

## **MINUTES FROM SUPPLY PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING 22-1, MARCH 9, 2022**

**1. General:** The Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office (DEDSO) convened a virtual meeting of the Supply PRC via Microsoft Teams and a teleconference on March 9, 2022. Specific discussion topics are identified below. The meeting agenda, briefing material, and the Action Item Tracker are available on the Supply PRC web page:

<https://www.dla.mil/SupplyPRC>

**2. Purpose:** DEDSO hosted a Supply PRC to inform stakeholders about the ongoing efforts and status on several important topics impacting DoD Components. As part of the meeting, DEDSO elicited input from the Components. The topics are:

- Action Item Review from Supply PRC 21-1 and 21-2
- Purpose Code Recap
- DLA Non-Cataloged Stock Numbers
- ADC 1160 Recommending and Authorizing Credit for Validated SDRs
- PDC 1408 Requisitions with Priority Designator Code 09-15 and Special Requirement Category 777
- Pseudo Routing Identifier Codes (RIC)
- Pseudo DoD Activity Address Codes (DoDAAC)
- War Materiel Requirements (WRM) Procedures

Dr. Gail Fuller, Mr. Rafael Gonzalez, Ms. Tonja Carter, and Mr. Benjamin Breen facilitated the meeting discussions. The discussion topics and resulting action items are below. The Action Item Tracker contains the resulting action items which, unless otherwise noted, are due within 30 days from the Supply PRC 21-2 meeting minutes publication unless otherwise stated.

**3. Opening Remarks:** Dr. Gail Fuller, DEDSO Supply Team welcomed attendees and introduced Mr. Nelson Alvarez, Acting Division Chief, DEDSO and Ms. Jan Mulligan, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense – Logistics (ODASD(L)). Mr. Alvarez welcomed attendees and encouraged a spirited discussion on the issues being addressed today. Ms. Mulligan thanked the DEDSO Team for hosting the meeting and for their efforts coordinating this event. Ms. Mulligan addressed a new requirement in the proposed change process. The ODASD(L) Team will engage with DEDSO up front in the process prior to full development of a proposed change to look for cross Component issues. This will not impact routine minor changes affecting existing processes and procedures.

Mr. Gonzalez provided a brief overview of the DEDSO Website and how to find the previous Supply PRC minutes on the Committees Webpage. He also replied to the meeting invite and included the link to the DEDSO Website <https://www.dla.mil/Defense-Data-Standards/>.

#### 4. Meeting Topics:

**a. Agenda Topic 1 – Action Item Review from SPRC 21-1 and 21-2.** Dr. Gail Fuller, DEDSO reviewed the previous open action items and there was no significant input or updates provided from the participants. The six open action items are identified in the meeting slides.

**b. Agenda Topic 2 – Purpose Code Recap.** Mr. Rafael Gonzalez, DEDSO led the discussion and provided a recap of the Purpose Code topic from the October 2021 Supply PRC. The last Supply PRC meeting addressed the concept and was a brainstorming session to gain Component input. DEDSO is taking a pause to make sure that any proposed changes are effective and will meet the Component requirements for segregation of materiel held on their behalf in a storage activity/distribution center. The DEDSO team wants to make sure there is a complete understanding of how the Services are currently using the RICs with the purpose code to segregate materiel in storage. The proposed change is still in development and requires some additional research before moving forward with the purpose code revisions.

Mr. Frederick Lloyd, Army Materiel Command (AMC) stated that he sent DEDSO several questions related to the Project Code proposal. Mr. Gonzalez replied by email to the questions during the meeting.

Mr. Nidal Deeb, Naval Air Warfare Center, Lakehurst, stated the desire to track material better by owner. Mr. Gonzalez stated the proposed expansion of the purpose code would allow segregation of materiel under the same owner RIC. The intent is to allow greater flexibility for the purpose code to support current and future initiatives across the DoD. DEDSO's goal is to reduce the impact as much as possible. Several participants indicated a desire to be included in future discussions as this change evolves. Mr. Gonzalez recommended that they maintain in contact with their Service Primary Supply PRC Representative. Mr. David Daugherty, USMC Logistics Command (MARCORLOGCOM) G4 stated concerns with the revised purpose code concept, PMR and other concerns and ideas not specifically related to the Supply PRC 22-1 agenda items. Mr. Gonzalez recommended Mr. Daugherty to setup a separate meeting with DEDSO to further discuss these concerns.

