N REPLY
REFER TO   DLMSO

SEP 3 0 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply
Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting, Aug 27-29, 1996

The attached minutes of the DLMS PRC meeting are forwarded
for your information and appropriate action.

We anticipate scheduling the next PRC meeting for November
19-21, 1996. Confirmation and agenda will follow. Discussion
topics should be submitted to DLMSO by November 5, 1996.

The DLMSO points of contact are Ellen Hilert, Supply PRC
Chair at 703-767-6117, DSN 427-6117, or e-mail
ellen_hilert@hq.dla.mil, or Vermella Saváge, MILSTRIP System
Administrator, at 703-767-6127, DSN 427-6127, or e-mail
vermella_savage@hq.dla.mil

JAMES A. JOHNSON
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment

Distribution:
ADUSD(L)MDM
Supply PRC Representatives

√ REPLY
REFER TO   DLMSO

SEP 2 7 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Supply
Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting, Aug 27-29, 1996

Purpose: The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office
(DLMSO) hosted a Supply PRC meeting on August 27-29, 1996, at the
Headquarters Complex, Ft. Belvoir, VA. The purpose of this
meeting was to discuss the inappropriate use of Force/Activity
Designator (F/AD) I and develop standard procedures for
monitoring F/AD I usage; resolve outstanding issues related to
Proposed MILSTRIP Changes (PMCs) 40 and 41 and Approved MILSTRAP
Change 15; discuss weapons system identification options; and
share information concerning on-line access to MILSTRIP Sup 1,
the DLMS 2.0 manual, and the implementation convention review
process. The agenda is shown at Enclosure 1. A list of
attendees is shown at Enclosure 2.

Brief Summary of Discussion: Ms. Ellen Hilert, Supply PRC
Chair, and Ms. Vermella Savage, MILSTRIP System Administrator
provided opening remarks and reviewed the meeting agenda.

   Agenda Items:

       a. **F/AD I.** Mr. Kevin Fitzpatrick, OSD(L)MDM, led a
discussion of current deficiencies in the existing procedures and
practice regarding F/AD I usage. By design, this designation is
reserved for the highest national priorities and can be assigned
only by Presidential authority, by the Secretary of Defense, the
Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), or as authorized by
the CJCS. Criteria for assignment are maintained in DoD 4140.1-
R, DoD Material Management Regulation. On an annual basis the
Joint Staff audits F/AD usage to ensure continued validity.
Requisitioning data is captured over a review period, and the
Services are required to validate use by activity. Audits
continue to find a significant number of unauthorized activities

using F/AD 1 priorities. Unauthorized use allocates potentially scarce resources to activities that would otherwise have a lesser priority. To correct this situation, OSD working with the Joint Staff developed a process which will automatically validate F/AD 1 usage. A table of authorized activity DoDAACs will be maintained by the DSDC/Defense Automatic Addressing System Center (DAASC) for the purpose of automatically downgrading the requistiion priority of those which do not pass validation. The Committee provided support in developing procedural steps necessary to accomplish this process. However, the members expressed concern that the planned automated process may have some implementation problems and will not adequately address the larger issue. Proper assignment of F/AD and Urgency of Need presents a difficult enforcement problem. Additionally, current F/AD definitions are open to variying interpretation by the Services. Mr. Fitzpatrick assured the Committee that action is underway to redefine the F/AD categories (potentially restricting F/AD II for combat support). The planned automated process should be regarded as a "first step" with expanded policy and procedures to follow.

Action: OSD will direct, by memorandum, the implementation of enforced F/AD 1 compliance via automated processing. DLMSO will develop the supporting Proposed MILSTRIP Change to be coordinated under a 60-day evaluation and staffing period. Implementation will occur 60-days from the date of the Approved MILSTRIP Change.

      b. **PMC 40, Processing Cooperative Logistics Supply Support Arrangement (CLSSA) Requisitions.** This change clarifies policy relative to use of Not Mission Capable Supply/Anticipated Not Mission Capable Supply (NMCS/ANMCS) and expedite handling codes as they apply to Foreign Military Sales. Discussion revealed significant differences in current Service interpretation and practices.

Action: No action can be taken until Services complete evaluation and provide responses to the PMC. Nonresponsive Components (Army, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) agreed to investigate and provide a timely response to DLMSO.

      c. **PMC 41, Defense Program for Redistribution of Assets (DEPRA) Follow-up Timeframes.** This proposal reduces the DEPRA follow-up timeframes to 5 days and the overall suspense period to 30 days.

Action: The Committee accepted the proposed change with one minor revision which is to generate the initial follow-up when supply status BA or CB is not received within *10 days* instead of 5 days.   DLMSO will issue the Approved Change with implementation to occur 60 days from the date of the change memorandum.

      d.   **Approved MILSTRAP Change 15, New Ownership Code 0 (Zero) to Identify DoD Special Operations Forces (SOF) Ownership.** This change adds a new Ownership Code 0 providing an automated means to identify and account for SOF assets.   Army has reported that implementation in their legacy system would be problematic, and cost prohibitive. Army recommended deferring implementation until DLMS and using project codes to identify SOF assets in the interim.   Navy and Air Force nonconcurred in the recommendation to use a project code citing that project codes have not provided adequate visibility/accountability for SOF assets.   Navy and Air Force had recommended a November 1996 implementation date for Ownership Code 0.   Marine Corps had not responded to the proposed change or the request for implementation date.

