

DLSSD-B

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

SUBJECT: Minutes: Joint DoD MILSTRAP/MILSTRIP Focal Point Committee Meeting, March 19-23, 1990

I. **PURPOSE:** DoD Directive 4000.25 requires quarterly meetings of the Defense Logistics Standard Systems Focal Point Committees. This joint meeting of the DoD MILSTRAP and MILSTRIP committees was convened at 0830, March 19, 1990, in the Defense Logistics Standard Systems Division conference room, 6301 Little River Turnpike, Alexandria, VA. The primary purpose of the meeting was to review the Modernization of Defense Logistics Standard Systems (MODELS) recommendations, listed in the agenda at attachment 1, determine whether the recommendations should be adopted, and identify the required data elements, segments, and transactions involved to include a "wedge" in the MODELS base line. Development of any needed supporting procedures will be accomplished after the base line is established in May 1990. MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP proposals, listed in attachment 1, were also scheduled for discussion to resolve comments and determine future action. A list of attendees is at attachment 2.

II. **BRIEF SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS:**

A. **Administrative.** The System Administrators opened the meeting with introductions, routine administrative comments, and an explanation of the meeting objectives.

B. **MODELS Enhancements:**

1. **RECNO 89-043, Transmit Alert of Defective Items.**

a. **Discussion.** At their February 26 to March 7, 1990, meeting, the MODELS Functional Working Group (FWG) agreed with the focal point committee recommendation to consider RECNO 89-043 in conjunction with RECNO 89-344, Automate All Discrepancy Reports Under One Reporting System. The Navy was to review a list of alert notification data elements, suggested by DLA, and provide any

additions at this meeting. Navy had no additional data elements. DLA recommended adding 'action office Product Quality Discrepancy Report (PQDR) Number'.

b. Disposition. LMI will add 'action office PQDR number' to the alert notification which will be addressed in MODELS version 2 under the Supply Discrepancy Reporting consolidation effort.

2. RECNO 89-077, Means for ICPs to Direct Storage Activities to Reclassify Materiel.

a. Discussion. This enhancement was previously discussed at the January 90 Joint MILSTRAP/MILSTRIP Focal Point Committee Meeting at which time it was agreed that two transactions would be developed to accomplish the Inventory Control Point (ICP) request for reclassification of materiel and the storage activity reply. Following the meeting, DLSSD, working with LMI, formatted the transactions and assigned a third DI code to separate up and down traffic as follows: **DI Code DVX**, ICP Request/Followup for Reclassification; **DI Code DVY**, Request for Extension of the Reclassification Timeframe; and **DI Code DVZ**, Reclassification Reply. DLSSD also added a date field and management code to each transaction to accommodate the intended purpose. At the March meeting, DLSSD clarified that the DVZ constituted a negative reply and that a positive reply would be submitted in the form of the **DI Code DAC**, Dual Inventory Adjustment transaction. An advice code will be added to the DAC transaction to be used when it is submitted in response to an ICP followup. Services and Agencies were asked to provide reasons why reclassification cannot be effected. The Services responded that relatively few conditions exist whereby the storage activity would refuse the request to reclassify materiel. The primary example cited was the nonavailability of the specified materiel. At this point the committee discussed the possibility of returning to the original two transactions. There was also a lengthy discussion concerning the necessity for including serial number tracking on the reclassification formats and the need to break out storage activity responses by management code.

b. Disposition. LMI will develop formats for reclassification to include serial number tracking, looping by denial code on the DVZ reply, and a workload priority designator as requested by the Army. LMI will structure the formats so that the Procurement Instrument Number (PIN) or a document number functions as a control number in the base (rather than the from/to portion) of the transactions. LMI will develop management codes based upon the

reasons for requesting an extension as cited in Chapter 5 of the MILSTRAP manual. These are large quantities, nonavailability of personnel and/or test equipment, or other circumstances considered justified by the storage activity Commander. Denial codes similar to those used on the MILSTRIP DI Code A6_ transaction will be assigned to the DVZ reply. LMI may elect to create new transaction sets for the reclassification transactions, rather than the 533 transaction as originally proposed, due to complexity of the looping structure. LMI will attempt to complete this enhancement for the MODELS baseline.

3. RECNO 89-088, Unique EDDS Diversion Order, Denial, Confirmation, Status Transaction.

RECNO 89-144, Notification to Transshipment Facility of Incoming Consolidation/Purpose/Destination Information.