**c. Agenda Topic 3 – DLA Non-Cataloged Stock Numbers.** Mr. Gonzalez and Ms. Amy Walker, DLA led the discussion. Participants that were at the Supply PRC in May 2020 would have heard about the DLA challenges with non-catalog items moving into the DLA Warehouse Management System (WMS) and the development process that is limiting customization. Ms. Walker reiterated a long-standing DLA concern with not always having the information typically provided in the Pre-Positioned Materiel Receipt (PMR) transaction to identify the material. She highlighted some improvements in the number of non-cataloged items stored at DLA and stated the numbers went down from 63K to 30K. Ms. Walker stated there is a monthly snapshot that goes to the Service point of contacts.

DLA WMS requires a product master record to exist and relies on the PMR and advance shipment notification to capture operational/audit attributes. The 832N Catalog Data transaction to establish an item master record along with the 527D PMR transaction will be required going forward. DLA WMS contacts will continue to be available as needed to move existing non-

cataloged items to WMS and get the master data required. The relevant high level WMS requirements are:

- Requires a product master record to exist and relies on PMR and advance shipment notification to capture operational/audit attributes
- Enforces compliance with current cataloging policy to minimize WMS customization; eliminates DLA decision of operational/audit attributes related to Existence and Rights
- For existing items, DLA will require the Services and DLA EBS to send 832N transactions to WMS for Product Master creation for non-cataloged items to be stored in DLA Distribution
- For future/incoming items, DLA will require the DLMS 527Ds Pre-positioned Material Receipts (PMR) to identify ownership upon receipt

Mr. Gonzalez stated that everyone needs to understand the PMR is an essential part of the process to enable the warehouse to identify the material and assign the correct owner. This is not a new requirement and is a core DoD logistics process.

Mr. David Dougherty, USMC stated there are often limits from the retail community submitting a PMR. Non-cataloged items are problematic and there is a concern that materiel rolling off the logistics catalog may have items without technical catalog data. DLA asked whether he was talking about materiel disposition or distribution, and he stated he was referring to assets going from USMC retail to DLA Disposition Services.

Mr. Gonzalez stated DoD FedMall has the capability to input transaction data in a legacy format. He also stated draft Approved DLMS Change (ADC) 1244B includes a change in the 856S Shipment Status transaction to identify the future owner of the material. This will help DLA to identify the materiel owner. There would still be a need to get the local stock number (LSN) data and there may be a way to address the USMC issue. Regarding the 832N technical data, this transaction is currently limited to three narrow scenarios which could be expanded upon if solid requirements are identified through the DLMS change process for how the 832N is expected to function. Mr. Gonzalez reiterated the PMR policy and restated the existing policy against using LSNs between Components. More discussion is likely required about what direction the logistics community wants the storage activity to do in these instances. The SDR process to resolve these issues takes some time. Mr. Gonzalez briefly mention the need to enforce PMR policy and brainstorm about possible ways to get Components to comply. Mr. Dougherty stated that the USMC was not a fan of sending materiel back to the owner. If there are any questions, please reach out to the DEDSO Supply Team.

Mr. Gonzalez stated the Army controls the management control number (MCN) assignment and will ask submitters for the technical data. Mr. Gonzalez believes that the U.S. Army Logistics Data Analysis Center (LDAC) has a way to communicate the MCN to DLA offline and to identify whether an item is a weapon. Keeping the MCN as part of the data helps DLA with storage decisions. There may be a need for a smaller group to work this issue.

Mr. Dougherty stated a need to have the capability to do free form DLMS transactions like we do with MILS transactions to provide to the services. He referenced financial and other system blackout periods when they had system implementations and were unable to do DLMS

transactions when they were moving between systems. Mr. Gonzalez recommended a separate meeting to further discuss US Marines requirements.

**d. Agenda Topic 4 – ADC 1160 Recommending and Authorizing Credit for Validated SDRs.** Mr. Troy Brown, HQ DLA J3 Inventory Management and Mr. Gonzalez DEDSO addressed the issue reversal and DLA desired to understand if the current manual process needs to continue. Mr. Gonzalez clarified the two scenarios for the issue reversal discussion (see slide 11) and stated that Option B is more complex in both scenarios – the manual process at the end of the day using the D7 to adjust the on-hand balance.