Action: **Mr. Milliken, AMC AMCLG-SM, agreed to investigate the situation, reevaluate the Army position, and provide a response by October 15, 1996.   Based on his initial inquiries into the issue, a favorable reply for DLSS implementation is possible. Mr. Ron Tyler, HQMC LPS-1, also agreed to evaluate the change and provide the initial Marine Corps response by October 15, 1996.**

      e.   **Review of On-Line MILSTRIP, Supplement 1, Routing Identifier and Distribution Codes.**   Mr. Moran, DAASC, demonstrated the on-line supplement available through Internet access.   The Committee agreed that this could prove to be a valuable tool; however, limited access to Internet within the Components will not support elimination of the paper document at this time.

Action: **DAASC will investigate possible enhancements and increased flexibility of the current display and search mechanisms.**

      f.   **Review of On-Line DLMS Manual.**   Mr. Pipan, DLMSO, with technical support from Mr. Moffett, DASC-N, provided a demonstration which included a look at the DLMSO Internet home page and capabilities for viewing the DLMS Version 2.0 manual. DLMSO is in the process of expanding this valuable resource to

include all Defense Logistics Standard Systems (DLSS) publications. Eventually the home page will also serve as a source of information for proposed and approved changes.

Action: DLMSO will provide, under separate cover, a step-by-step guide to assist Components with start-up and navigation of the home page. Basic information is as follows: URL is http://www.dasc.dla.mil/dlmso. Use ACROBAT software (click on ACROEAD) to convert text.

g. **Federal/Defense Logistics Functional Working Group (LFWG).** Ms. Donna Wesolowski, Co-Chair, briefed the Committee on the formal approval process each of the DLMS implementation conventions (ICs) must undergo. Briefly, this includes a detailed syntax and editorial review conducted by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) Electronic Data Interchange Standards Management Committee (EDISMC). Corrected ICs are submitted to the LFWG for review to insure that the standards are applied properly against the business case. DLMSO representatives are present to provide background and assist those unfamiliar with the IC in deciphering the particular application. When accepted by the work group, a 30-day public review period follows and ultimately submission to the EDISMC for approval as a federal standard. This approval process is required under current DISA architecture. Enclousre 3 is a list of the LFWG members and Enclosure 4 is the LFWG charter.

Action: Component functional experts were encouraged to attend upcoming sessions of the LFWG. DLMSO is currently preparing multiple supply ICs for the next work group session to be held in Orlando, Florida, beginning October 21, 1996. DLMSO will assure that Committee members are advised of the content and dates of future meetings. (See Enclosure 5.)

h. **Weapon System Identification.** Mr. Charlie Strong, DLMSO, briefed the Committee on proposed options for revising MILSTRIP to carry weapon system identification and demand data. The DLMS 2.0 was designed to accommodate stratification of weapon system by quantity within the requisition, but implementation is not a near-term possibility. Briefing charts are provided at Enclosure 6. Discussion centered around the lack of a supporting infrastructure within existing Component systems to provide and effectively use the weapons system data. Beyond selecting a suitable means of conveying the data, the DoD must also develop and maintain a standard coding structure and modify automated

systems to incorporate weapon system identification in decision support.

Action: The purpose of this briefing was informational. Follow-up action is required at a higher management level before any supporting action from the PRC is desired.

   i.   **Additional Discussion Topics:**

      (1)   DLMSO has prepared two followups memorandums requesting semi-annual status on implementation of approved DLSS and DLMS changes. Nonresponsive Components (Army, Marine Corps, DLA, and JLSC) were asked to comply. Mr. Bob Vitko, DLA MMLSI, questioned the benefit of producing the report at this time since, with the exception of the few approved changes which DoD has directed for implementation in the legacy systems, approved changes with implementation dates of 1993 or later have not been implemented. Implementation of approved changes in the legacy systems had been "suspended" in support of their implementation in the DoD standard logistics systems which were being developed under the Corporate Information Management initiative. DLMSO indicated that select Components may have implemented some changes not directed by DoD and the status report will provide visibility of those changes. It will also provide DLMSO with a tool to evaluate the overall DoD position on implementation of approved changes. With the acceptance of a standard logistics system by all Components unlikely, DoD must reassess the open approved changes and develop a revised implementation plan. The status report provides a starting point for this effort.

      (2)   Recently this office has found it necessary to chase after Component responses to DLMSO correspondence concerning DLSS and DLMS Changes. Committee members were informed that requests for extensions are generally accommodated and an interim status gives us early notice of any problem areas. Cooperation in this area would be greatly appreciated.

      (3)   DLMSO is in the process of preparing a register of all DLSS and DLMS Component representatives including names, communications numbers, and mailing addresses. Distribution will be made shortly. Maintaining current information is difficult and assistance from the Committee is enlisted in notifying DLMSO when changes occurs.

PREPARE/REVIEW:
ELLEN HILERT
Supply PRC Co-Chair

REVIEW:
MARY JANE HEFNER
Supply PRC Co-Chair

REVIEW:
VERMELLA SAVÁGE
MILSTRIP System Administrator

REVIEW:
JOSEPH PIPAN
DLMS Logistics Data Manager

APPROVE:
JAMES A. JOHNSON
Director, DLMSO

Enclosures

SUPPLY PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

HOSTED BY THE
DEFENSE LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT STANDARDS OFFICE (DLMSO)
8725 JOHN J KINGMAN ROAD ROOM 1655
FORT BELVOIR VA 22060-6221
POD 5, CONFERENCE ROOM 2501, SECOND FLOOR

