May 17, 2024

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office (DEDSO) Defense Logistics Management
Standards (DLMS) Summit Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) Process Review
Committee (PRC) Meeting 24-01

      This memorandum forwards the attached minutes of the Supply Discrepancy Report
Process Review Committee providing updates and review on WebSDR Metrics and Proposed
Status Codes, Draft Proposed DLMS Change (PDC) 1444A, Unrouteable SDRs, Supply
Discrepancy Report (SDR)/Product Quality Deficiency Report (PQDR) Process Review Joint
PDC 1446, and LIN Segment Issue.

      The Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office point of contact is DoD Supply Discrepancy
Administrator, Mr. Benjamin Breen, or DoD Supply Discrepancy Administrator Alternate Mr.
Corbin Austin e-mail: DEDSO.SDR@dla.mil

Sarah Winegardner
Director, Defense Enterprise Data
      Standards Office

Attachment:
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:
ODASD(Logistics)
SDR PRC Attendees

MINUTES FROM DLMS SUMMIT SUPPLY DISCREPANCY REPORT PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING 24-01, MAY 09, 2024

SUBJECT: Defense Enterprise Data Standards Office (DEDSO) Defense Logistics Management Standards (DLMS) Summit Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting 24-01

Purpose: DEDSO convened the First Annual DLMS Summit/Supply Discrepancy Report PRC meeting in-person and via LMI/Microsoft Zoom on May 09, 2024. Specific discussion topics were the following: WebSDR Metrics and Proposed Status Codes, Draft Proposed DLMS Change (PDC) 1444A, Unrouteable SDRs, SDR/Product Quality Deficiency Report (PQDR) Joint PDC 1446, and LIN Segment Issue

Meeting documentation: The meeting agenda, briefing material, and the Action Item Tracker are available on the SDR PRC web page: Supply Discrepancy Reporting (dla.mil). Please provide any questions or feedback by sending them to email address: DEDSO.SDR@dla.mil.

Brief Summary of Discussion: Mr. Ben Breen, DEDSO SDR Administrator, facilitated discussions during the SDR PRC 24-01 meeting. No action items were reported for this meeting.

Opening Remarks: Mr. Breen welcomed attendees, provided a brief overview of DEDSO's mission statement and vision, and encouraged a discussion and feedback from all participants on today's meeting topics. In addition, Mr. Breen gave a quick review on how to become an SDR PRC Representative and the importance of having an accurate and up-to-date official Primary and Alternate Appointment letter and why its required and needed for one coordinated response from each Component/Service.

1. Meeting Topics: Mr. Breen and Mr. Austin provided a brief overview of the topics to be discussed, outlined below.

a. Agenda Topic 1 – WebSDR Metrics and Proposed Status Codes

Mr. Breen DEDSO SDR Administrator, began the discussion for updating the way we currently capture metrics and how we would like to collect, analyze, and use the data for predictive future analysis and how it will be stored in Advana. Presently, Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) sends the data (suspended stock IPTs) to Office Defense Acquisition and Sustainment for Logistics (ODASD LOG). Why is the data coming from DLA and not WebSDR since technically WebSDR is the DoD Hub for all SDRs that come through the department and all Federal agencies that we interact with? When we begin sending data from WebSDR to Advana we need to relook and rethink how we categorize SDRs.

Mr. Breen proposed the following questions to the committee and laid out the ultimate goal in how we collect SDR data. What does it mean when an SDR is in a specific status? For example,

when an SDR is Established/Posts/Rejected - How do we handle it? The way we would like to design this in the future is the Transaction must post for it to move to the next level or new status. The intent is to be able to say with confidence that this SDR is in a specific status. The goal is to know that the data going into Advana is accurate and that we have confidence in it. To do this we need to build a hierarchy of confidence in the data so when ODASD LOG asks how many open SDRs are within the department, we can respond with accurate data and ODASD LOG will have a full and accurate picture. Ultimately the goal is to internally build a better structure of how we view an SDR so we're confident in the SDR data status process. There were several questions and feedback from the attendees, and they agreed with what the goal is for collecting SDR data.

Carey Deforest from General Service Agency (GSA) inquired in your example where the follow-up is rejected because it hasn't been 55 days for the original. If GSA receives the original, are you going to pass that follow-up? Or are you going to reject it before we receive it because it hasn't been the 55 days? Mr. Breen responded that Defense Automatic Addressing System (DAAS) WebSDR Hub would reject it at DAAS WebSDR level and wouldn't let it pass through. That this came in on this date. The follow-up comes in on day 10 doesn't meet the criteria and it should have been on day 55 or 56 therefore it will not move forward to the receiving system to have them reject it instead DAAS WebSDR Hub would reject it upfront. Carey Deforest (GSA) agreed with this process.