On slide 12, Scenario A is depicted in a screen image from the existing DLA Distribution Standard System (DSS) showing an example of an Air Force owned item where the customer received the item and sent an SDR for the missing 3 of 5 items. The example illustrates how the negative number is used to reverse the receipt – wanted to open this for discussion – this may require a smaller working group to define what we are going to do in the future.

Mr. Breen asked if it is DLA’s position to do a loss and a gain and work the SDR like with other Services and recommend final credit based on the ICP response – Mr. Brown said this is currently how it is done for all Services except Navy. Mr. Breen rephrased DLA’s comment and stated they want to move to a more typical SDR process and move away from the reversal process for all Services. The Air Force continues to use an M Series document number. The M-Series document number issue was addressed in past Supply PRCs and separate correspondence with the Air Force. (See Agenda Topic 6.)

Mr. Gonzalez asked for input from US Navy and US Air Force. He also stated issue reversals after the item is shipped to the customer should not happen as the item has been received by the customer. Mr. David Childress, Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP) N6 and Ms. Theresa Sipe, NAVSUP N6 stated they will take these as an action and report to DEDSO any findings.

Air Force representatives Mr. William Wenzel, Master Sergeant Nitzia Millis, and Ms. Danielle Woods-Lewis, all from Headquarters Air Force A4LR stated that they require more information about the root cause of this issue to reverse the shipment. Mr. Brown stated appreciation for US Navy and US Air Force taking the action to review this issue.

**Action Item 1.** Air Force and Navy identify if the procedures under ADC 1160 are required and advise if the manual issue reversal process can be ended. **15-day response requested.**

**e. Agenda Topic 5 – PDC 1408 Requisitions with Priority Designator Code 09-15 and Special Requirement Category (SRC) 777.** Mr. Damian Alvarez, NAVSUP Weapons Support System (WSS) P&D and Mr. Richard Morrow, DEDSO briefed. Mr. Morrow introduced the brief – stating DEDSO was contacted by Navy in 2021 with a draft PDC, which was formally issued and sent out to the PRC membership in November 2021. Only three PRC members responded as of the date of the Supply PRC, so Mr. Morrow wanted to raise the issue and let Navy talk about why this is an important change. Mr. Alvarez stated the issue is when the Required Delivery Date (RDD) 777 is used, for Navy this is causing items that would be shipped by air, to be shipped via ocean means. The reason for the change is current practice is

not in accordance with the Defense Transportation Regulation. If PD 09-15 is used, the SRC 777 will be stripped from the requisition and cause material to be diverted from air to surface shipment. This change will leave the SRC 777 untouched. Mr. Morrow stated this change is to align the DLMS and the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR).

**f. Agenda Topic 6 – Pseudo Routing Identifier Code (RIC)** Ms. Tonja Carter / Mr. Richard Morrow, DEDSO briefed. Ms. Carter stated this topic was discussed in previous Supply PRC meetings and the Services were working with DLA to reduce the usage of pseudo RICs. Ms. Nancy Dean, DLA J345 stated DLA is still getting some pseudo RICs and are using the WMS implementation as the point in time to have this issue resolved. Ms. Tiffanie Dew, Army Materiel Command (AMCOM) has been working pseudo RICs with DLA and has implemented some changes. The Army is also implementing some changes in support of foreign military sales (FMS) customers. Ms. Carter asked Army to clarify if the FMS customers are using the pseudo RIC. Ms. Dew stated they were being used to segregate FMS owned material from regular army owned materiel in storage. Army is setting up a real RIC for this purpose, but this will not be implemented until 2023. Mr. Jim Weiner, DLA Distribution, stated that Army is taking the most aggressive approach to resolve the pseudo RICs. Ms. Carter asked whether it would be possible to use a real DoDAAC vs a pseudo RICs or a purpose code? Ms. Dew stated that Army uses Ownership Code 8 (which is not maintained by DSS) so they cannot track storage costs by other data. Mr. Weiner stated that for FMS assets – when a country returns an item under warranty or overhaul, that item needs to be isolated and segregated. The FMS items are one-for-one with segregation by FMS Case and document number – exact item is repaired and returned for FMS. He also stated that Navy FMS materiel goes directly to the maintenance facility.