MEETING AGENDA

	AUGUST 27, 1996 BEGINNING 1300	
	1300-1330	
1.	WELCOME/OPENING REMARKS/INTRODUCTIONS	ELLEN HILERT
	1330-1400	
2.	ADMINISTRATIVE REMARKS/MEETING AGENDA	MELLA SAVÀGE
	1400-1600	
3.	FORCE/ACTIVITY DESIGNATOR (F/AD) I USAGE (DLMS MANUAL, CHAPTER 5)	ELLEN HILERT/ KEVIN FITZPATRICK
	DAILY WRAP-UP SESSION/ADJOURN	
	AUGUST 28, 1996 BEGINNING 0800	
	0800-1000	
4.	PMC 40, PROCESSING CLSSA REQUISITIONS	MELLA SAVÀGE
	1000-1130	
5.	PMC 41, DEPRA FOLLOW-UP TIME FRAMES	MELLA SAVÀGE
	1300-1400	
6.	AMC 15, NEW OWNERSHIP CODE 0 (ZERO)	MARY JANE HEFNER
7.	REVIEW ON-LINE VERSION OF MILSTRIP, SUP 1 (You may view the code list in advance of the meeting on the Web under the Defense Automatic Addressing System Center Home Page at http://www.daas.dla.mil by choosing the DAASC Bulletin Board button then clicking on the bulletin board system and selecting MILSTRIP Supplement 1.)	MELLA SAVÀGE/ BOB MORAN
8.	DLMS 2.0 MANUAL ON-LINE PRESENTATION	JOE PIPAN/ JIM MOFFETT

Encl 1

	DAILY WRAP-UP SESSION/ADJOURN	
	AUGUST 29, 1996 BEGINNING 0800	
	0800-0900	
9.	FEDERAL/DEFENSE LOGISTICS FUNCTIONAL WORKING GROUP (LFWG) BRIEFING	DONNA WESOLOWSKI/ LTCOL RICH BRAUD
	0930-1030	
10.	PREVIEW PROPOSAL OPTIONS TO REVISE MILSTRIP TO CARRY WEAPON SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION AND DEMAND DATA	CHARLES STRONG/ MELLA SAVAGE
	FINAL WRAP-UP SESSION/ADJOURN MEETING	

SUPPLY PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

AUGUST 1996

NAME	OFFICE SYMBOL	VOICE TELEPHONE DSN COMMERCIAL	FACSIMILIE DSN COMMERCIAL	E-MAIL ADDRESS	DAYS IN ATTENDANCE 27	28	29
Ellen Hilert Co-Chair, Supply PRC	DLMSO	427-6117 (703)767-6117	427-6162 (703)767-6162	ellen_hilert@hq.dla.mil	x	x	
Mary Jane Hefner Co-Chair, Supply PRC	DLMSO	427-6123 (703)767-6123	427-6162 (703)767-6162	maryjane_hefner@hq.dla.mil	x	x	
Mella Savage DoD MILSTRIP System Administrator	DLMSO	427-6127 (703)767-6127	427-6162 (703)767-6162	vermella_savage@hq.dla.mil	x	x	
Phil Fiskett Naval Supply Systems Command	SUP-4113A	430-3436 (717)790-7054	430-7054 (717)790-7054	philip_fiskett@navsup.navy.mil	x	x	
Joe Marotta	DMA (CSM)	235-8455 (703)275-8455	235-8472 (703)275-8472	marottaj@dma.gov	x		
Kent Helber	HQ AFMC/LGIM	787-5497 (513)257-5497	986-1186 (513)257-8904	khelber@hq.afmc.af.mil	x	x	
Ron Straw	NAVICPMECH	430-7016 (717)790-7016	430-1479 (717)790-1479	ron_straw@icpmech.navy.mil	x	x	x
Bob Vitko	HQ DLA MMLSI	427-1601 (703)767-1601	427-2528 (703)767-2528	robert_vitko@hq.dla.mil	x	x	x

NAME	OFFICE SYMBOL	VOICE TELEPHONE		FACSIMILIE		E-MAIL ADDRESS	DAYS IN ATTENDANCE		
		DSN	COMMERCIAL	DSN	COMMERCIAL		27	28	29
Brenda K. Meadows	HQ DLA MMLSI	427-1606	(703)767-1603	427-2528	(703)767-2528	brenda_meadows@hq.dla.mil	x		
Terry Davis	HQ AMC AMCLG-SM	767-8508	(703)617-8508	767-9054	(703)617-9054	tdavis@hqamc.army.mil	x		x
Sherry McCown	DOT, FAA AML-611		(703)954-9618		(405)954-4136		x		
Ward Ceaser	HQ DLA MMENS	427-7508	(703)767-7508	427-7502	(703)767-7502	wardell_ceasar@hq.dla.mil	x		
Deborah Hill	DOT/FAA AFR-102		(202)267-8841		(202)267-5753	dhill@mail.hq.faa.gov	x	x	/
Cathy Pastore	DOT/FAA AFR-102		(202)267-9932		(202)267-5753	cpastore@mail.hq.faa.gov	x	x	/
Susan Jones	DOT, FAA AMZ-120		(405)954-5392			susan_jones@mmacmail.jccbi.gov	x	x	x`
Linda Tollison	DOT/FAA AMZ-310		(405)954-5414		(405)954-3930	linda_tollison@mmacmail.jccbi.gov	x	x	x
Kevin Fitzpatrick	OSD(L)MDM	225-5145	(703)695-5145		(703)697-3428	fitzpakd@acq.osd.mil	x		
Major Terry M. Flannery	HQMC I&L LPP-2	426-1061	(703)696-1061	426-1079	(703)696-1079		x		

