



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

IN REPLY  
REFER TO

December 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee  
Meeting 12-03, November 8, 2012

The attached minutes of the DLMS Supply PRC Meeting (12-03) are forwarded for your information and action as appropriate.

The DLA Logistics Management Standards points of contact are Ms. Ellen Hilert, (703) 767-0676, DSN 427-0676; or email [ellen.hilert@dla.mil](mailto:ellen.hilert@dla.mil), Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, (703) 767-0677; or email [mary.jane.johnson@dla.mil](mailto:mary.jane.johnson@dla.mil), and Ms. Heidi Daverede, (703) 767-5111 or email [heidi.daverede@dla.mil](mailto:heidi.daverede@dla.mil).

FOR 

DONALD C. PIPP  
Director  
DLA Logistics Management  
Standards Office

Attachment  
As stated

cc:  
ODASD(SCI)  
Supply PRC  
Attendees  
ODASD DPAP (PDI)  
Joint Small Arms/Light Weapons Coordinating Group (JSA/LWCG)



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

IN REPLY  
REFER TO

December 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) Supply Process Review Committee (PRC) Meeting 12-03, November 7, 2012

**Purpose:** The DLA Logistics Management Standards Office hosted the subject meeting at the LMI Government Consulting Office in McLean, Virginia. Specific discussion topics are noted below. A list of attendees and briefing materials are available on the Supply PRC Webpage: [www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/Archives/archives\\_sprc.asp](http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/Archives/archives_sprc.asp) (refer to hyperlinks from the meeting agenda for briefings).

**Brief Summary of Discussion:** Ms. Ellen Hilert, Co-chair, DOD Supply PRC/DOD MILSTRIP Administrator, Ms. Heidi Daverede, Co-chair, DOD Supply PRC/DOD MILSTRIP Alternate Administrator, and Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, Co-Chair, DOD Supply PRC/DOD MILSTRAP Administrator, facilitated discussion. Action items identified below are to be worked within 24 days of the date of this memorandum unless otherwise noted.

**Review of Meeting Topics:**

**a. Item Unique Identification (IUID) Status Update.** IUID implementation topics were addressed, including the UII and/or serial number on shipment status and supply discrepancy report transactions, and improvements to the automated data capture of the UII and/or serial number when preparing an Issue Release/Receipt Document (IRRD).

**(1) PDC 1030, Implementation of IUID in the DLMS Shipment Status Supporting DOD IUID Supply Procedures and Associated Supply Discrepancy Report Procedures.** The IUID in Supply Business Processes briefing by Ms. Hilert focused on the key parts of PDC 1030 to include IUID data (unique item identifier (UII) and/or serial number) in the DLMS shipment status and Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) transactions. The brief identified shipment status and SDR scenarios when and how IUID data should be carried; it also addressed the enhanced functionality of the shipment status to maintain positive control and visibility of IUID content in multiple freight piece shipments. PDC 1030 is consistent with the draft Integrated Requirements Set (IRS) ODASD (SCI) is developing. PDC 1030 addresses MILSTRIP (DD 1348-1A) and non-MILSTRIP (DD 1149) shipments. The PDC proposes passing both UII and/or serial number in all shipment status transactions when available. The PDC specifically identifies that the DOD Distribution Depot shipping process will not stop for lack of IUID data on items with an IUID Indicator Yes (Y). There is no requirement for the shipping activity to opening boxes when the UII is not on the outside or systemically available. PDC 1030 was released on October 11, 2012 and Component responses were originally due on November 26, 2012; however extensions were granted into December. Two discussion items relevant to the IUID Indicator were clarified. First, the receiving process will continue to follow the existing process to check for IUID marking on (new procurement) receipts.

