need to be adjusted/changed?

-Assumption: Multiple system changes needed to accommodate new 5-character Purpose Code.

2. No comments

3. If the objective is that the Purpose Code is inter-component and no longer intra-component, what does "only the materiel owner will know what the purpose code value means" mean? If purpose codes are inter-component then the purpose code should be the same for each service with the exception of the Owner RIC.

Examples or illustrations would be very helpful.

DLA system, DSS, and Retail system, GCSS-Army, do not store stock using Ownership/Purpose Codes (OP Code).

-OP Codes are used within LMP to for multiple purposes. The most significant Owner Code is for PM designation.

4. NAMI doesn't use Ownership codes but this would affect PM Ownership code 9 assets. Although all PMs now have distinctive Owner RICs so eliminating the Owner Code might not be a problem. If the Purpose Code can be 5 characters and determined by the Service then the Ownership 9 could become a part of the Purpose Code if necessary.

-This would require mass system changes (S&D and IMWM and other business areas).

5. Again, requisitioning by Purpose Code would potentially cause more errors. For example multiple batches based on Purpose Codes and requisition filled from wrong Purpose Code. Potential to cause more discrepancies in stock balances.

-Army Storage activities for DLA De and Retail sites do not store under OP Codes but by Condition Code and Owner RIC.

-MILSTRIP document changes and System changes would need to take place in multiple Systems to allow for proper Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) between all Supply Systems and interfacing (middleware) systems.

6. System changes in LMP and beyond required (equivalent to DAD DIC but would need to be able to transmit outbound).

Would sunsetting Ownership Codes only involve the numeric codes 0-9?

There are many Purpose Code processes in LMP that will be affected by changes. One specific process relates to Excess Disposal Orders. LMP moves all excess stock into a purpose code M batch prior to disposal. If purpose code changes are made, Excesses process would need to be updated. Audit procedures reviewed. Also, EOD will need changes. Requisition processing will need changes.

Enclosure 2

Request for Information – U.S. Marine Corps Feedback

Greatest Concerns, from Marine Corps perspective:

1) LOGCOM has questions regarding why this is being proposed and would like to seek a better understanding of why DLA is requesting this change and what issues they are trying to address.
2) Who will be expected to pay for systems changes required if this goes forward (GCSS-MC and any other impacted systems)?

They also provided responses to the specific questions below:

1. Who has implemented the purpose code and ownership code and how it's been used today? We also need to understand any negative impact to this approach.
   RESPONSE: LOGCOM currently uses to the purpose code to flag assets by specific program or utilization.
2. Any negative impact if we sunset the Ownership Code data element? This means that upon approval of the change, the ownership code will no longer be available and will get discontinued as part of this effort.
   RESPONSE: Loss of ownership code could impact Fleet requirements based an ongoing proof of concept regarding owned war reserve materiel.
3. DEDSO will like to make the implementation of this effort as simple as possible. We believe the Services will greatly benefit from this. **For those who have implemented the purpose code**, we will like to understand the level of impact that would take to modify the current business rules and attributes of the purpose code. This will help us determine if the best route is to create a new data element or expand the existing purpose code.
   RESPONSE: Modification of current business rules and implementation would be significant as GCSS and DOD/DLA/Marine Corps policy do not currently support this approach. See below for initial top level concerns:
   - GCSS: In GCSS the purpose code field is limited to one character. GCSS would have to be updated to comply with the 5-character purpose code requirement.
   - Fleet: Currently, only LOGCOM users have access to the purpose code functionality in GCSS. With the growth of Fleet units storing material at DLA and Fleet units shipping material to DLA at the direction of LOGCOM purpose code functionality will have to be expanded to fleet users.
   - Electronic Data Interchange: The electronic exchange of purpose code data between and DLA would have to be more functional than it currently is.
   - Marine Corps and DOD/DLA policy: Policy at all levels would need to be modified.
   - DLA inventory segregation and serialization efforts: Need to better understand how this ties into other on-going DLA efforts.
   - CUEC/Internal Controls. How will this impact the current CUEC and internal controls environment.