NAME	OFFICE SYMBOL	VOICE TELEPHONE DSN COMMERCIAL	FACSIMILIE DSN COMMERCIAL	E-MAIL ADDRESS	DAYS IN ATTENDANCE 27	28	29
Dave Brown	DAASC/RSI	986-5681/Ext 412 (513)296-5681		dbrown@daas.dla.mil	x	x	
Robert N. Moran	DAASC	986-5044/Ext 293 (513)296-5044		rmoran@daas.dla.mil	x	x	
Di Honey	DOT/FAA AML-120	(405)954-5038		di_honey@mmacmail.jccbi.gov	x	x	
Terry Tandarich	NAVSUP 71A	327-0906 (703)607-0906	327-0859			x	
Phil Baduini	NAVSUP 73B	327-2707 (703)607-2707	327-0859 (703)607-0859			x	
Ron Tyler	HQMC, I&L LPS-1	426-1073 (703)696-1073	426-2707 (703)696-2707	tylerrl@mqg-smtp3.usmc.mil		x	
Gary Hood	GSA-FSS-FCSD	(703)305-5516		gary.hood@gsa.gov		x	
Linda Kimberlin	DLA MMBNS	427-7565 (703_767-7565	427-7502 (703)767-7502	linda_kimberlin@hq.dla.mil		x	
John Milliken	AMC AMCLG-SM	767-8278 (703)617-8278	767-5094 (703)617-5094	jmilliken@hq.amc.army.mil		x	
Darlene DeAngelo	DLA-MMLSR	427-1608 (703)767-1608	427-2528 (703)767-2528	darlene_deangelo@hq.dla.mil			x

NAME	OFFICE SYMBOL	VOICE TELEPHONE DSN COMMERCIAL	FACSIMILIE DSN COMMERCIAL	E-MAIL ADDRESS	DAYS IN ATTENDANCE 27	28	29
Joe Pipan	DLMSO	427-6109 (703)767-6109	427-6162 (703)767-6162	joseph_pipan@hq.dla.mil		x	
Jim Moffett	DASC-V	427-2005 (703)767-2005		james_moffett@hq.dla.mil		x	
Donna Wesolowski	Army	793-8071 (309)782-8071		dwesolow@ria-emh2.army.mil			x
Rich Braud, LtCol	DLMSO	427-6158 (703)767-6158	427-6157 (703)767-6157	richard_braud@hq.dla.mil			x
Charlie Strong	DLMSO			charles_strong@hq.dla.mil			x

Charter
Logistics Functional Working Group

1.   **Purpose**. This document serves as the Charter for the Logistics Functional Working Group (LFWG). It is a written understanding between the Federal Electronic Data Interchange Standards Management Coordinating Committee (FESMCC) and the Department of Defense (DoD) Electronic Data Interchange Standards Management Committee (EDISMC) defining the LFWG objectives, scope, general terms of reference, and general methods of operation. The FESMCC and DoD EDISMC agree that the LFWG will consolidate the logistics support functions and responsibilities within a single organization.

2.   **Authority**. The FESMCC, under the authority of FIPS 161-2, establishes interagency functional working groups for selected business areas including but not limited to logistics; procurement; finance; transportation; and communications, control and security , as required, to provide a focal point for development and maintenance of implementation conventions. The FESMCC also coordinates the functional working groups to ensure that they are working quickly and efficiently to provide useful implementation conventions (ICs) for the Federal Departments and Agencies in accordance with responsibilities detailed in the FESMCC Charter and Operating Procedures.

Similarly, Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) is the DoD Executive Agent for managing DoD Information Technology (IT) standards, including ensuring standardization across service systems and infrastructures. The DoD EDISMC is the principal DoD organization within which to develop and maintain a consistent, comprehensive approach to electronic data exchange (EDI) issues and related IT matters. Because of the diversity and scope of business areas and technical matters, the DoD EDISMC charters a series of DoD functional working groups with the responsibility of harmonizing business and EDI standards issues through the development of a consistent approach to exchanging business data among the various trading partners.

Due to the need for close coordination and comparability of operating objectives among Federal Departments and Agencies, including the DoD, agreement has been reached that a single functional working group should be established to deal with logistics matters. Accordingly, the Logistics Functional Working Group is established as a combined Federal/DoD working group. It shall derive its authority jointly from its parent bodies and will support the responsibilities of both the FESMCC and DoD EDISMC through the resolution of standards-related issues affecting logistics functional requirements.

The LFWG is responsible for overseeing all matters related to the exchange of logistics business data. In performing these responsibilities it will follow procedures and

Handout @ FEDISMC
c . . 1 2

The LFWG is responsible for overseeing all matters related to the exchange of logistics business data. In performing these responsibilities it will follow procedures and direction adopted by the FESMCC, to include IC formats, common methodologies and constructions, etc. When necessary the LFWG will coordinate functional area requirements among the other FESMCC and DoD EDISMC functional working groups, as required, to ensure a consistent approach to all such matters.

The signing of this Charter by the Chair, FESMCC and the Chair, DoD EDISMC formally recognizes this body as a Federal Civilian working group level forum jointly working with the DoD.

