

Meeting Minutes

01 MARCH 2011

INTRODUCTION

The Defense Transportation Electronic Business (DTEB) Committee met on 01-02 March 2011 at the DRC offices at Scott Air Force Base, IL. Dr. Leon Wilson, United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) J6-AD Branch Chief, and Mr. John Will, USTRANSCOM Distribution Enterprise Data Office (DEDO) co-chaired the meeting. While noting that he was standing in for CDR Shawn Murphy as co-chair, Dr. Wilson made brief opening remarks and thanked everyone for attending. Ms. Kimberlea Thompson, DRC and Mr. Pete Varone, LMI, meeting hosts, provided administrative remarks, initiated participant introductions,¹ presented the agenda, and turned the meeting over to Mr. Will for a brief discussion of the review process for the previous meeting's (13-14 December 2010) minutes.

The briefing slides from the meeting are posted on the DTEB website here: [USTRANSCOM ITS Link](#). A summary of the action items from the meeting is located on the end of these minutes.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Mr. Varone distributed copies of the December 2010 meeting minutes. Participants were asked to review the minutes overnight and come to Tuesday's meeting prepared to discuss/approve as appropriate.

SECRETARIAT REPORTS

ASC X12 COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Pete Varone, LMI, briefed the group on the January 31 – February 4, 2011 ASC X12 Committee meeting he attended in Seattle, WA.

¹ Please contact Clayton Dulaney (clayton.dulaney.ctr@ustrancom.mil) at USTRANSCOM if you need contact information for any of the attendees. You can access the DTEB meeting webpage by following this hyperlink: [USTRANSCOM ITS Link](#). The attendee list is at the bottom of that page.

The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of LMI and should not be construed as an official agency position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

Data Maintenance

The X12I (Transportation) committee reviewed 51 Data Maintenance (DM) items. The majority of DMs are for tracking Context Inspired Component Architecture (CICA) message development. There continues to be ongoing discussion on the data maintenance item regarding the issue of borrowed codes sets which potentially affects DTEB.

The current proposal is to establish a method whereby trading partners would be able to identify the version of a code list they desired to use for a particular data element exchanged within a differing version of the transaction set. X12 has hinted that if passed, this proposal would require that X12 manage and publish industry-specific ICs. Subcommittees X12I (Transportation) and X12F (Finance) disapproved the DM.

Mr. Frank Napoli, LMI, added that under this proposal X12 would manage the publication of individual IC's and that trading partners would then have to obtain this information from X12. This is in part a revenue generator for X12 and IC's would have to be purchased from them by the trading partners. General consensus by the transportation and finance subcommittees is that this is not the desired end-state and the industry implementation guides (IG's or IC's) should be published by the industry sector.

Attendance

The X12 meeting attendance continues to be low however there has been some increase in attendance since the last meeting. Low attendance continues to be attributed to decreased travel budgets and the fact that the EDI standard is stable.

For this meeting, both the Motor and Marine task groups met virtually via conference call. X12 has agreed that 2010 experimentation with virtual meetings was positively received by the membership and has agreed to continue to support virtual meetings by individual task groups as well as to hold one trimester meeting per year as a complete virtual meeting.

X12 XML Update

The Transportation subcommittee XML task group held a joint meeting with representative of the X12 Communication Control subcommittee (X12C) to discuss recommendations for the simplification of the CICA XML development process. Agreement has been reached between X12C and X12I regarding recommended modifications that will simplify the process and a data maintenance item is being progressed that will modify the design rules.

Work was also started by the X12I XML task group on the development of an XML version of the Bill of Lading. This workgroup is being chaired by representative from the motor task group and the work that was accomplished at this meeting was primarily in getting the task group "stood up". Concerns were raised by the DTEB commit-

tee members that DOD involvement in the bill of lading schema development process be protected. Specifically it was requested that SDDC and DLA receive minutes and updates regarding this development effort.

The next X12 meetings are as follows:

- ◆ June 2011 (Virtual)
- ◆ October 2011 (Pittsburgh, PA).

It was also noted that Mr. Pete Varone with LMI has assumed the responsibilities as secretary for the ASC X12I (Transportation) subcommittee and the Motor as well as XML task groups. Frank Napoli with LMI will continue to attend the X12 meetings as well participating in the X12C (Communication Control) subcommittee.