Alex Sparks from Product Deficiency Reporting Evaluation Program (PDREP) inquired about an open/awaiting disposition that's a valid original where they sent out the 00 and WebSDR sent back the 103. Is that where you would say, now it is open/awaiting disposition and until then is it still in draft status? Mr. Breen responded that not every system gets the 103 acknowledgement. Ideally, we want to move in that direction where the submitting system submits the SDR, they get back the 103 acknowledgment that says we received/accepted/posted/you now have a valid 00. For the other systems that don't get a 103 acknowledgement the other methodology is they send in a 00. Then we send you back a 900 series or 700 series rejecting reply code informing the submitter there is no 00 on file and it's been rejected. If someone sends in a SDR 00 with no Document Number, it goes into catastrophic failure or a DAAS reject category and gets failed upfront immediately. DAAS then sends an email back to the submitting system/POCs stating there is no 00 on file/no document number this was rejected catastrophically. So, for PDREP you would receive the 103 acknowledgement stating its valid. For the other systems that don't receive a 103, 700/900 series rejection, or a catastrophic failure rejection email then the SDR posted.

Alex Sparks (PDREP) had the following follow-up question: If you have submitted a valid 00 and it's been received from WebSDR, but it doesn't say that the end system is going to safely receive it. Is this something you're considering when discussing the status because it should still be open and awaiting disposition. But it doesn't clarify or state anywhere what happens if something goes wrong further down the line. Mr. Breen gave an example of when DLA Distribution sends an SDR. The SDR comes through and passes all the edits. WebSDR sends back the 103 acknowledgement and it's going to DLA (Routing Identifier Code (RIC) SMS)) the DLA Enterprise Business System (EBS) receives it but it's not a stock number DLA manages. DLA Distribution doesn't know that. All they know is someone turned in material and it has RIC SMS as the owner. Everything's valid in DAAS WebSDR and it passed all the checks, goes

through, and DAAS sends it to DLA, EBS gets it and then determines EBS doesn't have a material master for this which most SAP systems require material master for, so EBS rejects it and sends back a rejection. This usually happens within a few hours.

Jose Pereira (DLA) inquired from a policy standpoint, the inventory system of record is what we're basically chasing after when we're looking for these metrics. At the DoD level I've already brought up as we're transitioning into a new system. We're in a kind of limbo status of trying to pull the data which complicates it even more because even the data fields themselves are not matched up in between the legacy system and the new ones. So, I want to make sure I'm tracking what your goal is. Even the definition of what they consider to be SDRs when we're briefing out the DoD compliance is debatable amongst the Service Components. Have you received directions or guidance on if this is the way to make sure everyone is on the same page? There are actionable and non-actionable buckets when we're reporting to DoD but what everyone is tracking the definitions are different. Mr. Breen responded that the same can be said for suspended stock. Meaning what do we consider to be suspended stock? Suspended stock can mean something different to DLA and it could mean something totally different to the Army. So, from a definition perspective we need to codify and define what suspended stock truly means for the department so when we say suspended stock we are in 100% agreement on what it means so there's no disparity between the Components and Services. The source of a particular transaction can come out of Logistics Modernization Program (LMP), PDREP, or GSA Vision, we've collected the data and based on agreed upon business rules and edits this is what the status will be.

Tim Hecht from Air Force Security Assistance Command (AFSAC) asked as far as reconciling the two systems is there a process to determine when we have the status as open, and you have it as closed or vice versa? Mr. Breen stated we are currently doing that with PDREP in a bi-weekly meeting where we go through and try to reconcile the data which has enabled us to learn where we need to start taking corrective action. Mr. Breen encouraged all Service and system Points of Contact (POCs) to reach out to DEDSO so we can start having those types of conversations. Again, this is so we can ensure the data we're sending over to Advana is accurate and we can have confidence in it.

Mr. Breen requested that all of the Service PRC Representatives, Functionals, and end users of the SDR Community continue to review the different categories and provide feedback and suggestions on how we define these SDR categories so when we populate Advana with the data it's as accurate as possible.