3. **Objectives**. The primary goal of the LFWG is to act as a single forum for all Federal Departments and Agencies as well as the DoD member Services and Agencies to participate in a dialog and resolution of all matters related to the use of EDI as an enabling technology in the conduct of all logistics business areas. This will be accomplished through the following objectives:

- Increase the use of electronic commerce (EC) and EDI among the Federal Government logistics community
- Support the implementation of new and evolving business processes and practices, utilizing EC and EDI to the maximum extent possible as a means of achieving operating efficiencies
- Promote an orderly approach toward business process transitions in order to maintain user satisfaction through the implementation process
- Utilize EDI standards in a consistent manner
- Promote and develop a standard methodology for communicating logistics business information
- Satisfy all user requirements in a timely manner

4. **Scope**. The LFWG assumes responsibility for all logistics matters not specifically assigned to other functional working groups including, but not limited to, supply, inventory management, maintenance, program management, environmental, and administration functions. It will serve as the forum as well as the sanctioning body for the development and acceptance of Federal Government and/or DoD-wide agreements on logistics business matters. Specifically, the LFWG scope of responsibility will include:

- Ensure that all logistics business requirements are met within a timely manner through the use and development of EC and EDI standards
- Maintain a working knowledge of both the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) X12 and United Nations Electronic Data Exchange for Administration, Commerce and Transport (UN/EDIFACT) EDI standards used in the conveyance of logistics business data

2

- Resolve technical differences among the LFWG membership in order to achieve consensus for the development, portrayal, and conveyance of logistics business information
- Review and approve ICs, data maintenance or other work products prepared by Departments, Services and Agencies for purposes of EC and EDI implementation prior to submission to the appropriate parent body
- Act as the advocate of all LFWG work products reviewed and voted upon by the parent body
- Ensure that all IC and data maintenance work is consistent with EDI standards, structures, usage, and formats
- Ensure that all IC and data maintenance work is consistent with prescribed formats and requirements
- Accept, coordinate, and develop solutions for specific work requests presented to the LFWG when sufficient resources are made available from either the parent body or requesting organization
- Preview and provide recommendations to submitters of logistics work products prior to formal submission to the LFWG
- Preview and coordinate an LFWG position on work products developed by other working groups

5.   **Membership and Voting**. The LFWG will have co-chairs elected by their respective LFWG memberships and confirmed by their respective parent bodies. Co-chairs are elected for a period of two years. Membership in the LFWG is automatically conveyed to a single voting representative from each member organization of their respective parent bodies. (Note. The DoD FESMCC representation to the LFWG will be satisfied through DoD EDISMC membership and participation.)

Organizations not holding membership on either the FESMCC or the DoD EDISMC may request membership in the LFWG by submission of a written request to either co-chair. The request should document the nature of the organization's involvement in logistics matters, confirming that such membership does not conflict with representation from the existing FESMCC or DoD EDISMC member Department, Agency or Service, and a designation of a primary and alternate organization representative(s). Acceptance of the request for LFWG membership will be discretionary for the co-chairs based upon an assessment of the submission request and as ratified by the LFWG membership.

The primary organizational representative (including government civil servants or uniformed members) as well as a designated alternate voting member, shall be identified in writing to the co-chairs. The LFWG will maintain an active list of all working group members. Organizations are encouraged to promote continuity of representation to this position in order to ensure a knowledgeable and consistent approach to the work of the group.

Because of the wide range of logistics business areas, voting members are not expected to be functional experts in all matters falling under the purview of the LFWG. Accordingly, each LFWG member may augment attendance at any meeting with functional business experts and observers in order to ensure that a sufficient degree of expertise and consideration is provided to the subject under review. Nevertheless, voting responsibility continues to reside only with the voting representative.

The LFWG recognizes that substantial work, including policy development and system design, is underway in a number of Federal Departments and Agencies and DoD organizations which will impact the work of the LFWG and other functional working groups. The LFWG will consult with representatives from any such organization as technical experts and advisors in order to ensure that all LFWG work products are consistent with overall Federal and DoD policy and IT initiatives.

Each LFWG member organization will hold one vote. Approval of any matter under vote will result from a simple majority of votes cast by LFWG members in attendance at the time a vote is taken. No provisions will be made for providing proxies or accepting votes from members not in attendance. Votes from the co-chairs will only be cast whenever a voting matter has not reached a simple majority.

6. **Method of Operation.**

(a) Cognizance.

The LFWG will establish, maintain, and publish a list of ANSI ASC X12 Transaction Sets for which it has primary cognizance as designated by the corresponding parent body. Corresponding UN/EDIFACT messages are also deemed the responsibility of the LFWG. Where ongoing Federal, Service or Agency business areas are known but where no supporting transaction sets or messages exist, the LFWG will retain primary cognizance in those business areas for all EC and EDI standards work products.

In certain business scenarios multiple business disciplines will utilize the same transaction set or message to convey functional business information. When multiple functional working groups utilize the same transaction set or message to convey business information, unless specifically directed to the contrary by the FESMCC, the LFWG will retain primary cognizance over the standards and will coordinate the development of a consistent approach to usage and data exchange.

Cognizance is deemed to include development of new EDI standards, data maintenance to existing standards, and ICs.

The LFWG will determine the number of business functions to be included in any single IC. In making this determination, the LFWG will endeavor to minimize the number of ICs being issued for each transaction set. However, other factors related to a decision to combine business functions within a single IC will include the complexity and clarity of

the resultant IC, the degree of relationship existing among the business functions, and the acceptability of the product to the business trading partners.

(b) LFWG Meetings.

The co-chairs will schedule LFWG work items on the agenda, as required. In developing meeting schedules the co-chairs will consider FESMCC, DoD EDISMC, ANSI ASC X12, and UN/EDIFACT meeting schedules, standards publication schedules, and user requirements. The LFWG will maintain a calendar identifying meetings and other factors affecting the work of the LFWG.