DTEB IC AND DM UPDATES

Mr. Clayton Dulaney, LMI, presented the latest IC and Data Maintenance (DM) updates. The following summary of the DMs, with associated status, describes those that have been submitted since the December 2010 DTEB meeting:

- ◆ 7 DMs Submitted
- ◆ 3 Functionally approved (by vote or No Vote Required (NVR))
- ◆ 1 Disapproved
- ◆ 1 Voting
- ◆ 1 Withdrawn
- ◆ 1 Awaiting review

NVR deals with corrections, typos, spelling, obvious misstatements, etc. Programmatic changes require votes. Present practice would have us not bundle NVR DMs, but rather make the changes as they're approved. Application of NVR DMs to ICs will be announced by listserv email and will be annotated on the 'What's New' pages of all appropriate versions of the IC but the version numbers will not change.

Approved

DM 1000 (NVR)

- ◆ 858B TCMD
- ◆ Change borrowed code note at index 150-02 from "Use '98' to denote Container Number." to "Use '98' to denote Classified Container Number".

-
- ◆ Clarifies intent and makes the note similar to that at index 152-01.

DM 1001

- ◆ 858B TCMD
- ◆ At index 163-02 change NTE02 data element “Active RFID Tag Serial Number” data attribute from 1/10 to 1/32.

DM 1002

- ◆ 858M Truck-Water-Air Manifest
- ◆ At index 12-02 and index 206-02, change NTE02 data element “Active RFID Tag Serial Number” data attribute from 1/10 to 1/32.

Out for Voting

DM 1005

- ◆ 858M Truck-Water-Air Manifest
- ◆ N903 data element “Aircraft Tail Number” size data attribute from 4/4 to 5/6
- ◆ Align with DTR – 5 or 6 character field

Question was raised regarding what is currently in reference data systems for this field? Reason is to ensure consistency with DTR and TRDM. Kimberlea Thompson, DRC, followed up with TRDM personnel to determine what/who is the official source for assignment of Aircraft Tail Numbers. TRDM personnel advised that the tail number assignment is not managed by TRDM; each branch has a specific source for these assignments. There is no one single source for assignment or tracking of aircraft tail numbers.

Question was also raised regarding other IC’s that may be affected by this change. Mr. Dulaney agreed to review other IC’s for consistency and advise.

Disapproved

DM 1003

- ◆ 856A - Receipt/Shipment-Consolidation/Due-In/REPSHIP
- ◆ Proposed adding SRC since CIIC alone is not sufficient for REPSHIP purposes

-
- ◆ Determination to rescind DM item was made on a REPSHIP teleconference – 2/10/2010...Reason: So we don't have multiple DMs updating 856A for REPSHIP
 - ◆ Since it was in voting, it could not be withdrawn

Withdrawn

DM 1004

- ◆ 856A - Receipt/Shipment-Consolidation/Due-In/REPSHIP
- ◆ Proposed changing REF02 data elements from 1/30 to 1/32.
- ◆ Agenda item for DTEB/REPSHIP further discussion.

General Discussion

Concerns were raised by several of the committee members regarding issues with the new DTEB web site. Issues were identified with the notification process and with DM visibility especially with items that had been withdrawn or were disapproved. Mr. Dulaney advised that there were known issues that are currently being reviewed and corrected with the DM notification process on the new DTEB web site. Additional comments were held for discussion during the DTEB web site update.

IC Maintenance Summary

No IC's have been modified since the last DTEB meeting. Modifications are pending to IC's as follows:

2 Resulting from Approved DMs

- ◆ 858B, 858M

2 Resulting from Previously Approved DMs

- ◆ 300A, 315N

Commercial Carrier Interfaces

Mr. John Will, USTRANSCOM provided an update for the Automated Carrier Interfaces (ACIs). There has been a request by the Ocean community to have another ACI face to face meeting however both USTRANSCOM and SDDC have indicated that they are unable to accommodate a meeting at this time due to resource constraints. SDDC is currently in the process of reviewing the USC7 which likely result in

changes. It was felt that a face to face meeting following the USC7 changes would be more productive and that no meeting should be scheduled until after the changes were finalized. SDDC has been working with the various modes on data quality issues in the interim and continues to see progress in this area.