Action Item: There were no action items regarding this topic.

b. Agenda Topic 2 – Draft PDC 1444A

Mr. Austin, DEDSO, SDR Alternate Administrator, began the discussion with a brief overview of the process prior to and after Approved Defense Logistics Manual Standards Change (ADC) 1444. Prior to ADC 1444 there was no prevention of the DLMS 842AW transaction routing when it either contained an invalid supply condition code or it was missing a Supply Condition Code (SCC). In addition, it was also allowing the submitter or an action activity to update the original document number. When this occurred, it caused issues with the SDR system and confusion for the users. ADC 1444 WebSDR requires a valid SCC in the 842 transaction. If the

SCC is not present the user will receive a 928 reply code rejecting it. Also, for Type 5 SDRs both the To and From SCCs are required. If a submitter or action activity attempts to modify the original document number DAAS will send a rejection 910 reply code. (noting that the first and second part have not been implemented yet, but the third part has been implemented). Mr. Breen noted the reason why this has not been implemented to date is because there are several systems currently still not sending the SCC and if this rule was turned on there would be thousands of rejections. We need for the systems to implement this because for DAAS WebSDR to ensure that data can be transmitted over to Advana a valid Supply Condition Code will be required. Mr. Breen also noted that there will be a final date when this will be implemented.

PDC 1444A addresses exceptions to Document Type Code 6, 7, V and W. PDC 1444A also updates the SCC in the 842AW for clarification. There are 2 Courses of Action (COA) DEDSO believes should be considered:

COA1: Do not require a SCC in the 842AW Transaction based on the Document Type (6, 7, V and W) Rational: Is this stock suspended in location?

COA2: Do not require a SCC in the 842AW Transaction based on the SDR reporting total non-receipt and specific discrepancy codes. We would need to determine which Shortage or Non-receipt discrepancy codes (S, S4, S5, S7, S8) to include in the exception. Rational: If it's a shortage you didn't receive it then how will you know what SCC to report it in.

Do we make an exception just for total non-receipts or do we say customer SDRs don't need it because if it's not suspended is it recorded on the Accountable Property System of Record. Mr. Breen noted that we don't want to have a lot of convoluted exceptions. The question we're proposing is do the customers in the field suspend it, or do they just tag it and put it on a shelf? Which is why DEDSO looked at COA1 however, bottom line is it's really what the SDR community wants.

Mr. Breen requested the SDR PRC Representatives provide feedback via email from the PRCs perspective within their activity so DEDSO can look at the consensus between all the Services and Components and finalize PDC 1444A for formal staffing.

Action Item: There were no action items regarding this topic.

c. **Agenda Topic 3 – Unrouteable SDRs**

Mr. Austin began the brief by defining an unrouteable SDR. An unrouteable SDR is an SDR that is not assigned to a system which is routed via email to the Component PRC Rep or Delegate. Currently these unrouteable SDRs are generated at time of receipt at DAAS WebSDR. Mr. Austin noted that currently DAAS is working on developing a report that will capture these unrouteable SDRs and that this report would be in addition to the notification email. The intent of this report is to assist in identifying the initiators and the number of unrouteable SDRs that the initiators submitted for a month. In addition, this report will allow the PRC Representatives to identify initiators that may benefit from additional training and to assist them in identifying the actual shipping activity so that they could submit it to the appropriate RIC. This will also allow the PRC Representative to determine whether or not they should update the routing table to go to their SDR system instead of receiving the email hopefully cutting down on the manual transactions that would have to be submitted via WebSDR. It was also noted that in the future

DAAS plans to create a link within the WebSDR online application that would allow the PRC Representatives to access their email routing so they will be able to make updates to their POCs/email addresses themselves.

Action Item: There were no action items regarding this topic.