LFWG meetings will be scheduled no less frequently than biannually. However, at the discretion of the co-chairs, meetings may be held more frequently. Every attempt will be made to provide LFWG members with a minimum 30 day advance notice of any LFWG meetings, the anticipated work agenda, and work products consistent with their availability.

Every attempt will be made to rotate meeting locations to centrally agreeable sites to minimize the travel costs incurred by the LFWG members. Meeting duration will not exceed one week in length.

(c) Procedures.

All logistics work requirements for the LFWG will be provided to the co-chairs via the FESMCC or the DoD EDISMC, directly by a LFWG member, or directly by the Chair of another Federal or DoD functional working group.

Acceptable work requirements may include, but are not limited to:

* draft ICs for review or preview,
* draft EDI standards data maintenance for review or preview,
* other working group requirements to be incorporated into existing ICs falling under the cognizance of the LFWG,
* other working group draft data maintenance for EDI standards falling under the cognizance of the LFWG, and
* undeveloped work products or requirements.

In cases requiring extensive work beyond the normal LFWG meeting schedule the co-chairs may authorize temporary ad hoc task groups for the purpose of completing this work. Separate task group meetings are authorized at the discretion and availability of task group members to meet projected user requirements.

Additional resources required to provide technical advice, support for work development, etc. may be requested from the co-chairs by a LFWG representative.

Resources will be provided by the co-chairs based upon availability and at the discretion of the co-chairs.

All work requirements will be processed on a "first in, first out" basis unless the co-chairs deem it appropriate to reorganize the workload based on user requirements and any other appropriate factors.

Under normal circumstances, any work products that are ready to progress from the LFWG to the FESMCC or to the DoD EDISMC will not be delayed in order to add functionality requirements. However, if in the opinion of the co-chairs, the functional requirement is so significant as to limit the usability of the work product, the product may be delayed pending incorporation of the functionality. If the work product is not delayed, the submitter of the added requirement will be so advised and will be asked to submit a new work product proposing a change to the original work product.

Changes to existing ICs can be submitted to the LFWG at any time. However, approval and subsequent incorporation of the change into the IC will be done consistent with FESMCC and DoD EDISMC guidance regarding version/release updating to ICs. This practice will be in effect as a means of ensuring a level of consistency and minimum disruption to the user population. Therefore, every effort should be made by LFWG members to ensure the consistent attendance at LFWG meetings as well as a complete staffing of all work products prior to their submission to the parent approving authority. Every attempt will be made to inform the submitter of the approximate time for functionality incorporation.

Changes to existing EDI standards (including the development of new segments which will be incorporated into an existing transaction set or message) for which an approved IC already exists can be submitted to the LFWG at any time. Each such submission should be accompanied by a complete business case supporting the change as well as a draft change to the existing IC.

Changes to existing EDI standards (including the development of new segments which will be incorporated into an existing transaction set or message) for which no IC has been approved will be developed and processed in conjunction with the development of the IC. Each such submission should be accompanied by a complete business case supporting the change as well as a draft change to the existing IC. Every effort should be made by the submitter as well as the LFWG to correlate the projected implementation plan requirements for the IC with EDI standards body meeting and approval schedules.

All logistics work requirements (including IC changes, IC development, and data maintenance to EDI standards) shall be introduced initially to the LFWG. Those requirements approved for progression which fall under the cognizance of another functional working group will be submitted to that working group in a manner and format prescribed by that working group. Either the co-chairs or a designated LFWG

representative will coordinate with the other working group to define, explain, or actually develop the work product, at the discretion of the other working group chair.

The development of new EDI transaction sets or messages will be undertaken by the LFWG only after reaching consensus that existing standards cannot be used to satisfy user requirements. In such cases draft or skeletonized ICs are helpful, but not required, as a means of ensuring that all user functional requirements have been met. A more structured and complete IC will be developed by the LFWG as the new draft standard moves through the EDI standards body approval process. This practice will ensure that limited resources are expended in the most appropriate manner consistent with the development and approval of the new standard.

The co-chairs will submit concurrently to the FESMCC and DoD EDISMC all work approved by the LFWG. The co-chairs will act as the advocates for all such work as it progresses through the review and voting processes. All work products submitted will be in the format prescribed by the FESMCC. Any changes resulting from this process will be returned to the LFWG for consideration and incorporation by the LFWG.

(d) Conflict Resolution.

In progressing any work item the LFWG must satisfy all user business requirements. This does not mean that the technical solution proposed by the submitter must be adopted by the LFWG. An alternative solution may be proposed by the LFWG in order to meet the user business need as well as the requirement to maintain consistency among all logistics data exchanges. Should the submitter not agree with the LFWG proposal, an appeal may be made to the co-chairs for reconsideration. In cases of appeal disapproval by the LFWG, a final appeal may be submitted to the FESMCC by the user's voting representative.

7.   **Charter Updates.** This charter will be updated as required to meet evolving procedures, identified business needs, and direction from the FESMCC and DoD EDISMC. Questions or comments associated with this Charter should be referred to the current LFWG co-chairs.

7

8. Charter Approval and Ratification

Approved by: _Donna Wesolowski_   _8/22/96_
(insert DoD LFWG Chair name and title)   (Approval Date)

Approved by: _Gary L. Hood Co. Chm_   _8-21-96_
(insert Fed LFWG Chair name and title)   (Approval Date)

Ratified by: _SIGNED_   _27 Aug 1996_
(insert DoD EDISMC Chair name and title)   (Date)
CMDR RANDY HOFFMAN
DISA / JIEO

Ratified by: _SIGNED_   _29 Aug 1996_
(insert FESMCC Chair name and title)   (Date)
THERESA SORENTI
GSA

8

Logistics Functional Working Group membership list. The primary and alternate voting members are listed where known.