RECNO 89-339, Develop MODELS to Accommodate Navy Advanced Shipping System Transactions (Include Capability to Group BK_ Transactions).

a. Discussion. RECNOs 89-144 and 89-339 were deleted. Requirements under these RECNOs were moved to RECNO 89-088 with MILSTRAP as the lead system interfacing with MILSTRIP and DTEDI. Since there were a few unresolved issues regarding these recommendations; such as, the status of TRANSCOM's effort to develop procedures on consolidating shipments during various stages in the shipment channel--transportation tracking between nodes, the Navy volunteered to take the lead in coordinating the combined effort now covered under this enhancement. The Navy will contact the other S/As and request their input. The Navy will set up a meeting between the S/As and advise DLSSD of the established meeting date. After the meeting with the S/As, the Navy will provide the status of the meeting to either the Joint MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP Committee, or to the MODELS Functional Working Group in August 1990. We will also give the FMS community an opportunity to review the final package for applicability within their systems. We suggested that RECNO 89-088 be deferred until MODELS Version 2.

b. Disposition. We agreed to revise the title of RECNO 89-088 to read: Consolidated Processing Point for Shipments and Returns, which more appropriately define requirements transferred from the deleted RECNOs 89-144 and 89-339. The Navy will meet with DLA, Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps during their investigation of the combined effort now addressed under this enhancement. The Navy will report their findings to the MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP Committee or to the FWG in August 1990. We will have the ILCOs review the final

package for applicability to their systems. We recommend that RECNO 89-088 be deferred to MODELS Version 2.

4. RECNO 89-094, MODELS Transaction for Certificate of Disposal.

a. Discussion. The Certificate of Disposal is currently a manual form which provides notification to DRMS that waste materiel has been destroyed under S/A regulations. The problem with automating the Certificate of Disposal is similar to the issue surrounding electronic signature authentication. Under the manual system, contractors complain of having to hold materiel awaiting disposition instructions. The Certificate of Disposal acts like the DD Form 250 which authorizes payment to the contractor. We also discussed merging the invoice with the certificate. The Coast Guard mentioned different rules applicable to Federal civil Agencies/activities regarding the turn-in of automated equipment (formerly ADPE).

b. Disposition. We tabled this topic to determine under which DLSSD system to address these issues and will coordinate our decisions with MILSBILLS, MILSCAP, MILSTRIP, MILSTRAP, and LMI (applicability to the 810 transaction). We also agreed that if the additional information could not be finalized within the next 1 or 2 weeks that we would recommend this topic for inclusion under MODELS Version 2.

5. RECNO 89-096, Augmentation of Supply Support Requests

a. Discussion. This enhancement proposes use of EDI technology to transmit Provisioning Line Item Supply Support Requests (SSRs). These are prepared by the Services to furnish supply and technical information relative to individual items which are required, such as to support a new weapons system. Under existing formats, the amount of information conveyed is hampered by the 80 record positions available. A DLA subject matter expert, Mr. John Ferguson, spoke to the committee about the need for advancement in this area and about current related developments. He described the Data Review and Monitoring Aid (DRAMA) automated system being developed by an Air Force and McDonald Douglas team. Also, Mr. Ferguson indicated that there is significant interest in incorporating the 19 data elements listed by DLA which are not currently available in the SSR C series formats.

b. Disposition. There are over a dozen C series transactions used to relate SSRs. Resources must be allocated to

adapt and enhance these into the EDI MODELS structure. Due to current resource constraints, the committee agreed to defer this item to Version 2.

6. RECNO 89-104, Augmentation of Prepositioned Materiel Receipt Data.

RECNO 89-133, Provide MILSCAP and shipper information in Requisition Status Transaction

a. Discussion:

(1) The committee approved RECNO 89-104, for inclusion in MODELS version 1, at the January 90 Joint MILSTRAP/MILSTRIP Focal Point Committee Meeting, where DLA provided a list of optional contract data elements to be added to the PMR (transaction 527 (DI Code DU_)). The Services were to review DLA's list and provide any additional data elements at this meeting. The Services indicated they had no additional data elements. The committee agreed with DLA's recommendation to add: certificate requirement indicator, critical application indicator, and special requirements indicator; and to delete: contract delivery date, unit of issue conversion factor, and FOB site.

(2) The MILSTRAP System Administrator questioned DLA's inclusion of a hazardous materiel indicator since this element was already being added to the PMR under RECNO 89-013, Develop Item Type Storage Code. DLA wanted the element added under RECNO 89-104 to assure it was included in MODELS PMR data as RECNO 89-013 was not fully approved yet. RECNO 89-013 approval was pending until the item type storage codes were developed; and a determination was made as to whether or not they would be cataloging data elements; and whether cataloging data, which is disseminated through the Defense Integrated Data System (DIDS), should be repeated in MODELS transactions. The Services and DLA indicated that DIDS data was not always readily accessible. The MILSTRAP System Administrator felt that this was a Service/Agency system problem. The MODELS FWG chairman ruled that cataloging data could be included in MODELS transactions when circumstances warranted it. He approved RECNO 89-013, pending receipt of the item type storage codes from the responsible DoD committee, thereby negating the need for including the hazardous materiel indicator in RECNO 89-104.

(3) LMI determined that the packaging data being added, per MIL-STD-2073, was extensive and, therefore, recommended developing two separate segments for packaging and contract data. The committee agreed to this recommendation.