d. Agenda Topic 4 – SDR/PQDR Joint PDC 1446

Mr. Breen presented a Joint Proposed DLMS Change PDC 1446 which lays out the way forward for the PQDR Process. The PQDR PRC also joined the SDR PRC during this discussion. Currently, when the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Community has a quality related efficiency, the current process allows them to submit an SDR. This allows them to be able to report their deficiencies through the SDR process even though they're quality related. Normally this is completed through the PQDR process for quality related material. The PQDR PRC established a series of ADCs (1007 series) that created a new DLMS 842P PQDR Data Exchange transaction. This new transaction will no longer allow the PQDR submitting systems (PDREP, Joint Deficiency Reporting System (JDRS)) to transact point to point. Today these systems transmit point to point. There are no DLMS transactions, transactions don't pass through DAAS and is considered a non-compliant process. The ADC 1007 series, the new 842P DLMS Implementation Convention (IC) and the new business rules lay the groundwork for what will be carried in the PQDR transaction systemically in the future (in the next 2 years) where they will go through DAAS and PDREP PQDR module will house them. PDREP PQDR module will be similar to WebSDR, but it will be the DoD PQDR Repository. The intent is to allow the FMS Community to be able to submit PQDRs in the future for actual quality deficient items versus how they're currently submitting them as SDRs, so we are no longer comingling deficiencies and have a clear process for the FMS Community to report PQDRs. Currently, one of the complaints from the FMS Community is they submit an SDR that's a quality related issue and the FMS International Logistics Control Office (ILCO) or customer question if the Action Point conducted an investigation? Was the root cause of the problem ever determined? SDR investigations do not provide that type of level of detail to answer those types of questions. PQDR investigations provide all of this information such as root cause analysis, detailed investigation findings, and a corrective action plan that will be provided back to the FMS Customer. PDC 1446 will standardize and document the PQDR logistics process across DoD. Standardization will improve communication between the ILCO and Action Activities/Action Points. Jose Pereira (DLA) suggested adding to the system requirements to ensure transactional compliance, so it's no longer done via email. Mr. Breen (SDR) and Mr. Mark Rockwell, (DEDSO PQDR Administrator) closed by stating staffing would start June 2024 to capitalize on the momentum and agreement before there is any turnover of key personnel.

Action Item: There were no action items regarding this topic.

e. Agenda Topic 5 – LIN Segment Issue

Mr. Breen and Ms. Marsha Lucas (DAAS) briefed a Material Identifier issue in the LIN segment of the DLMS 842AW Implementation Convention (IC). Currently, there are several types of Material Identifiers e.g., NSN (National Stock Number), LSN (Local Stock Number), Manufacturer Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) and Part Number combinations.

Each one of these Material Identifiers have different Qualifiers/Codes within the DLMS 842AW transaction. For example, the Qualifier/Code for NSN is FS and the Qualifier/Code for LSN is SW. The issue is we have a disparity among the components systems on how they have programmed or designed their systems to look for those Materiel Identifiers in specific locations. Nothing past LIN09 segment is being seen. Noting that the schemas and the IC should mirror each other. If the IC only allows certain qualifiers in certain positions, then that's how the schema is defined as well. Currently, when DAAS receives a rejection back from GSA, DAAS has to manually go in and tweak the Extensible Markup Language (XML) data file to get data into positions where GSA can accept it then retransmit the transaction to GSA. There's a disconnect between how the Services are programming their systems with Material Identifiers and the WebSDR Translator. To fix this disconnect moving forward DEDSO and DAAS would like to setup a meeting with the PRC Representatives and the Technical Reps to come to a consensus and determine the best way forward then draft a PDC. A meeting will be scheduled with PRC Representatives, Technical Representatives, and Programmers to discuss a solution to this issue.

Action Item: There were no action items regarding this topic.

f. **Wrap Up/Action Items**

Mr. Breen and Mr. Austin thanked the participants for the great discussion and progress, highlighting the importance of communication from the group. The next DEDSO SDR PRC has yet to be scheduled and will be coordinated with the SDR PRC group prior to being scheduled.

g. **Attendees:**

#	Component/ Service	Name	In-Person	Virtual
1.	DLA HQ J345 IM	Troy Brown II	Yes	
2.	HQAMC G3 (LISD)	Chris Kennedy	Yes	
3.	GSA	Carey DeForest		Yes
4.	GSA NCSC	Tammy White		Yes
5.	DLA HQ	Jose Pereira	Yes	
6.	DLA HQ	Eric Flanagan		Yes
7.	DLA	Michael Alston	Yes	
8.	DLA	Arvin Singh	Yes	
9.	OPNAV N4L6	Renee Eller-Hendrix		Yes
10.	US Navy/NAVSUP	Jared Trinkaus	Yes	
11.	US Navy/NAVSUP	Todd Kepner	Yes	
12.	US Navy/PDREP	Alex Sparks	Yes	
13.	US Navy/PDREP	Elizabeth Woodbury	Yes	
14.	DLA	Denisse Cunningham		Yes
15.	DAAS WebSDR	Marsha Lucus	Yes	
16.	DAAS WebSDR	Sean Humenansky	Yes	
17.	DAAS WebSDR	Kim Bogner	Yes	
18.	AFSAC	Steven Passage		Yes
19.	AFSAC	Tim Hecht		Yes

20.	Logistics Services Management Center (LSMC) USMC Logistics Command	Steven Williams		Yes
21.	Supplier Performance Risk System	Belinda Labourdette		Yes
22.	DEDSO	Ben Breen	Yes	
23.	DEDSO	Corbin Austin	Yes	
24.	DEDSO Support	Mashiya Young	Yes	
25.	DEDSO Support	Ella Collier	Yes	