Second, a Navy representative (SPAWAR) asked about the relevance of the Controlled Inventory Item Code (CIIC) and how the IUID indicator impacts the CIIC. It was noted that the IUID Indicator is separate and the CIIC would be a factor in determining the setting of the IUID Indicator to Yes (Y). The IUID Indicator to be made available in the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) Master Data Capability (MDC) and later fully integrated into cataloging data will provide a single source to determine if a stock number falls under the IUID management requirements. The determination for the IUID applicability is a collaborative decision among the Components participating in the DOD IUID work group. GSA advised that currently there are no immediate plans to implement Wide Area Workflow (WAWF) for GSA Direct Vendor Delivery shipments, so there may be a need to modify the proposed procedures for inclusion of UIIs on the 856S for DVDs when sourced by a GSA vendor.

**(a) Process Gap for Shipment Status in Response to a Follow-Up:** The ICP will follow existing MILSTRIP procedures to prepare the status transaction based on the Materiel Release Confirmation (MRC) (DLMS 945A), which will not include the UII and/or serial number at this time. This is a recognized gap for IUID content on the shipment status. A significant systems change would be required to direct the follow-up inquiry to the shipping activity vice the ICP for DOD shipments in order to support retransmission the original shipment status with UIIs and/or serial number.

**(b) Multiple Freight Pieces.** PDC 1030 addresses multiple freight pieces, where a single shipment status reflects materiel that is shipped in more than one box thereby allowing association of passive RFID with a particular box. The shipment status transaction currently provided for this type of shipment is not distinguishable, since the Transportation Control Number is the same on each and no box identification is provided. The revised 856S shipment status transaction will also provide visibility of UIIs by box and the box count. This will further support receipt process by UII and passive RFID, as well as identification of UII items when a box is missing. Implementation of this change will require that the shipping activity identify the UIIs during the pack process by specific box so that this information can be perpetuated to the shipment status. This change will enhance visibility of materiel, particularly for DLA.

**(c) Supply Discrepancy Reports for IUID.** PDC 1030 addresses the SDR reporting requirements associated with mismatches between shipment status, documentation, and the materiel received, as well as the desire not to trigger SDRs prematurely based solely on the IUID Indicator. Pending full implementation of IUID policy, SDRs are not to be used to report lack of IUID content on shipment status, items, or packaging on shipments originating from a DOD activity based solely on IUID Indicator Y. PDC 1030 includes an SDR decision matrix to determine when to submit an SDR for missing, overage, incorrect, or mismatched IUID data for items identified by a NSN with IUID Indicator Y. A new data element is established to indicate whether the IUID content in the SDR is applicable to materiel received or not received (missing). During the discussion, Ms. Hilert stressed the importance of integrating the receiving and SDR systems to facilitate reporting of discrepancies where IUID data, UII and/or serial number, is perpetuated systemically.

**(2) PDC 399A, Automated Data Capture for Serialized Item Shipments and Preparation of the Issue Release/Receipt document IRRD (DD Form 1348-1A or DD Form 1348-2) Continuation Page.** ADC 399 established requirements and procedures to identify significant shipment data and the UIIs/serial numbers for multiple items within Portable Data File 417 (PDF417) 2D bar code(s) on the IRRD. It also identified procedures for using an IRRD

continuation page for Macro PDF 417 bar codes and a separate requirement for using Code 39 linear bar codes to identify all applicable serial numbers. PDC 399A is a proposed addendum to ADC 399 to update the language and data encoding procedures to improve content of the IRRD. UIIs and serial numbers would be encoded and linked together, when they are machine readable and readily available, or when retrievable from the system generating the shipping form. To establish the relationship between a specific UII and its associated serial number, the PDC uses a new technical approach (ISO/IEC 15434 Format 06 envelopes) to “bracket” the UII and serial number for each item within the 2D bar code(s) and it removes the ADC 399 requirement to link a UII to the serial number used to derive the UII (data identifier (DI) 42S). Jim Weiner (DLA DDC J6N) raised a question on how the depot will obtain IUID data when the materiel does not physically move but does change ownership (referred to as ship-in-place scenario) . Ms. Hilert noted that ownership changes such as this are not addressed in the PDC and will require further discussion to determine if a suitable process can be identified.