Donna Wesolowski
DoD LFWG Chair
(309) 782-8071

LOGISTICS FUNCTIONAL WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Adams, May   Defense Printing Service
HQ, DLA
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6221

Badgett, Shiela   DISA   DISA Alternate DITCO IDT31
2300 East Drive
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5406
(618) 256-9314

Berkoff, Linda P.   Fed ECA PMO
(202) 501-6876

Boeckmann, Lisa   DISA   DISA Primary DITCO IDT41
2300 East Drive
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5406
(618) 256-9587

Braud, LTC Richard   DL MSO   DUSD(L) Primary
8725 John J. Kingman Rd.
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6221
(703) 767-6158
DSN 427-6158

Buttrey, Diana   DFAS-HQ/DDE
Finance Working Group Chair
(703) 607-0355

Clark, Don   NAVAIR
(703) 604-3611

Cogdill, Gene   DLA
DSN 427-2608

Felix, Donna   Army
STRICOM
12350 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3224
407-384-3799, DSN 970.

Encl 4

Grant, Paul D.   Federal ECA PMO
(202) 501-6998

Hood, Gary   GSA   Federal Co-Chair
Federal Supply Service
ATTN: FCSD
Washington, DC 20406
(703) 305-5516

Howard, Carolyn   Army
USA MICOM
ATTN: AMSMI-AIS-FA
Redstone Arsenal, All 35898-5110
(205) 955-8728

Johnson, Donna   Navy
COMNAVSEASYSCOM
Code 04322
2531 Jefferson Davis Hwy
Arlington, VA 22242
(703)602-1060, X213

Keene, 1LT Sean   Air Force   AIR FORCE Primary
HQ AFCA/XPRE
AF EDI Man. Team
(618) 256-5448

Kline, Sandra   NAVICP   NAVY Alternate PO432.07-Navy
Philadelphia, PA 19111-5098
(215) 697-5233

Lamatrice, Mike   NAVAIR
(703) 604-3611, X2558

Lotz, Judy   Naval Air Systems Command
 (703) 604-3090, X4180

Minnick, L. Joseph   NAVY EDI
(717) 790-5737

Myers, Geoff   Army
HQ, IOC
AMSIO-SMM-S
Rock Island, IL 61299-6000
(309) 782-5283

Navarro, Irene   Center for Standards DoD DISA
10701 Parkridge Blvd
Reston, VA 22091
(703) 735-3528

Price, Sandra   Army
USA MICOM
AMSMI-AIS-FS
Redstone Arsenal, AL
(205) 955-7178

Ripp, Arlene   DeCA
(804) 734-9906

Spruill, LCDR Joe   Navy   NAVY Primary
NAVSUPSYSCOM
5450 Carlisle Pike
Mechanicsburg, PA
(717) 790-1741

Stanford, Brad   Navy
Office of Naval Research
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217
(703) 696-5420

Wesolowski, Donna   Army   DoD Co-Chair
HQ, IOC
AMSIO-SMM-S
Rock Island, IL 61299-6000
(309) 782-8071

Federal/Defense Logistics Functional Working Group
Agenda
October 21-25, 1996

Monday, Oct 21

08:00   EDI 101 - Harry Featherstone

12:00   Lunch

13:00   Welcome and Introductions

13:15   Administrative Business
-- Review/Approve August 1996 Minutes
-- Review LFWG Calendar
-- Call for additional agenda items/changes

14:00   Old Business
-- Review list of LFWG cognizant transaction sets (TS Adds)
-- Summary status report on Ics in progress
    (Detail review scheduled separately)
- 196 IC Contractor Cost Data Reporting
- 511 IC Committment Document
- 806 IC Project Schedule Reporting
- 839 IC Contract Funds Status Reporting
- 839 IC Cost Performance Reporting
- 848 IC Material Safety Data Sheets
- 856 IC Ship Notice/Manifest (DD Form 250)
- 861 IC Receiving Advice/Acceptance Certificate

15:00   Migration of 806 transaction set functionality to
    UN/EDIFACT PROTAP message - Harry Featherstone

16:00   Summary of EDISMC & FESMCC August 96 Meetings

16:30   End of Business Day

Tuesday, Oct 22

08:00   Review of 861 IC - Application Advice - Steve Luster

09:00   -- Review of 869 IC - Order Status Inquiry (Requisition Inquiry) -
    Vermella Savage
    -- Review of 869 Order Status Inquiry (Cancellation) -
    Vermella Savage

10:00   Report on Air Force Bar Code Project - 1LT Sean Keene

12:00   Lunch

13:00	New Business
	-- Hazardous Waste Disposal Project Business Case - Shari Underwood
	- 856 IC - Ship Notice/Manifest - Don Egan
	- 861 IC - Receiving Advice/Acceptance - Don Egan
15:00	Presentation of 852 IC - Product Activity Data - Gary Hood
4:30	End of Business Day