(4) At the January 90 meeting, it was agreed that the contract data segment being added to the PMR, under RECNO 89-104, would also be added to MILSTRIP contract status (transaction 514 (DI Code AB_)), under RECNO 89-133. LMI recommended, and the committee agreed, to add only the new contract data segment to transaction 514 and not the packaging data segment.

b. Disposition. Under RECNO 89-104, LMI will add two new optional segments (contract data and packaging data) to transaction 527 (DI Code DU_). Under RECNO 89-133, LMI will add the new, optional contract data segment to transaction 514 (DI Code AB_). The packaging data segment will be defined as indicated in MIL-STD-2073. The contract data elements are shown at attachment 3 [NOTE: If a contract data element can be incorporated in segments N1 through N4 it is so noted in attachment 3, all others will be included in the new contract data segment].

E.K. - DO I NEED TO PUT APPROVAL OF 89-13 IN THIS DISPOSITION ??
OR SHOULD IT BE ADDED AS AN ITEM NUMBER???

7. RECNO 89-147, Deployed Unit Requisitions.

a. Discussion. The Navy discussed their problem of diverting shipments of materiel to follow deployed units when deployed units change locations. The committee suggested using DAAS to change the address of the DoDAAC when deployed units change locations and that LOGPLAN should cover changing locations as an internal mechanism. The Navy should use diversion procedures under MILSTRIP. The committee disagreed with any changes to the RQB to allow requisitions to follow deployed units stating procedures are currently in existence to cover this situation.

b. Disposition. The Navy agreed to take this recommendation back for further investigation. They will consider the use of the DoDAAD procedures for changing DoDAAC addresses to receive materiel and modifier procedures under MILSTRIP for diverting shipments to deployed units changing locations. This enhancement is considered closed. Navy will submit a new enhancement if more is required. LMI will not modify the N1 coding.

8. **RECNO 89-203, Expand the Cooperative Logistics Program Support Code (CLPSC) to Differentiate Between Foreign Military Sales Order (FMSO) I and II Requisitions (Approved MILSTRIP Change 22).**

RECNO 89-113, Develop Unique Requisition Contract and Shipping Information (DLSS Rp 72 Portion).

a. Discussion. RECNO 89-203 was developed from a request for implementation date (RFID) for Approved MILSTRIP Change 22, CLPSC. As a result of staffing AMC 22, the Navy indicated they would not use the new codes because their Cooperative Logistics Supply Support Arrangements (CLSSAs) are managed on a financial basis. The Army and Air Force stated they would probably not use the new codes. The change has been referred to the Director for International Logistics (DASD(L)IL) for determination of the need for the new CLPSCs. In regard to RECNO 89-113, the committee determined that the note for data segment element RQF09, "otherwise RQF09 is blank" should be deleted. The Air Force indicated that for FMS requisitions they may use rp 72 (RQF09) to convey intra-Service information for CLSSA requirements.

b. Disposition. RECNO 89-203 is suspended pending receipt of further guidance from the Director for International Logistics (DASD(L)IL). LMI will delete the words "otherwise RQF09 is blank" from the note for data segment RQF09. RECNO 89-113 is considered complete.

9. **RECNO 89-207, Materiel Release Order Confirmation of Foreign Military Sales Shipments (Discuss Army/DLA Research of DAAS Data to Determine Disposition of Proposed MILSTRIP Change 24).**

a. Discussion. The S/As have nonconcurred in PMCL 24. At MILSTRIP Focal Point Committee Meeting 90-1, November 28-30, 1989, the MILSBILLS Administrator provided the MILSTRIP focal points a DAASO special report that identified the number of billing adjustment requests with Advice Code 35 generated during the period of October 1-31, 1989. Advice Code 35 is used to advise that the ILCO has received shipment status but no billing. The DLA and Army requested the DAASO to provide a listing of billing adjustment requests to be used to research the problem. The Army and DLA stated the listings had not been received as of March 16, 1990; therefore, they could not perform the required research. If the DAASO data warrants a change to MILSTRIP, PMCL 24 will have to be changed to require the supply source to request the DAASO to provide shipment data in lieu of the DAASO automatically providing the data.

b. Disposition. PMCL 24 is suspended until completion of research by the Army and DLA.

10. **RECNO 89-210, Automated Verification of Excessive Quantity Requisitions (Review of Proposed MILSTRIP Change 29A Replies).**

a. Discussion. The Army and Navy nonconcurred in the proposal; however, the Army recommended a change that would, if adopted, overcome their objections to the proposal. The Navy and the other committee members concurred in the Army's change. The committee questioned how the future anticipated annual requirements, that may be entered in the response to the request for verification of excessive quantity (DI Code AQR) would be used. It was agreed to delete this data from the response (DI Code AQR). The GSA objected to the use of Status Code BO. The committee agreed that it was not necessary to use Status Code BO because the definition of the new transaction DI Code AQR, Verification of Excessive Quantity Requisition, fully explains its use. The committee agreed that the same rules for determining the recipient of MOV requests, chapter 7, paragraph F., should be used for determining the recipient of DI Code AQR transactions. The committee agreed to reduce the amount of data that must be included in the DI Code AQR and DI Code AQR transactions.

b. Disposition. An RFID will be issued with changes as follows:

(1) Change chapter 3, paragraph D.2. to read as follows:

"2. Requisitions that reflect quantities which exceed normal demands or quantities that appear to be excessive or in error may be verified by the supply source before positive supply is taken. When the supply source determines that the requisitioned quantity needs to be verified, the supply source will generate a DI Code AQR, Verification of Excessive Quantity Requisition (appendix C48). The DI Code AQR will be provided to the activity as designated by the M&S. If the M&S is 0, the DI Code AQR will be provided to the activity designated by the character in rp 54. If the character in rp 54 is invalid, the DI Code AQR will be provided to the requisitioner (rp 30-35). If the M&S is F, G, P, or Z, the DI Code AQR will be provided to the requisitioner (rp 30-35). A response is due within 30 days from the date of receipt of the DI Code AQR for U.S. Forces and 75 days for FMS customers. Requisitioners will respond with a DI Code AQR, Response to Request for Verification of

Excessive Quantity (appendix C49) by the specified response date, otherwise the requisition will be automatically canceled."

(2) Change chapter 4, paragraph H.9. to read as follows:

"9. Supply sources will furnish a DI Code AQR transaction when the intent is to request customer verification of an exceedingly large quantity requisition."

(3) Change chapter 4, paragraph H.9.b. to read as follows:

"b. The quantity field of the DI Code AQR transaction will contain the actual quantity required. If less than the original requisitioned quantity, the difference will be canceled with BQ status. If the quantity field is all zeros, then the entire requisition will be canceled with BQ status. An increase in the quantity field is not authorized."

(4) Paragraphs 4 and 5 of PMCL 29A will be deleted.

(5) Appendix C48 will be changed to leave as blank rp 51-53, 57-61, 65-66, and 74-80.

(6) Appendix C48, rp 67-69, will be changed to allow for intra-Service use.

(7) Appendix C49 will be changed to leave as blank rp 7-24, 45-69, and 74-80.

11. RECNO 89-213, Temporary Exemption of Selected Units from the MOV Process (DoDIG 89-046). (Review RFID Replies for Approved MILSTRIP Change 37).

RECNO 89-140, Retention of Navy Exception Processing for MOV.

a. Discussion. All of the Services/Agencies except the Army had provided recommended implementation dates. The Army indicated they would provide a date within 30 days from March 19, 1990. The committee determined the change could be implemented on a staggered basis with some minor modifications to the procedures.

b. Disposition. An AMCL will be issued with staggered implementation dates and will contain changes as follows:

(1) The fourth sentence to the revised subparagraph E.2., chapter 7, will be deleted.

(2) The word "also" will be deleted from the fifth sentence of the revised subparagraph E.2., chapter 7.

(3) Subparagraph L.2., chapter 7, will be changed to read:

"2. Upon completion of an MOV, as required by receipt of scheduled validation request documents, a DI AP_ response (format shown in appendix C26) for each DI AN_ request document (or requisition on the listing) will be furnished to the supply source which submitted the requests. Services/Agencies have the option to allow their activities to use the DI AP8 transaction (appendix C48) to respond to MOV requests which have been verified as valid and the quantity field remains unchanged. The DI AP8 transaction will not be generated until all changes relating to the applicable MOV cycle have been made. Responses will be submitted to the supply source by the reply due date shown in the request documents. The requisitioners will indicate the action to be taken on each scheduled MOV request as follows:"

(4) The new subparagraph L.5., chapter 7, will be changed to read:

"5. DAAS will provide appropriate DI AP_ responses to the respective supply source for each DI AP8 transaction received. DAAS will process the DI AP8 no earlier than 7 days after receipt, but no later than the last day of the cycle."

(5) The second sentence to paragraph 1. of the new Appendix A26, Message Request for DAAS MOV Response, will be deleted.

(6) The above changes to Approved MILSTRIP Change 37 completes action required on RECNO 89-140.

12. RECNO 89-217, Maintaining Accountability During Maintenance Actions (Review PMCL 5A/6A Replies)

a. Discussion. Replies to Joint Proposed MILS Changes 5A (MILSTRAP) and 6A (MILSTRIP) were received from all Services and Agencies except the Army. Army stated that they had no

official response at this time. The FWG chairman reiterated that DLSSD would not delay action on an item due to nonreceipt of a Service/Agency reply. The committee agreed that there wasn't sufficient time to discuss the comments to the proposals at this meeting. LMI indicated that, as written, the PMCL does not impact MODELS as the requirements have already been incorporated.

b. Disposition. RECNO 89-217 is closed for MODELS change purposes. The comments review, for Joint Proposed MILS Changes 5A and 6A, was deferred to a later date.

13. RECNO 89-219, Reason For Disposal (Review Reasons and Finalize ID List).

a. Discussion. The committee discussed the reasons for disposal cited in the meeting minutes from the joint MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP committee held in January. "Other, Surplus" will be included as an additional reason code. "Beyond Capability of Maintenance" will be added for use along with "Maintenance Expenditure Limit" under the same code. The committee agreed to include DI DAC (transaction set 533) under the DSI segment.

b. Disposition. LMI will assign one-position randomly assigned alpha codes for the listing of approved reasons for disposal. Data element 2002, Reason for Disposal Code, will be an 01/02 ID element under the DSI segment in transaction sets 514, 516, 517, 527, 532, and 533.