- **ACTION:** Component comments for PDC 1030 and PDC 399A were due on November 26, 2012 and November 12, 2012, respectively. Projected implementation dates for both PDCs are required in the Component PDC response.
- **ACTION:** DLA to explore feasibility of obtaining UIIs and/or serial numbers in the Distribution Depot “ship-in-place” scenario.

**b. Government Furnished Property (GFP) Update.** Several briefings and two Approved DLMS Changes (ADCs) affecting GFP were addressed. The significant discussions are identified in the following subsections:

**(1) GFP Briefing Overview.** Ms. Hilert provided an overview of GFP under MILSTRIP/DLMS and identified two key DLMS Changes that will support management of GFM. The key changes are Materiel Receipt Acknowledgment (MRA) /Receipt, and perpetuation of GFP Contract Data from Requisitioning and GFM Validation Process through Shipment Status.

**(a) ADC 390** revised the DLMS 527R Materiel Receipt Acknowledgement (MRA) to require the contract number (and call/order number, when applicable) of the DOD contract that authorized the contractor to receive GFM or CFM as applicable, on transactions associated with GFM and CFM. This requirement is applicable to both pushed and pulled GFM and also to contractor receipts when appropriate for intra-Service use such as Navy contractors using the Commercial Asset Visibility (CAV) System to report receipts to the Navy ICP. Contracting Officers must ensure the new requirement is implemented in contracts for contractors that receive GFM/CFM, or for materiel control activities (MCAs) preparing MRAs on behalf of contractors. A report is available on the DLA Transaction Services reports site that identifies the “Percent of Delinquents Summary Report – Contractor” . Some of the statistics in this report are misleading as some contractors use the DLMS 527R Receipt rather than the DLMS 527R MRA.

- **ACTION:** Components are requested to provide implementation dates for ADC 390.
- **ACTION:** DLMSO to work with the Supply PRC and DLA Transaction Services to revise the MRA Delinquency Report criteria as needed to more accurately portray the MRA statistics for contractors given that Navy contractors using CAV report GFM to the Navy ICP using a Receipt transaction rather than an MRA.

(b) **ADC 1014** revised procedures to include contract data in transactions associated with GFP and the MCA validation of CFM requisitions. DLMS compliant GFP requisitions (DLMS 511R) will carry the 13-position DFARS contract number, the call/order number and CLIN when applicable. This eliminates the abbreviated contract number used in MILSTRIP and eliminates the option for use of a manufacturing directive number (MDN) instead of the contract number on DLA contractor GFP requisitions. This change requires the GFP requisition contract information be perpetuated through the MCA GFP Validation process and be included on requisitions forwarded to the Source of Supply (SoS). For stock shipments, the SoS will perpetuate the GFP contract information to the Materiel Release Order (MRO) transaction (DLMS 940R) sent to the shipping activity and the shipping activity or SoS, as applicable, will perpetuate the GFP contract information to the DLMS shipment status transaction (DLMS 856S) where it can be captured for update of the GFP module of the IUID Registry.

- **ACTION:** Components are requested to provide implementation dates for ADC 1014.