Synchronization Task Group Meeting Update

Mr. Will provided a review of the results from the initial synchronization task group meeting held 08-Nov-10. Dr. Wilson advised that at the November meeting the group reviewed the charter to ensure that the group was focused on the desired objectives. It was noted both at the November meeting and subsequently emphasized at the 13-14 Dec 10 DTEB meeting that success of the Synchronization Task Group (STG) is predicated on involvement by both technical and functional representation and input. The chairs agreed to present the STG approach to USTRANSCOM leadership for high level support.

The STG discussed issues related to the DTR “chicken or egg” issue. Mr. Will advised that this issue is where the DTR administrator will not make updates to the DTR until all systems of record are capable of implementing /supporting the changes. However systems are not able to make changes in support of the synchronization efforts until there is a policy requirement to do so as would be so defined in the DTR.

Dr. Wilson advised that the STG action item from the November meeting to present the STG approach to USTRANSCOM leadership had been accomplished. Representatives from the STG met with the division chiefs (Mr. Rogers and Mr. Kinney) separately and both were in agreement with the STG approach to synchronization. Initially the intent was to present a MOA to General Mathews however efforts have been re-directed to the AO level to work out details and then direct it to the general officer level. Work is continuing on this effort at this time.

Concerns were raised that appropriate levels of support are not involved in the synchronization efforts; especially with involvement from the functional side. Mr. Will advised that there has been a significant effort within USTRANSCOM to get appropriate support from within the command. The requirement for assistance with implementing the Due-In and Nodal Status capabilities have been input into the Corporate Services Vision and Corporate Governance Process; including outreach to J5/4, J3 and J6-I but little support has been received thus far. It was also noted that we have not been able to progress the Nodal Status CONOPS beyond the O6 level for staffing. Members commented that there has been previous discussion by the STG regarding senior level accepting responsibilities and ownership of the DTEB process. Once the responsibility is accepted then there would be direction from the services and COMs to provide support into the synchronization efforts.

The STG agreed at the November meeting to establish a regular meeting schedule to be facilitated by TCJ6.

The STG also discussed IC versioning and agreed to delay implementation and release of new IC's pending finalization of versioning rules. The group discussed IC baseline and identified that most programs of record (POR) do not accept approval of a DM with their system shown as an impacted system as a requirement to implement the change defined in the DM. Thus a true enterprise baseline where all POR's are operating on the same level with all the same functionality is not possible to establish. This is driven by competing requirements within the various POR systems and their individual need to support certain DM items and have limited resources to implement change and support. Coordination between the PORs is being done but only at a level where implementation of DM items deemed to be critical by a POR are coordinated for implementation between other systems.

The DTEB committee members felt that establishment of a baseline version of the IC is critical to the success of synchronization efforts.

Discussion was held regarding the STG role in the development of baseline and future versions of the IC's. Members commented that there was significant confusion over STG and DTEB meetings held during the final quarter of 2010. Most members felt that the STG meeting in November was a replacement for the final DTEB meeting of the year. Agreement was reached that the work performed under the STG is primarily conducted by representation from the DTEB committee and that there is significant need to refocus work done under the STG auspice that should be done by the DTEB.

The STG also discussed new business items related to DM's 889 and 890 related to 'Outsized Dimensions' shipments and 'Net Explosive Weight' nomenclature. These DMs had been disapproved due to lack of pre-synchronization.

The DTEB held considerable conversation regarding implementation plans and have identified the need for various components to advise all other POR components of their efforts to implement changes. It was noted that as part of the REPSHIP meeting agenda there has been built into the meeting a request for standing updates from each of the component systems. Representatives from each of the components are provided an opportunity at this time to update others on their implementation efforts for REPSHIP. The same opportunity has also been provided for each component at the DTEB meetings and is included as part of each meeting agenda. It was recommended that a process be developed such as use of a quad-chart that could be used to standardize the update process across all components. These charts could also be stored on the DTEB web site so that components could review where exactly their trading partners were at and what their anticipated timelines were for implementation.