14. RECNO 89-315, Suffix Code Assignment.

RECNO 89-361, DoD Audit Trail Capability for Suffix Code Assignments.

a. Discussion. RECNO 89-361 was rolled into 89-315 and will be considered in conjunction with RECNO 89-311. The FWG disapproved the portion of RECNO 89-315 to develop a new electronic variable-length query to provide status of the entire requisitioned quantity back to the requisitioner, by requisition suffix code. DLSSD looked for volunteers to lead in writing procedures for this enhancement which includes RECNOs 89-361, 89-311, 89-361 and 89-369; however, no one accepted. DLA suggested making a draft--then the Services/Agencies could review for content and input additional information. FWG will include a discussion of writing procedures for enhancements as an agenda topic at their April meeting.

b. Disposition. Action for enhancement is considered complete. DLSSD will write draft procedures from existing manuals.

15. RECNO 89-319, Enhance Demand Recording Information--
Reason for Requisition Portion

RECNO 89-326, RIMSTOP Stockage Code as a DoD Standard
for Defining Purpose Codes

RECNO 89-346, Reason for Stocking and Requisition
Originator Issues -- Type of Requisition Portion

RECNO 90-008, Reason for Requisition

a. Discussion:

(1) The above enhancements were addressed jointly by the committee to clarify the interrelationship of the proposed codes which identify reasons for requisitioning and reasons for stockage. RECNOs 89-319, 89-326, and 89-346 were deferred from the January Joint MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP Focal Point Committee Meeting so that the Navy focal point could prepare additional justification and rationale for the enhancements and ascertain whether the reason for requisition and the reason for stockage could be merged into a single element. Also, DLSSD was to coordinate with DASD (L/SD) to determine the current status of RIMSTOP policy. RECNO 90-008 was grouped with the above enhancements because it too requests a new code to identify the type of requisition as currently indicated by the character appearing in record position (rp) 40 of the transaction document number.

(2) The Navy presented the results of their review to the committee as follows. No significant justification could be found to support joining the reason for requisition with the reason for stockage. The reason for stockage which identifies why the item is stocked should be resident in the data base at the storage point, but need not be passed on to other parties. The reason for requisition provides more definitive information about why the requisition has been placed. Accurate information of this type will help the ICP interpret the Demand Code entry (for recurring/nonrecurring demand) as it is frequently misunderstood and misused at the retail level. It was suggested that a mechanized matrix could be developed to perform this task.

b. Disposition. The committee agreed to recommend that a Reason for Requisition be adopted as an optional 01/03 ID

element to be included in the RQD segment for transactions 511, 518, and 532. The RECNO 89-346 request for such a code will be rolled up under RECNO 89-319. The committee also agreed to recommend disapproval of the reason for stockage request and closing of RECNO 89-326. Should any Service/Agency determine a need for such information, the RQU segment could be used. DLSSD determined that the RIMSTOP policy is still in effect and that the reasons for stockage enumerated therein should be considered when developing reasons for requisition. Reasons for requisition supplied by the Navy and existing Army codes for major items will provide the basis for the new data element. The specific reasons for requisition will be developed at a later date. The enhancement 90-008 will retain its separate identity. It was agreed that the information provided by the rp 40 character differs from that envisioned for the new Reason for Requisition. Instead, a Utilization Code will be recommended as an optional 01/02 ID element to be placed in the RFL segment for transaction 511 (DI Codes A0_, AM_ and AT_), 515 (DI Codes FTA and FTE), 518 (DI Codes A2_/A3_/A4_), 527 (DI Codes D6_, DW_, and DF_), and 532 (D7_).

16. **RECNO 89-326, RIMSTOP Stockage Code as a DoD Standard for Defining Purpose Codes.** See topic 15 above.

17. **RECNO 89-346, Reason for Stocking and Requisition Originator Issues -- Type of Requisition Portion.** See topic 15 above.

18. **RECNO 89-351, Enhanced MRA Procedures**

a. Discussion. Discussion under this enhancement number addressed that portion of the proposal that originated with PMCLs 4. It was agreed at the January Joint MILSTRAP/MILSTRIP Focal Point Committee Meeting that LMI would develop MODELS transactions as required to comply with AMCL 11 (MILSTRAP) and 15 (MILSTRIP) as enhanced by a DLA proposal submitted at the meeting. Following the meeting DLSSD restaffed the RFID with the DLA enhancement. The committee reviewed Service/Agency positions and comments on the RFID and confirmed that implementation dates submitted prior to the DLA proposal are still valid. It was noted that no response to either the original or revised RFID had been received from the Navy or Army. The Navy and Army representatives were asked to provide status on their responses to the RFID. The Navy indicated that their analysis was nearly completed and that a tentative date of November 1995 as applicable to the CONUS portion could be set. The Navy questioned the workload savings in expanding the proposal to unconfirmed MROs for Foreign Military Sales (FMS). Additional questions and concerns

about this area were raised and it was agreed that some minor changes will be necessary when finalizing the AMCL. The consensus supported the DLA proposal as beneficial. The Army had begun staffing, but did not have any service comments available for discussion at the meeting. In response to questions, the MILSTRIP Administrator confirmed that the shipment status will be sent to all potential recipients, as indicated in the second RFID for Approved Changes 11 and 15.