(2) **OSD GFP Overview.** Mr. Dave Guinasso (contractor support to OSD (AT&L) DPAP PDI) provided a briefing on issues relating to GFP. Key GFP concerns from the OSD perspective are, "What do we own, where it, and what is it worth?" It is believed that a high volume of GFP is not accounted for and recent audits have identified the need for improved record keeping with infusion of technology to capture information about GFP. One example cited was the movement of GFP items from one contract to another with no visibility. There is an ongoing effort to synchronize the GFP policy based on 19 business rules identified in his presentation. The DPAP office has worked with the Business Enterprise Architecture (BEA) to enhance visibility of GFP by incorporating GFP processes in the procurement strategy. Mr. Guinasso addressed extracting GFP items from contracts to create visibility and stressed the support for using standard transactions for enhanced visibility. The vision is to use technology to enable the capture information about property and follow its movement between the Government and the contractor. Four Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and eight Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), changes have been completed and several more are planned. Other accomplishments this year include publishing a GFP instruction, Standard Operating Procedures, and a guide book. A preference was noted to use electronic transactions to record shipments currently documented on the DD 1149 form. Ms. Hilert noted that the DD 1149 is mapped to the DLMS 856S Shipment Status when used for transshipments through a Distribution Depot and will include the UII and serial number when available. A concern was noted for holding up shipments because there is no "acceptor" at the ship-to location. Mr. Guinasso indicated that acceptance issues have the largest impact on prompt payment interest penalties in DOD. Ms. Hilert noted that DLA has been reluctant to provide destination acceptance for direct vendor delivery shipments in the past and asked for clarification on how the planned requirement for identification of an acceptor for all destination acceptance shipments will be applied without causing negative operational impact?

**(3) DLA GFP Reparable Item Property Transfer Interim Solution.** Ms. Beth Altman (DLA J335) provided a briefing on the DLA GFP interim solution to use the Wide Area Workflow (WAWF) and Depot Standard System (DSS) interface for GFP property transfers using the DLMS 856 Advance Shipment Notice (ASN) and DLMS 527R Receipt. This procedure involves vendor shipment upon acceptance of a repair service and receipt of reparable items when shipped to a DSS depot for storage. The contractor prepares a Reparable Receiving Report to obtain acceptance and then WAWF uses a property transfer document to execute the movement of the reparable to the storage activity. The interim solution will have the GEX translate the WAWF property transfer document into the 856 ASN format which DSS can process. Upon receipt of the item DSS will prepare the DLMS 527R Receipt (Document Identifier Code D4M) which the GEX will translate into the 856 GFP Property Transfer Receipt to update the WAWF record and the DOD IUID and GFP Registries. Ms. Hilert noted that the interim solution is targeting the only reparable items shipped from the repair contractor (not new procurement or other types of shipments). This interim solution helps address the Financial Improvement Audit Readiness (FIAR) requirement to improve DOD property accountability.

- **ACTION:** Recommend the Military Services review this interim capability to see if similar interim procedures might be helpful in their respective business processes.

**c. DOD EMALL/Funds Control Interface.** The update on the DOD EMALL/Funds Control Interface and status of DLMS 527R MRA implementation in EMALL was provided by Mr. John Ulrich, DLA. EMALL delayed the implementation to migrate the MRA reporting requirement from the 861 to the DLMS 527R; they encountered an issue with DLA's EBS on reporting of MRAs for non-medical items. In December, 2011, DLA Electronic Business System (EBS) was unable to accept the non-medical DLMS 527R. Ms. Hilert suggested coordination with Mr. Bill Shaffer (DLA J33), since EBS has the capability to receive a standard DLMS 527R for the MRA; it was unclear what issues were involved at the time of the meeting. Relating to the GCSS-Army implementation of the Funds Control Module (FCM), a concern was noted regarding a proposal to develop a separate point-to-point FCM for GCSS-Army in lieu of using the one that is already implemented for Army in EMALL.

- **ACTION:** Marine Corps to submit PDC with any required modifications to the standard FCM to enable implementation by the Marine Corps.
- **ACTION:** Army to submit PDC with any required modifications to the standard FCM to enable implementation by GCSS-Army.
- **ACTION:** DLA and EMALL team to clarify issues associated with the transaction from the 861 to the DLMS 527R MRA and submit a PDC if there is a requirements gap. Subsequent to the meeting, it was indicated that the primary issue involves preparation of the MRA for multi-line orders recorded directly with a vendor (under a DLA prime vendor/tailored vendor relationship program) and reported to DLA on the 850.