As one of the action items from the STG meeting GATES was to provide DSS and FACTS the status (testing, implementation, CCB approval, etc.) of all its open DM's and dated versions of IC's for the 858B. Representatives from DSS and FACTS reported that they have not yet received the requested information. It was noted that receipt of this information is critical to DLA so that FACTS and DSS can continue programming to meet the 2011 date. Question was raised; regardless of DM's has

GATES gone live with any acceptance of production 858B. GATES representatives reported that support was to be implemented with GATES version 3.5.2 in January 2011. With release of GATES version 5.0 (schedule for fall 2011) 858B APT record being exchanged. FACTS requested that specific points of contact be provided for the testing efforts; GATES representative agreed to take this as an action item and provide the contact details.

JOINT DTEB/REPSHIP CONFERENCE CALL

As part of the DTEB regular business meeting a joint conference call with representative from the REPSHIP Work Group was facilitated by Mr. John Will, USTRANSCOM. Minutes from the joint DTEB/REPSHIP teleconference were distributed via separate correspondence and are available for download from the [DTEB Committee web site](#).

DM1004 – PASSING 32 BYTE RFID TAG IN 856A

Mr. Pete Varone, LMI provided background on DM1004. The initial work proposed by the DM was at index 23-02, REF02 data element “Shipment-C Notice RFID Tag Number” and at index 62-02 data element “Due-In Notice RFID Tag Number” change data attribute size from 1/30 to 1/32. This was to accommodate ISO/IEC 18000-7 protocol standard that required 21 characters for active tag serial numbers. At issue is the fact that the data element 127 used in the REF02 by X12 standard definition can support a maximum field length of only 30 in version 4010.

Several options were presented to address the ability to pass 32 byte RFID tag lengths. The final recommendation was to change passing of the RFID tag data to the MAN segment. This would allow for passing of the 32 byte proposed tag length and would allow for future growth (should that occur). The issue with this is that it will require all systems using the 856A to re-map the data source for the RFID tag from the REF to the MAN segment.

DTEB members discussed and requested that they be allowed to take this issue back and check with technical support to determine impact to systems. Members are to report back at the next DTEB meeting.

DTEB WEBSITE MIGRATION UPDATE

Mr. Brent Bingham provided an update on the DTEB website migration to the .mil domain. As was discussed at the last DTEB meeting the cut over of the DTEB site to the .mil domain has been completed. A copy of the ‘banner page’ on the old (LMI) DTEB site was presented. Users are still able to obtain “archive” level information from the old LMI site however all new development and activity is now taking place on the new site.

The new public version of the DTEB website is very near completion but is still under development. Data content is still being uploaded to the new public version of the site include IC and DM level details.

Mr. Bingham commented that there has not been very much traffic or very many requests for new user-ids on the new DTEB site despite several mass mailings that have provided existing DTEB members/users detailed information on where and how to obtain a user-id for the new site. Questions were raised by the DTEB committee members regarding why there was not a cross over or reassignment of user-id information from the old DTEB site to the new one. Mr. Bingham advised that in order to access the new secure DTEB site users are required to have a CAC and a USTRANSCOM account. It was noted that many of the existing DTEB site users are not from the .mil domain and do not have access to a CAC. It is possible for users from the .com world to still get an account and access the site; instructions on how to request an account were provided in the mass mailings. To date only two .com domain users have requested access.

Following final approval to go live with the new public site it was estimated that it will take between 30 and 60 days to fully upload all the existing ICs and pending/active DM items. The current LMI site is scheduled to be brought down 31-Mar-11. Notification will be provided to the DTEB members when the new public site is available. This notification will be crafted in such a way that it will be able to be forwarded to the external customer base.

There was a brief review of how a new user request access was given. For users from the .mil domain this is basically an email process that is linked from the new website to request access to CRIS and ITS. For user request from the .com domain the process is still under review and the best options still have not been identified. This issue was reviewed by the Security Officers and was determined to be a security risk to allow external users access to the internal DTEB site. This means that a waiver would have to be signed by General Mathews (USTC-J6) for this access to occur and then the duration of that access would be limited in time to the end of the calendar year. Contingency options would be to identify data content on the secure DTEB site that is not available to users on the public site and make it available in a view/read only status.

Mr. Bingham advised that based on action items from the previous meeting two new features have been added to the DTEB site. First at the bottom of the page a link has been added titled 'Webmaster Contents'; this button is used to report issues, make recommendations for improvements to the structure of the web site. Second, a 'Report Issues' feature has been added; this feature is used to report issues with the data content of the site or have issues that need to be directed to the DTEB committee. In addition to these new features the action item to have document URL's be automatically generated has been completed.