Wednesday, Oct 23

08:00	DLMS Material Obligation Validation Process - Vermella Savage
	-- 517/LS18 IC Material Obligation Validation - MOV Reply and Reinstatement Request
	-- 517/LS45 IC Material Obligation Validation - MOV Notice Acknowledgement
10:00	DLMS Material Returns Process - Vermella Savage
	-- 180/LS28 IC - Return Merchandise Authorization and Notification - Material Returns Reporting
	-- 870/LS24 IC - Order Status Report - Material Returns Supply Status
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Continue review of DLMS Material Returns Process
	-- 856/LS23 Shipment Notice/Manifest - Material Returns Shipment Status
4:30	End of Business Day

Thursday, Oct 24

8:00	DLMS Material Reporting Process - Harry Featherstone
	-- 830/LS46 IC Planning Schedule with Release Capability - War Material Reporting
	-- 830/LS47 IC Planning Schedule with Release Capability - Special Program Requirements
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Continue review of DLMS Material Reporting Process
	-- 867/LS26 IC Product Transfer and Resale Report - Demand Reporting
	-- 867/LS49 IC Product Transfer and Resale Report - Issue
4:30	End of business day

Friday, Oct 25

8:00	Wrap up open items/issues
09:00	Schedule next meeting and set draft agenda
10:00	Adjourn

DONNA:
I HAVE MADE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE OVER HEAD AND SCREEN, PLUS THE
BUTCHER BLOCK PAPER.

HOTEL ADDRESS:
SHERATON INN
1724 ALAFAYA TRAIL
ORLANDO, FL
(407) 658-9008

PER DIEM FOR ORLANDO IS $65.00 AND $34.00

ROOMS ARE $65.00

HOTEL HAS RESTAURANT & LOUNGE:

CLOSE BY:
APPLEBEE'S
CHILES
OLIVE GARDEN
SHONEY'S
BERGER KING
WENDY'S
SEVERAL PLACES IN THE STRIP MALL ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE HOTEL
GREAT LITTLE PIZZA SHOP
CHINESE

LET ME KNOW IF THERE IS ANYTHING ELSE I CAN DO....

NANCY COX
E-MAIL ADDRESS:
COX1@STRICOM.ARMY.MIL

DLA Weapon System Support

Data Collection Requirements and Enhancements

NEEDS:

- Additional data to give full view of weapon system status and criticality

- DoD Components standard weapon system coding structure

- Single source for Weapon System Data

- Decision Support System and Reports

There is no free lunch; but there are cheap ones

DLA Weapon System Support

Options for Data Collection

Data Collection Options	Resource Requirement	Difficulty
1. Use Current MILSTRIP Requisition	Minimum Work	
2. Assign Unique DODAACs to Weapon Systems	Reprogramming	Some Work
3. Append Trailer Transactions to Requisitions	Reprogramming	Some Work
4. Implement DLMS Requisition (TS 511)	System redesign	

Degree of difficulty is proportionate to level of detail

DLA Weapon System Support
Options for Data Collection

Data Collection Option	Action Required	Difficulty
1. Use Current MILSTRIP Requisition (3 position codes)	Need Service Buy-In to procedures and system changes	

ADVANTAGES

- Quickest option available
- Reports made available by Weapon System
- Demand information available by Weapon System
- DAASC can populate LIPS database in 30 days after Services begin to transmit

DISADVANTAGES

- Requires requisitioners to put Weapon Systems codes in requisitions
- Limits one weapon system code per requisition
- Limits number of characters in the Weapon System codes
- Will require automated systems changes

Near term implementation feasible

DLA Weapon System Support

Options for Data Collection

Data Collection Option	Action Required	Difficulty
2. Assign Unique DODAACs to Weapon System Requisitions	Need Service Buy-In to procedures and system changes	Some Work

- <u>ADVANTAGES</u>
  - Requisition uniquely identified for unique weapon system
  - Reports readily available by Weapon System
  - Demand information available by Weapon System
  - Relatively quick to implement
- <u>DISADVANTAGES</u>
  - Services must assign unique DODAAC for each Weapon System to be tracked
  - Limits one weapon system code per requisition
  - Will require automated systems changes for retail and wholesale
  - Requires procedural revisions for assigning DODAACs for Weapon Systems

Near to Mid-term implementation feasible

DLA Weapon System System Support

Options for Data Collection

Data Collection Option	Actions Required	Difficulty
3. Append Trailer Transactions to Requisition (4+ position codes)	Service Buy In System Changes	Some Work

- **ADVANTAGES**
  - SAMMS currently accepts trailer cards (Medical Reqn's)
  - Flexibility in Weapon System code size
  - Allows tracking by Weapon System
  - Can identify quantity for multiple weapon System in a single requisition
  - Multiple trailer cards can be associated with a single requisition
  - DAASC can implement in 30-60 days
- **DISADVANTAGES**
  - Retail/Wholesale automated systems will require changes
  - Revisions required to current MILSTRIP procedures (New Doc ID-Trailer card)
  - No funds readily available for systems changes
  - Requires requisitioners to put Weapon Systems codes in requisitions

Feasible in near to midterm with more capability and more cost

DLA Weapon System System Support

Options for Data Collection

Data Collection Option	Actions Required	Difficulty
4. Implement DLMS Requisition (TS 511)	Services to redesign systems for implementation by OCT 1998	■

- ### ADVANTAGES
  - Full identification of demand data in one source
  - Allows tracking by Weapon System
  - Mulitple requisitions in one transaction
  - Flexibility in Weapon System Code size
  - Identify multiple Weapon Systems in a single requisition
  - Identify quantity for each Weapon System in a single requisition

- ### DISADVANTAGES
  - Extensive changes by Retail and Wholesale automated systems
  - Implementation costs
  - Requires requisitioners to put Weapon Systems codes in requisitions

Implementation in long term with full capability