Mr. Deeb, NAWCAD Lakehurst stated that when Navy moved material to DSS, it was set up to segregate by program office owner (Type model etc.) and worked with DLA to segregate using pseudo RICs by Program Office to make sure the equipment is segregated. The potential issue with the 160 to 170 pseudo RICs and DLAs WMS has been identified. Bottom line – for the transition to WMS, Navy has asked for another method other than pseudo RICs and is interested in energizing the previous purpose code discussion. Mr. Gonzalez stated the need to have the Navy review the documentation from the past PRC related to the purpose code discussion, so the current folks are conversant on the proposed solutions. Mr. Gonzalez stated that the proposed purpose code changes will only work with a DLMS transaction solution.

Mr. Weiner stated that the Navy Lakehurst items transferred to DLA were not standard and outside of the Navy Enterprise Resource Planning (ERM) system and were resident in Microsoft Access Database as non-standard stock numbers and outside the normal DSS operation. Mr. Deeb stated this was non-standard “Push” outfitting material/support equipment in a system called Support Equipment Resource Management Information System (SERMIS).

Ms. Carter asked the Services whether they were projecting a future shortage of RICs. US Army, US Navy, and US Marine Corps stated no. The US Air Force – Mr. Wenzel stated there was not an issue and they will go back to Air Force Materiel Command (AFMS) to confirm.

Ms. Carter stated ADC 1263 One DoDAAC to One RIC in the DoDAAD was issued to address the one-to-one relationship between RIC and DoDAAC. Mr. Morrow stated there were no more RIC series to be allocated. He provided examples of using RICs as plant codes in ERP systems

and using one RIC in supply transactions and assigning another RIC in transportation transactions for the same DoDAAC. This was not a practice that was ever envisioned with multiple RICs per DoDAAC. Mr. Morrow also stated that ADC 1263 also enforces not using multiple DoDAACs for a single RIC. An Army participant stated that internal to the Army they have multiple DoDAACs assigned to a RIC. Mr. Morrow clarified that this is not possible to do in the official DoDAAD database.

Mr. Dougherty, USMC believes the Marine Corps has resolved this issue and wanted to know if anyone could let them know if this was still an issue. Mr. Larry Tanner provided the Marine Corps with a report on March 14, 2022 to identify Marine Corps DoDAACs with multiple RICs.

**g. Agenda Topic 7 – Pseudo DoDAAC.** Ms. Tonja Carter/Mr. Richard Morrow, DEDSO addressed ongoing issues with Services using the incorrect Service Code, specifically the Air Force's continued use of the M Series Service code for Repair items for DLA. Ms. Carter commented that ADC 388 addresses this issue and previous Supply PRC meetings going back to 2012 and asked when the Air Force will stop this practice. Mr. Breen clarified that this practice does not appear to be used in a supply requisitioning process. Service responses were:

- Navy does not have any pseudo DoDAACs on their side
- Army was not aware of any pseudo DoDAACs; however, Mr. Morrow stated the Army does have many pseudo DoDAACs being used in the subsistence process managed by DLA Troop Support
- USMC was not aware of any pseudo DoDAACs on their side and only use the assigned L and M series DoDAACs

After the meeting, Mr. Morrow was able to provide the DEDSO Supply Team with a list of all of the pseudo DoDAACs currently being used to order subsistence. The total was about 127 DoDAACs, half of which were Army. The remainder were spread among the Air Force, Marine Corps, Navy. This was down from a total of about 700 at the beginning of the effort to clean these up.

**Action Item 2.** DEDSO research and forward history on the M-DoDAAC issue for maintenance item to the Air force for review. The Air Force POC is [william.wenzel.1@us.af.mil](mailto:william.wenzel.1@us.af.mil). Air Force will identify the financial implications of not using the M DoDAAC.

**h. Agenda Topic 8 – War Materiel Requirements (WRM) Procedures.** Ms. Tonja Carter, DEDSO asked the services if they are still using the WRM process identified in DLM Volume 2, Chapter 3, War Materiel Requirements and Simulated Mobilization Exercises. The existing chapter states require the services to submit WRM transaction on an annual basis. Navy – Ms. Elissa Harr stated as far as they are aware, there is nothing that they run and are not using this process. US Marine Corps stated they are not sending these transactions.

**Action Item 3.** All services to validate the need for the WRM procedures as well as the annual requirement as stated in chapter 3.

**i. Agenda Topic 9. Wrap Up/Action Items**

Mr. Alvarez thanked the participants for the good dialog. Ms. Mulligan thanked the participants and the DEDSO team for the work to reinvigorate the process review committee meetings and ultimately result in improved support to the war fighter. Ms. Mulligan stated a desire to be kept aware of the status and results of the action items. The next Supply PRC meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday July 20, 2022.