IC VERSIONING WORKSHOP

Mr. Will chaired the IC versioning discussion, the primary goal of which was to reach consensus on the versioning method to be implemented and determine the IC baselines. A brief overview of the STG member duties was provided. Comments were made regarding the STG member duty to determine a coordinated implementation date for new versions of an IC. It was the understanding of the DTEB committee members that versions would be coordinated and released based on the DTEB meeting schedule. The issue was determined to go beyond version release however as there was an identified need to coordinate implementation.

A new two-step process was proposed. In the first step, DTEB voting committee members, with prior coordination from their system/functional experts and/or policy department, will vote to approve the functional business need for a DM, following the voting procedures in use today. The second step is for the DTEB Committee, at its normal meetings, to decide together which of the functionally approved DMs should be included in the next version(s) of each particular IC and begin coordination to agree among themselves when those changes can be implemented in production. It was noted that with the new agile development process that response times for this two step process will need to be short. Within USTRANSCOM they are doing agile development in support of AT21. In support of that effort new data exchange development that goes through the DTEB committee needs to be responsive in a manner that is congruent with the agile development process.

Mr. Will discussed the STG based DM inclusion process. During its regular meetings the STG will produce a spreadsheet that will show which DMs can be implemented by which trading partners across the enterprise; when those DMs can be implemented; and implementation date for a specific version of the IC containing those DMs. This spreadsheet will serve as the basis for generation of the quad-chart reporting process discussed under the synchronization task group meeting update.

Based on action item from the previous meeting, Mr. Will provided an overview of responses from DTEB members as to their preference for which of the six version recommendation their component most preferred. (Note: see the IC Versioning Workshop slides at the link on page 1 for detailed responses.) Based on the responses the majority agreed that the option where each IC is totally cumulative as of its publication date constitute a new version. This option most resemble the practice currently in place but has proven to not be a successful version management process. DTEB members desired to have a version process that would allow the trading partners to define which DM's are included in the version that they implement. It was suggested that a baseline version for each IC be set and that versions be released as trading partners emerge and identify which DM's from a version they desire to support. The logic is that most systems have already implemented DM's up to the baseline, and those who haven't should consider implementing them to come up to the baseline as their first goal. DMs submitted after release of the baseline will become subsequent versions.

Mr. Will also gave a brief overview of the action item responses for prioritization of DM's. Responses for this action item were only received from two components, CMOS and GATES. The prioritization of DM's from the two respondents was reviewed without action.

ADJOURNMENT (DAY 1)

Mr. Will asked that participants review the minutes from the December 2010 meeting for approval at tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Varone thanked the group for attending, reminded everyone of the start time and agenda for the March 2 meeting.

Meeting Minutes

02 MARCH 2011

Review of Minutes

Mr. Varone opened the second day of the multi-day DTEB meetings with a review of the minutes from the previous meeting. Mr. Varone opened the floor to comments from the committee members. Comments received were as follows:

- On page #4, the first line states that DLMSO uses EDIFACT software to generate isomorphic schemas. This should be corrected to state that DLMSO uses EDIFECS SpecBuilder software to generate isomorphic schemas.
- In several locations throughout the minutes the acronym DLMSO is used. DLA Logistics Standards Management Office has not approved the use of acronyms when referring to this office and it was requested that all references to DLMSO be replaced with DLA Logistics Standards Management Office.
- On page #24 the reference to AIT as Automatic Information Technology should be change to read Automatic Identification Technology.

A verbal vote was taken to approve the minutes as modified and passed unanimously.

Mr. Will added one point of clarification to the minutes from the previous meeting. The December minutes indicated that all email addresses that were currently on the listserv of the current DTEB web site would be carried forward to the new DTEB web site. As clarification this is only in reference to the email addresses found on the listserv and is not an indication that new accounts would be created for all email addresses found on the listserv on the new DTEB site. Question was raised regarding if the entire email addressee's that were migrated from the old DTEB web site to the new DTEB web site had received notification of the DTEB site migration. Mr. Will and Mr. Varone took action item to verify that all email addressees on the old DTEB site had been notified of the site migration.