b. Disposition. The November 1995 implementation date was tentatively established based upon responses received prior to and at the meeting. (The Navy response was received subsequent to the meeting with an implementation date of November 1, 1995.) The MILSTRAP Administrator indicated that the lateness of the implementation date may displease the Office of the Secretary of Defense since the AMCL is intended to correct findings documented in two DoD IG Audit reports. If necessary, she will report back to the committee members. Minor changes to the DLA portion of the proposed change include forwarding MRA followups for FMS to the International Logistics Control Office (ILCO) and permitting use of the date prepared on the ILCO response since they may not have access to the actual date received. DLA agreed that use of freight forwarder information to complete the MRA response at the ILCO is satisfactory. LMI will employ new transaction sets for the MILSTRAP transactions because the data conveyed is significantly different from existing transaction sets. MILSTRIP transactions, DI Codes ARH and ASH, are compatible with MODELS transactions 514 and 516 respectively, and will be included therein.

19. **RECNO 89-354, Automated Transmission of Contract History Data**

a. Discussion. The committee approved RECNO 89-354, for inclusion in MODELS version 1, at the January 90 Joint MILSTRAP/MILSTRIP Focal Point Committee Meeting. At that meeting, DLSSD distributed the DI Code DLW contract history data transaction, which was developed by the Integrated Materiel Management Committee (IMMC), to the Services/Agencies to review for its acceptability as a MODELS transaction and to identify any additional required elements. The Services/Agencies had no additional requirements. DLSSD informed the committee that the IMMC chair had advised that DI Code DLW was going to be included in change 1 to DoD 4140.26-M, Defense Integrated Materiel Management Manual for Consumable Items, and would be staffed, approved and implemented through the IMMC channels. DLSSD will publish DI Code DLW, along with DI Codes DLS, DLT, DLU, DLV, and DLX, in MILSTRAP at a future date. Once published in MILSTRAP, these

logistics reassignment related transactions will be removed from DoD 4140.26-M. The Service/Agency MILSTRAP Focal Points voiced their concerns over procedural transactions being implemented through IMMC channels and bypassing their established staffing procedures.

b. Disposition. LMI will incorporate DI Code DLW in MODELS as agreed to at the January 90 meeting. DLSSD will staff an RFID to establish a date for incorporating Logistics Reassignment transactions (DI Codes DLS through DLX), implemented by the IMMC, in MILSTRAP.

20. RECNO 89-356, RECNO 89-356, Notification of Customer Nonresponse to Materiel Obligation Validation (MOV) Request (DoDIG 7SL-050) (Review Proposed MILSTRIP Change 28A Replies).

a. Discussion. The Army and Navy nonconcurred in the proposal. The Army's nonconcurrence was predicated on AMCL 150B being implemented by all the Services/Agencies; specifically, that "requisition's which are to be filled by direct delivery from vendors, status codes BV and BZ, are excluded from automatic cancellation of the MOV process." The Navy nonconcurred because of their interpretation of the change that the new DI AV_ transaction would perform the exact functions as the DI AN_ transaction and would have the same results. The proposal does not duplicate the functions of the DI AN_. The proposal will require a notification to be provided to customers of nonresponse to MOV request when backordered requisitions are in BZ status. The notification will advise the customer that materiel will be shipped and charged to the requisitioner unless an appropriate cancellation is received by the supply source. The proposal, PMCL 28A, was a counter proposal to PMCL 28, which was written in response to DoDIG Audit Report No. 89-046, recommendation A.1.b., to include the cancellation and reinstatement provision of AMCL 150A for items in preaward procurement status. The Services/Agencies approved the staffing of PMCL 28A as an alternative to PMCL 28 at MILSTRIP Focal Point Meeting 89-4, July 11-13, 1989.

b. Disposition. An RFID will be issued with changes as follows:

(1) The second sentence of chapter 7, paragraph F., will be changed to read:

"MOV requests and DI AV_ transactions will be transmitted to the activities determined under the following rules:

(2) The format for the DI AV_ transaction will be changed to leave as blank rp 51-53 and 57-79.

21. RECNO 89-357, Inter-Service Lateral Redistribution Program (DoDIG 89-115) (Review MILSTRIP Proposed Change 38 Replies).

