

Defense Transportation Electronic Business Committee Meeting Minutes 29–30 JUNE 2010

INTRODUCTION

The Defense Transportation Electronic Business (DTEB) committee met on 29–30 June 2010 at the Defense Logistics Agency’s (DLA) Defense Distribution Center (DDC) in New Cumberland, Pennsylvania. CDR Shawn Murphy, United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) J6I and military co-chair of the DTEB committee, made brief opening remarks and thanked everyone for attending.

Ms. Sonya Gish, Deputy Director of Processes and Planning (DDC J-4), welcomed everyone and provided a brief overview of the DDC mission. She noted that robust information systems and communication capabilities are imperative for the DDC to support warfighters and provide them with the material that they need. The DDC’s primary information system is the Distribution Standard System (DSS). She stated that DSS interfaced with a multitude of systems to support the DDC mission and added that it is critical that the systems coordinate their implementation efforts with each other. She also highlighted the importance for the technical community to coordinate with the functional community when making system enhancements.

Jim Burns, contractor support to the Office of the Secretary Defense–Transportation Policy (OSD-TP), noted that Jolie Lay, OSD-TP’s representative to the DTEB committee, was leaving OSD-TP. Ms. Lay’s replacement has not been named.

The meeting attendees introduced themselves,¹ and Frank Napoli, LMI, reviewed the meeting agenda and provided administrative remarks.

Presenters’ briefing slides from the meeting are posted on the DTEB website here: [Link—Briefing Slides](#).

A summary of the action items from the meeting are located on the final page of these minutes.

¹ Please contact Frank Napoli (FNapoli@lmi.org) at LMI if you need contact information for any of the attendees; you can access the DTEB meeting webpage by following this hyperlink: [Link—June 2010 DTEB meeting webpage](#). Click the “Attendees” button at the bottom of the page to view the attendee list.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

CDR Murphy asked the attendees to take copies of the minutes from the previous meeting, review them overnight, and be ready to approve or amend them when called to do so on Wednesday.

TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT REPORTS

X12 Trimester Meeting Update

Frank Napoli, LMI, provided an update on the June 2010 X12 virtual trimester meeting. Due to cuts in company travel budgets, X12 decided to hold a virtual meeting for the first time. Mr. Napoli reported that participation was noticeably lower at the virtual meeting than at the previous physical meetings.

Mr. Napoli said that the X12 membership trend of larger companies leaving and smaller companies joining X12 that he reported at the last DTEB meeting is continuing. There is some concern that, if this trend continues, it will negatively affect X12's revenue stream because membership dues are based on company revenue. However, current revenue is adequate, partially due to the large number of smaller companies joining and partially because of high volume sales of documents related to the federal government mandating use of X12 version/release 5010 for the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) standards. Mr. Napoli believed that the primary reason larger companies were leaving X12 was because the X12 EDI standards were mature and do not change that often.

Mr. Napoli reported that X12I (Transportation Subcommittee) reviewed 61 data maintenance (DM) items, the majority of which were for tracking Context Inspired Component Architecture (CICA) X12 standard XML messages. He noted that none of the DMs directly affected DTEB transactions.

This X12 meeting also revisited the question of "floating" code tables, where code tables are maintained and revised in isolation from particular X12 version/releases. Tommy Lyons, Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO), submitted a proposal for allowing the code tables to float; however, the proposal was disapproved by X12I and several other subcommittees. The vote was roughly split 50 percent in favor and 50 percent opposed. Mr. Napoli believes that Mr. Lyons and other proponents of floating code tables will continue to develop and submit proposals; and that, eventually, some form of solution or compromise will be reached.

Mr. Napoli reported that X12 has begun the formal process of submitting both the CICA Technical Specifications and the Syntax and Design Rules for formal approval as ANSI standards.