DDCOI 101 UPDATE

Ms. Connie McCoy, USTRANSCOM provided an update/overview of the Distribution Data Community of Interest (DDCOI). Ms. McCoy updated the DTEB on the objectives of the DDCOI are to identify and create enterprise wide standardized information exchanges; define a standard vocabulary for use in standardized data exchanges; consolidate and synchronize reference data management efforts; establish data quality standards for enterprise exchanges; and develop technical governance

policies. Efforts of the DDCOI are in direct support of the Corporate Services Vision and AT21 initiative and have the full backing of USTRANSCOM leadership.

Ms. McCoy gave a brief overview of the organizational structure, member organizations and current work initiatives. Details of the current work items are outlined in the presentation material that can be found in the DDCOI 101 presentation slides that can be found at the link on page 1 of these minutes.

The DDCOI is working to evolve its focus and is working to identify key distribution core data services; define distribution data architecture; and virtual/integrated (with the POR's) data quality service environment. The DDCOI has identified several action items to support these objectives. Key items include Enterprise Service Bus future direction and integration; defining critical elements for data exchange; DPO secure enclave and others.

IC VERSIONING WORKSHOP (CONT.)

Mr. John Will opened the conversation by indicating that Ms. Connie McCoy had a recommendation for a method of IC versioning to present for consideration; Mr. Will then turned the time over to Ms. McCoy. Ms. McCoy recommended that a baseline version of the IC be established (version 0). New versions are only created when two or more trading partners desire to implement DM items that are submitted subsequent to the baseline (version 0) IC. The new version will identify which DM's are supported by the new IC version. In this method trading partners are allowed to identify what functionality they will support based on trading partner agreement. As the need for new/additional functionality is identified the IC is updated to support the associated DM and a new version number is assigned. As trading partners implement new functionality and old versions are no longer supported the old versions are retired and are removed from the web site.

Considerable conversation was held over the proposal for versioning. After discussion the committee consensus was that IC versions should be based upon DTEB Committee approval of implementation of an agreed set of DM items. Trading partners would then determine what functionality they will support from the released version and the trading partner agreed implementations could be identified with a unique version number.

A recommendation was made that USTRANSCOM take action item to establish a versioning process rules document. Once the versioning rules document is completed it will be forwarded to the DTEB committee just like any other formal proposal for staffing and members will be provided an opportunity to review, provide feedback and approval/disapproval of the proposal. If there is not agreement at that the end of the review period over what the rules for versioning should be the issue will be brought to J6-A, who has final approval authority as outlined in the DTEB charter.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Denise Merritt to provide copy of quad-chart used to brief and track where GATES was with implementation of system changes.
2. DCO staff to facilitate selection process of format to be used by various components to brief where they stand on implementation efforts. Once format is established submit change request for enhancement to DTEB web site in support of posting these updates and making available to other components.
3. GATES to provide DSS and FACTS the status (testing (including testing points of contact), implementation, CCB approval, etc.) of all its open DM's and dated versions of IC's for the 858B (Karen Palmer).
4. DTEB members are to review with system support personnel the impact of changing the location for passing of RFID tag id's in the 856A from the REF to MAN segment and report back to John Will and Pete Varone.
5. John Will/Pete Varone to verify all email addressees on the old DTEB website have been notified of the site migration.
6. USTRANSCOM J6-AD staff to write up versioning rules document and provide to DTEB for review/comment and concurrence.
7. Clayton Dulaney to review all ICs for occurrence of 'Aircraft Tail Number' to assure min/max of the value entry is 5/6...creating DMs if required.
8. DTEB leadership to develop tools for tracking and reporting synchronization and implementation of DTEB product versions.

NEXT MEETING

Relevant planning dates:

X12 Meeting: March 30 – June 10, 2011 (Virtual)

Independence Day (Federal Holiday) Monday, 04 July 2011

Dates for next DTEB Committee meeting:

Tuesday–Wednesday, June 21 – 22, 2011

Meeting to be held in conjunction with the DDCOI meeting; location decision was held in abeyance pending determination of where that meeting will be held.

Next meeting dates and location are subject to change based on DDCOI meeting schedule.

ADJOURNMENT

The participants agreed to adjourn the meeting after setting the proposed next meeting date. The meeting was adjourned at 1140 hours.