**d. International Standards Organization (ISO)/Geopolitical Entities, Names, and Codes (GENC) Country Code.** Ms. Samantha Khuon provided an overview on the status of the GENC implementation. The Country Code Working Group (CCWG) continues to work on the migration from the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) 10-4 country code standard to the use of ISO 3166-1. CCWG developed GENC to fill in the missing entries left in the wake of the departing

FIPS 10-4. OSD was drafting a revised memorandum to postpone the implementation of GENC to September, 2013; however, subsequent to the Supply PRC meeting, all indications are that the revised implementation date will be identified by NGA in the GENC Implementation Plan. ADC 448B (Delayed Implementation for International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 3166-1 Codes for the Identification of Countries and their Subdivisions) was issued by DLA Logistics Management Standards Office to notify the implementers of GENC about the delay from the original September, 2012 implementation target date. A concern was raised regarding the implementation timeline and the effect on systems under development, particularly for shipping labels. Approval was expected before the end of the year, but we do not expect required implementation before the mediation capability is in place to allow identification of a code in DOD that is not a recognized country.

**e. Accountability of Property To/From Maintenance (PMR/Shipment Status).**

**(1) PDC 449 Revised MILSTRAP Procedures for Logistics Accountability During Maintenance - Disallows Logistics Use of Inventory Adjustment Transaction (DAC) for Physical Movement of Materiel from a Storage Activity to a Maintenance Activity.** Under the Depot Maintenance Inter-Service Support Agreement (DMISA) concept, visibility of assets after receipt by another Component organic repair depot is an ongoing problem at some locations particularly while items are in the repair process. For example, the Marine Corps notes they lose visibility when sending some items to Army maintenance activities.

(a) The Air Force concerns with lack of visibility during maintenance were addressed in a briefing by Ms. Merrita Briggs, Air Force Materiel Command. Ms. Briggs noted that for three Navy and one Marine Corps non-reporting DMISA repair sites collocated with a DSS storage facility, the Air Force D035A system does not have visibility when items ship. Their first indication is the MILSTRAP Document Identifier Code (DIC) D6\_receipt transaction. With no PMR from the repair site, retrograde tracking computations are extremely difficult. Ms. Briggs noted that there are two Navy sites (Crane, IN and Keyport, WA) where this process appears to be working and the required transactions are being received.

(b) Mr. Jim Weiner, DLA Distribution, noted the depots use a pseudo Routing Identifier Code (RIC) for receipts. When they receive DMISA assets they flip the RIC to allow the local maintenance facility to incorporate items into local repair facility. Transactions get reported to the maintenance activity RIC, but the Air Force does not see it coming out of the maintenance sites. He also noted that systems operating at local sites may not be using a DLMS compliant system requiring workaround.

(c) Ms. Emily Burt-Hedrick, Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP), noted that the DoDAACs identified in the Air Force briefing are not the DoDAACs used for their Fleet Repair Centers even though some are associated with the sites noted. The Navy representative will talk to the Commercial Asset Visibility – Organic Repair Module and Electronic Retrograde Management System (eRMS) contacts to clarify.

(d) Ms. Hilert noted that the Air Force owner should be getting a condition code change and, apparently, they are neither getting that nor the issue transactions (D7B) from the non-reporting sites. Ms. Hilert noted that the DMISA site should also be creating the shipment status transaction to the depot and Ms. Johnson noted the PMR should be created in advance and updated as necessary (vice created at the point when the repaired item is ready to be returned to the depot).

(e) PDC 449 is related as it addresses discontinuing use of an inventory adjustment for supply condition code change (MILSTRAP 947I/DAC) as a method to record physical movement of an item between a storage activity and a maintenance activity. Ms. Johnson noted the need for a joint JPIWG/Supply PRC meeting to address questions and concerns associated with this change proposal, and that a meeting would be planned to address other concerns with accountability/visibility during maintenance such as those Air Force raised. A focused meeting (by phone and DCO) will be scheduled for late January 2013.