RECNO 89-353, Distinguishing Excess and Long Supply in DI Code FTE.

a. Discussion. The Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and DLA nonconcur in the proposal as written, however, they all provided comments for improving the proposal. The Army stated they had not completed the staffing of the proposal with their users. The DLA requested the proposal clarify the process of unfunded requisitions (who can submit them/how will they be processed). The Services/Agencies were requested to provide their procedures for DEPRA processing of unfunded and funded requisitions to DLSSD-BM no later than May 1, 1990. The DLA recommended a new excess transaction advice code be assigned for activities to indicate that the reported quantity is below the retention level and is only available to be returned for credit or to fill reimbursable requisitions. The committee agreed with DLA. The Navy, Marine Corps, and DLA requested the procedures be clarified for billing and reimbursement of issue related costs. The billing and reimbursement comments will be referred to the DoD MILSBILLS Administrator for action. The DLA recommended paragraph C.2.a., chapter 4, DEPRA, be changed to increase the concurrent DEPRA/ICP screening period. The committee agreed that the time period should be extended to a maximum of 75 days. The DLA recommended paragraph C.2.b., chapter 4, DEPRA, be changed to increase the screening period for items reported only to DEPRA. The committee agreed that the time period should be extended to a maximum of 75 days. The Navy requested, that in view of the number of comments and the limited amount of time available, that a separate meeting be scheduled to fully discuss all responses to PMCL 38. The committee agreed that a 3-day meeting should be held to completely review the comments using a revised copy of DEPRA that incorporates all the latest effective approved changes. After the committee agreed that a separate meeting should be held, they agreed to discuss the DoD IG's recommended changes to PMCL 38 prior to discussing another agenda topic. The DoD IG's comment to add a new excess transaction code was in accord with DLA's recommendation for a new code (see above). The committee did not agree that the start of the DEPRA's lateral redistribution program should be delayed until receipt of the wholesale manager's response to the excess report. The Navy disagreed because the present concurrent screening doubles the chances of the excess being used to fill existing requirements.

The DLA disagreed because their system only processes the excess reports 2 or 3 times a week. DEPRA could fill incoming requisitions while the report was pending processing by the wholesale manager. The committee did not agree with establishing a new status code that would allow the wholesale manager to advise the reporting activity that the excess materiel is not required at this time and to report the materiel, if is still considered excess, in the next reporting cycle. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps believed that this code would probable be used by the wholesale manager in place of using Status Code TB (return without credit). Also, that the wholesale manager would use the code over and over. The current codes are sufficient and the revised PMCL 38, per the S/A comments, maximizes the use of excess.

b. Disposition. The Service/Agency comments will be discussed at a meeting scheduled for April 18-20, 1990, Cameron Station, Building 4, Room 4D327. The S/A are bringing their unique DEPRA processing rules for funded and unfunded requisitions. In addition, the S/As are also to provide their recommendations for issue priority designators that should be processed by DEPRA. A revised DEPRA manual that includes the latest effective approved changes will be available for use. Requirements under RECNO 89-353 will be satisfied by the addition of advice codes.

22. RECNO 89-360, Unit Price/Billing Flexibility.

RECNO 89-352, Multiple Unit Price Fields.

RECNO 89-362, Identify the Ultimate Recipient or Buyer of DoD Materiel in the Requisition.

a. Discussion. In regard to RECNOs 89-352 and 89-360, the committee determined that advice codes could be used to advise that a price different than the standard price is to be used/charged. The committee also determined that status codes could be used to advise the customer that the price being charged or allowed (credit) is different than the standard price. The committee, in regard to RECNO 89-362, determined that a list of codes should be developed to identify the type of activity/organization that could be the ultimate recipient of DoD materiel. The committee referred all three RECNOs to the DoD MILSBILLS System Administration for development of price qualifiers for the price cited on the transaction and categories of ultimate recipients of DoD materiel. Subsequent to the meeting, the DoD MILSBILLS System Administrator provided the following recommendations:

(1) For RECNOs 89-352 and 89-360, add Data Element 236, Price Qualifier, to the IQI and RQQ segments. The current qualifiers in the Data Element Dictionary appear to be adequate for the DoD requirements at this time. When the procedures are developed, and other codes are determined to be required, additions can be made at that time.

(2) For RECNO 89-362, add "EC" for "Entity Category" to Data Element 66, Identification Code Qualifier. Add the following codes to Data Element 67, Identification Code:

DO	Department of Defense Entity
FE	Federal Agency
FM	Foreign Military Sales
NA	Non-Appropriated Funded Activity
PP	Private Party (Non U.S. Government Activity)
SA	Security Assistance (Other Than FMS)
UN	Undefined

b. Disposition. The recommendations by the MILSBILLS System Administrator for RECNOs 89-352 and 89-360 are to be added to the IQI and RQQ segments. The recommendations for RECNOs 89-362 are to be added to Data Elements 66 and 67. These RECNOs are considered complete.

23. RECNO 89-366, Recording Date of Inspection in Depot Receipt Transaction

a. Discussion. This enhancement recommended adding a new data element to the DI Code D4_ receipt (transaction 527) to record the date of inspection. This information could then be passed to the office responsible for payment to contractors for use in determining if an interest penalty is due the contractor. Addition of this code would reduce the amount of manual work associated with providing this data off-line. DLA indicated this information was needed for locally administered, non-fast pay contracts, whenever the contract requires the depot inspect and/or accept prior to paying the contractor. After discussing the recommendation, the committee agreed that a date of inspection/acceptance should be added to transaction 527 for DI Code D4_.

b. Disposition. LMI will add a date data element, which will be defined as date of inspection/acceptance, to transaction 527 for DI Code D4_. LMI will ascertain what this element is called in MILSCAP and use the same terminology.