A hot topic of discussion at the virtual meeting dealt with the automated generation of isomorphic XML schemas based on X12 EDI Implementation Conventions

(ICs). The Insurance Subcommittee (X12N) would like X12 to offer this capability due to HIPAA guidelines. Insurance companies and healthcare providers currently exchange HIPAA transactions via X12 version/release 4010. Some organizations plan to migrate to version/release 5030, while some others would like to begin exchanging the HIPAA transactions via XML. The HIPAA guidelines allow insurance companies and healthcare providers to use XML; however, the XML construct must match the EDI construct. Mr. Napoli noted that the CICA-based XML schemas do not match the EDI construct. X12I disapproved the proposal to publish isomorphic schemas as X12-approved XML. Mr. Napoli noted that many in X12I feel that if the proposal is ever approved, CICA will die.

The next meeting for X12 is a physical meeting in Cincinnati, OH to be held 17–22 October 2010.

DTEB/FEDeBiz INTERFACE

Mr. Napoli provided an overview of the process that the DTEB committee follows for having DTEB-developed ICs posted on FedeBiz, the official website for federal and DoD ICs.

First, Mr. Napoli provided background. The DTEB committee was designated as the transportation functional working group of the DoD Electronic Data Interchange Standards Management Committee (EDISMC), which falls under the Federal Electronic Data Interchange Standards Management Coordinating Committee (FESMCC). Throughout the 1990s and into the 2000s, the DTEB-developed ICs (in .SEF file format) were posted on the EDISMC/FESMCC website. During the 2000s, the EDISMC and FESMCC were moved under the Business Transformation Agency (BTA). Funding for both committees was cut significantly and neither committee exists anymore. Mr. Napoli reported that BTA still posts ICs in .SEF format on the FedeBiz website; however, Cedric Vessel, a support contractor to BTA that administrates the FedeBiz website, was unsure if the funding stream for maintaining the website would continue in the future. Heidi Daverede, DLMSO, stated that DLMSO pushes all of their IC updates to Mr. Vessel for posting on FedeBiz.

Mr. Napoli reported that the DTEB committee stopped forwarding their ICs for posting on the FedeBiz website after Willie Fitzhugh (the previous DLMSO representative to the DTEB committee) retired from DLMSO. However, the FedeBiz website provides a hyperlink that points users to the DTEB website to find the most current version of DTEB-developed ICs. Mr. Napoli pointed out that there are also some older versions of the DTEB-developed ICs located on the FedeBiz website. Mr. Napoli asked the DTEB committee members for input on whether they would like the DTEB committee to begin forwarding updated ICs to BTA for posting or if the current process of linking the FedeBiz website to the DTEB website was preferred.

The committee agreed that, at the very least, the older versions of the ICs should be removed from the FedeBiz website to prevent users from implementing or

referencing an outdated IC. LMI will coordinate with Mr. Vessel and provide a recommendation to USTRANSCOM on how it should proceed.

Nancy Lopez Cruz, SDDC, asked if LMI could begin posting the .SEF files to the DTEB website. Mr. Napoli reported that the .SEF files are not currently posted on the DTEB website due to copyright concerns. Ms. Daverede pointed out that the .SEF files are located on the FedBiz website and did not think that copyright was an issue. She added the DTEB website could be configured to limit .SEF file access to DTEB committee members only. LMI agreed to research the issue.

DTEB SUPPORT CONTRACT UPDATE

Ms. Sandy Claverie, USTRANSCOM J6-AD, provided a DTEB support contract update. She reported that USTRANSCOM has taken the initiative to migrate the DTEB website and DECoDe (the software tool that facilitates development of ICs) from the LMI network to the USTRANSCOM network. The DTEB website will reside on USTRANSCOM's Information Tool Suite (ITS) (formerly known as CRIS). Initially it will be accessible through ITS, but will migrate to being accessible through USTRANSCOM's iDistribute portal. Appropriate parts of the DTEB website will also be accessible through USTRANSCOM's public website so that commercial trading partners can access the site with read-only privileges. The appearance of the new website will be different, but the functionality will remain. DTEB website functionality will be rolled out in phases on ITS and iDistribute and will be fully migrated by November 2010. DECoDe will be fully migrated by October 2010.

Ms. Claverie reported that full access to the DTEB website will require users to have Common Access Cards (CACs). However, USTRANSCOM is looking into whether the CAC-requirement could be waived and require users to have only usernames and passwords.