- **ACTION:** Air Force to identify the sites where this process appears to be working and the transactions being used with a process summary.
- **ACTION:** PRC leads to review current procedures and research enhancements planned under modernization in preparation for the planned meeting.
- **ACTION:** Target January for the meeting with the JPIWG and Supply PRC on PDC 449 comment/resolution as well as identification/discussion of transactions being used when moving assets between maintenance and storage activities. Topics to include: current process, root cause for the lack of owner visibility, and future plans.

**(2) MILSTRAP DIC DZC Transaction.** The second issue addressed by the Air Force was the DZC transactions being used to change ownership between Services. The DZC transaction does not feed the required systems. Ms. Johnson noted this is not a correct means to change ownership as DZC is for use with logistics reassignment only. Ms. Hilert noted that DLA has issued revised guidance not to use the DZC for this purpose based on clarification during the Joint Physical Inventory Working Group (JPIWG) meeting. Ms. Briggs clarified that these transactions are still originating from the Service side not the DSS side.

- **ACTION:** DOD Components and DLA will distribute and enforce guidance to discontinue the unauthorized use of DIC DZC transaction when changing item ownership not associated with logistics reassignment. The offending depots causing Army problems are Corpus Christi and Tobyhanna.

**f. Status of Update on Defense Logistics Manuals (DLMs) and combining the Defense Logistics Standard System (DLSS) and DLMS Manuals.** Mr. Paul Jensen, DLA Logistics Management Standards Office, provided the committee with an update on the status of initiatives to re-issue the DOD 4000.25 family of manuals as DLMs and then combine the legacy MILSTRIP and MILSTRAP manuals into Volume 2 of the DLM 4000.25 DLMS manual. DOD Instruction 4140.01 was signed in December, 2011 and directed publication of the DOD 4000.25 family of manuals as DLMs within 180 days. All un-published ADCs were incorporated in the respective manuals and the DLMs were published incrementally between April, 2012 and early June, 2012. We are now about to publish Formal Change 1 to the DLMs; it includes approximately 12 ADCs issued since the DLMs were initially issued. There is an effort under way to combine the MILSTRIP and



MILSTRAP manuals into DLMS Volume 2. This approach is being pursued because the level of effort required to maintain two closely related sets of manuals is resource intensive. Use of legacy 80rp terminology will be maintained. The effort to combine the MILSTRIP and MILSTRAP manuals with DLMS Volume 2 is projected to be completed in 2013.

**g. Component Updates (DLMS Implementation Status).** Brief update comments were provided by the following Components:

- **Navy.** Implemented the financial system at most Systems commands and some major activities. Implemented the single supply solutions at Navy Supply centers. Retired numerous legacy systems. BP28 afloat systems are next and are determining who has responsibility for sustainment, NAVSUP Business Systems Center or SPAWAR. Single Supply Baseline (SSB) is intended to replace R-Supply Afloat which is a MILS based system. The timeline for this replacement was not identified but probably will not be completed before 2017. The Navy has consolidated some independent systems into the B28 afloat systems. The new name is Naval Tactical Command Support System– Open Architecture (NTCSS–OA) SSB Base line. Some pieces of the parts functionality – financial inventory and logistics type items will be released in 2014 with other releases through 2017.
- **Marine Corps.** Implementation of GCSS–MC is progressing. It will roll out to tactical units in December, 2012, followed by inventory control point and storage activities.
- **Defense Logistics Agency.**
  - Auditability – DLA Auditability target is 2015. System changes and other issues that do not have a documented effect on auditability will be delayed. Approximately 10K man-hours of development work is already identified to support the auditability assertion requirements.
  - Working on DLA Energy Convergence over the next couple of years.
  - Declaring success on Reutilization Business Integration (RBI) for the DLA Disposition Services process integration into DLA EBS and DSS. A PDC for FMS requisitioning is pending.
  - Base Operating Supply System (BOSS) incorporating into EBS
  - Inventory Management and Stock Positioning (IMSP) Spiral 2 – Fleet Readiness Center (FRCs) scheduled for April 2013 in San Diego. Ms. Hilert asked about the IMSP Rollback for the Norfolk Naval Shipyard (NNSY) site. Mr. Shaffer (DLA J3311) noted that the IMSP rollback at NNSY removed all the IMSP enhancements. He noted there were some systems encountered that DLA was not aware of. The IMSP rollback at NNSY will need to be addressed at a future date as the present method is unsustainable. Focus is on implementing the remaining FRCs.