24. RECNO 90-008, Reason for Requisition. See topic 15 above.

C. MILSTRIP Proposals:

1. Approved MILSTRIP Change Letter (AMCL) 1, Control of Access to DoD Materiel Inventories Required by Defense Contractors.

a. Discussion. The DASD(L)SD representative stated that the objective of this discussion is to resolve interface problem issues on AMCL 1 since it must be implemented on November 1, 1990 for as many contracts as possible. A time schedule should be developed for applying GFM controls on any remaining contracts not under GFM controls after November 1, 1990.

(1) The committee discussed the DLA comments which requested AMCL 1 be changed to:

(a) Develop a new DI Code AX3 originated by the SOS and passed to the MCA as a result of processing materiel release confirmations, receipts for returned/unused GFM, and other transactions which necessitates the increase/decrease of quantities approved for issue on GFM contracts. The committee did not agree with the need for the new DI Code AX3; however, they did not object to DLA's use of it internally.

(b) Change the definition of Status Code DJ to read: "GFM quantity requisitioned partially exceeds the contract authorized quantity. Quantity has been adjusted to reflect authorized quantity". The committee concurred with the change to the Status Code DJ explanation.

(c) Develop advice codes for the MCA to use when the AX1 contains an invalid document number, unit of issue, quantity, or signal code. The committee disagreed with the development of new advice codes because the conditions cited by DLA should have been discovered in the initial requisition edit process by the SOS before the generation of the DI Code AX1.

(2) The Navy's comments do not require any revision to AMCL 1; however, changes are required in processing the DI Codes AX1 and AX2 transactions between Navy and DAAS.

(3) The Army submitted a request to have the Services/Agencies meet with DAAS in an effort to resolve interfacing S/A unique requirements that could be accommodated under DAAS so that the implementation of AMCL 1 would not be delayed until the S/A unique requirements are resolved. The DASD(L)SD representative did not object to the S/A use of DAAS as an interim measure; however, he wants to be advised of how long it will take for each S/A to fully implement the AMCL 1.

(4) The Air Force stated that they cannot make any additional changes to AMCL 1 and meet the established implementation date of November 1, 1990; however, they have no objection to the assistance of DAAS.

b. Disposition. AMCL 1 will be reissued as AMCL 1A with changes agreed to during this meeting and will incorporate its three addendums. The S/A focal point representatives will meet with DAAS representatives in Dayton, Ohio to identify individual S/A requirements. Tentative agreements made with DAAS during this meeting, scheduled for April 10-11, 1990, will be forwarded to DLSSD to coordinate with DASD(L)SD for approval prior to implementation.

2. Proposed MILSTRIP Change Letter 33A, Reporting and Returning Class V Ammunition to the Single Manager Conventional Ammunition.

a. Discussion. All of the Services/Agencies concurred in the proposal except the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps could not provide concurrence/nonconcurrence until the Executive Director of the Joint Ordnance Commanders Group (JOCG) Supply Subgroup had reviewed the proposed change. The JOCG Supply Subgroup concurred with the proposed change to include Class V ammunition under the Materiel Returns Program (MRP) during their meeting of February 6-9, 1990. On this basis, the committee agreed to release PMCL 33A for staffing a request for implementation date.

b. Disposition. We will issue an RFID for the approved PMCL 33A.

3. **Proposed MILSTRIP Change Letter 39, DAAS Reject of Requisitions with Invalid Ship-to and Mail-to Addresses in the MAPAD.**

a. Discussion. All of the Services/Agencies concurred in the proposal. In addition, the Air Force recommended the proposal include DI AM_ and AT_ transactions. The DLA recommended that the proposal require ICPs to reject requisitions received off-line (mail, message, courier, fax, telephone) with invalid ship-to and mail-to addresses. The committee concurred in these changes recommended by the Air Force and DLA.

b. Disposition. We will issue an RFID with changes cited in the discussion paragraph above.

III. DECISIONS REACHED: Decisions reached are as described in the discussions paragraph.

IV. FOLLOWUP ACTIONS REQUIRED: Followup actions are as described in the Paragraph II disposition for each RECNO.

Prepared By: _____

Prepared By: _____

Prepared By: _____

Approved By: _____

Approved By: _____

Attachments:
As Stated

113 106 4/14/90
Action Ofcr: M. Hefner, V. Savage, E. Hilert
Date: Mar 90
Typed by: all
Doc. Name STRAP/STRIP MTG MAR 90--ENC
ALIS Cabinet: MILSTRAP
ALIS Drawer: In Process
ALIS Folder:

DLSSD File No.: BT
DLSSD File No.: BM 236.20 (2)