- **ACTION:** DLA to provide status on the PDC for RBI Requisitioning.
- **ACTION:** DLA to provide status the IMSP rollback and what happened to the enhancements.
- **GSA.** The Order Management System (DLMS-compliant) is replacing GSA's legacy FSS-19 and CSC systems. GSA is already capable of processing the DLMS 870S, 856S, and 869A. Next DLMS implementation focus is with the DLMS 511R and 527R. GSA's goal is to fully implement the DLMS by 2015.
- **USTRANSCOM – DTEB.** USTRANSCOM is working on a coordinated response on the Single Line of Accounting (SLOA) PDC and Ms. Hilert requested they hold their comments until the revised final PDC is available.

**h. DOD 4140.01-M, "DOD Supply Chain Materiel Management Procedures" Update.**

Ms. Lora Conrad, (ODASD/SCI) updated the committee on draft DOD 4140.01-M. The manual is restructured as 11 volumes and the Washington Headquarters Service and first legal review is complete. The manual was released for formal Component coordination and the current suspense date is January 31, 2013. The most significant changes are to Volume 5 (Distribution) customer collaboration, and dedicated truck. Verbiage about anti-counterfeit is woven throughout the manual. Ms. Conrad stressed the use of the formal comment form (SD 818, 2012 version).

**i. DLMS Change Status Report.** Ms. Daverede briefed the committee on an enhanced tool being implemented to track the status of DLMS changes. Previously, DLMS change status information was tracked using multiple documents: 1) a static Word document posted to the website, and 2) various internal documents. The new tool provides canned reports and an ad hoc reporting capability that uses drop down lists and filters. The tool is accessed from the DLA Logistics Management Standards Website: [www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/eLibrary/changes/Qtrly\\_Status\\_Rpts/DLMS\\_Change\\_Status\\_Report\\_Website.xlsx](http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/eLibrary/changes/Qtrly_Status_Rpts/DLMS_Change_Status_Report_Website.xlsx).

The publicly available reports are:

- DLMS Change Report
- Component Response Report
- Overdue Component Response Report
- Component Implementation Status Report
- Impacted DLM Publications Report
- Impacted DLMS Supplements Report

**j. DLMS Enhancement Report.** Ms. Daverede reviewed an existing resource that can be used to identify new or enhanced capabilities available in the DLMS Supplements for exchanging information among logistics systems and enhancements that provide capability beyond the legacy 80 record position transactions. Functional analysts and system developers should review the DLMS Enhancement Reports while changes to systems and applications are being developed to ensure they have an understanding of the enhanced capabilities enabled by the DLMS Supplements. The report is currently available at: [www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/eLibrary/changes/processchanges.asp](http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/eLibrary/changes/processchanges.asp).

**Wrap up.** Ms. Hilert thanked the Components for their participation in the Supply PRC meeting. She noted that the plan for future Supply PRC meetings will continue to be smaller and more focused on individual topics and may use conference call/DCO rather than multi-day meetings.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
ELLEN HILERT  
Co-Chair DOD Supply PRC

Approved:   
DONALD C. PIPP  
Director,  
Defense Logistics Management  
Standards Office