A participant asked if the TRDM/TMDS code tables would still be available through the DTEB website. Ms. Claverie stated that the tables would still reside on the DTEB website, and would also remain accessible through the USTRANSCOM public website so that commercial trading partners can continue to access the tables.

Ms. Claverie noted that users should continue to use the current DTEB website until USTRANSCOM notifies them to switch over to the new website. Ms. Lopez Cruz, SDDC, stated that SDDC must send a customer advisory (CA) to the carriers about the new website location and access requirements.

Ms. Claverie also noted that USTRANSCOM is working to identify websites and documents that will need to be updated to point to the new website URL. Jared Andrews, LMI, noted that the current DTEB website URL appears in many places throughout the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR). Ms. Claverie also noted that the name of the website would remain DTEB.

Ms. Claverie further reported that USTRANSCOM J6 is looking to consolidate some of their contracts. Development and maintenance of DECoDe and the DTEB website will be competed for FY11 as part of the USTRANSCOM Tool Suite Contract. XML and ANSI X12 development and maintenance will be competed for FY11 as part of the Information Management and Validation Contract.

To facilitate the migration of the DTEB website and DECoDe onto the USTRANSCOM infrastructure, code for both tools is currently frozen, so no new functionality can be added to the website or to DECoDe.

A discussion ensued regarding posting .SEF files on the DTEB website. Mr. Napoli pointed out that this would be a new requirement for the new DTEB website.

DISTRIBUTION DATA COMMUNITY OF INTEREST (DDCOI)

Connie McCoy, DISA/USTRANSCOM, provided an overview of the DDCOI. Ms. McCoy's briefing covered the following:

- ◆ What is a Community of Interest (COI)?
- ◆ DDCOI Charter and Strategy
- ◆ DDCOI Organization, Activities, and Members
- ◆ Action Items.

Please see Ms. McCoy's slides on the DTEB website for more detail.

Ms. McCoy asked the committee if they would like to pursue holding future DDCOI and DTEB meetings jointly. Many of the same participants attend both meetings. Therefore, combining the meetings would reduce travel costs. She also stated that the DTEB and DDCOI complement each other in that the DDCOI creates the vocabulary and the DTEB committee creates the templates. She also stated that the Distribution Steering Group (DSG) oversees and charters the DDCOI and that the DSG "blessing" could be extended to the DTEB.

Ms. Daverede stated that the DTEB committee and DDCOI should work together and added that it's also important to get involvement from the DTR policy community. Without all three elements working together, it is difficult to make progress and execute e-business initiatives throughout the Defense Transportation System (DTS). She added that DLMSO's Supply Process Review Committee (PRC) has an effective governance process in place that brings stakeholders from the technical, functional, and policy communities together.

A discussion ensued regarding the best process for getting system buy-in to participate in new e-business initiatives. The DTEB committee has sponsored a number of initiatives over the years in response to changing business requirements;

however, many of those initiatives have stalled because there is no policy direction within the DTR. Mr. Will stated that USTRANSCOM J5, which administers the DTR, has taken the position that the DTR should not drive system changes. USTRANSCOM J5's position is that the DTR should not be updated until after the necessary system changes are made throughout the DTS. However, Mr. Will noted that many systems are reluctant to participate in new e-business initiatives unless they have policy direction.

Mr. Will and Ms. McCoy agreed to coordinate to determine if future DTEB and DDCOI meetings should be held jointly, and how to address the DTR chicken and egg issue.

DATA MAINTENANCE REPORT

Bill James, LMI, provided an overview of the DM requests submitted since the last DTEB committee meeting. To view Mr. James' slides, which provide a summary and brief description of each DM, please see the link on Page 1 of these minutes.

Here is a summary of the DMs, with associated status, that have been submitted since the February 2010 DTEB meeting:

- ◆ 7—Approved (by vote or no vote required [NVR])
- ◆ 1—Voting
- ◆ 4—Disapproved
- ◆ 1—Withdrawn.

A discussion ensued regarding the 920A, 920B, and 920C ICs that were developed to support the Transportation Discrepancy Reporting (TDR) process, but have not yet been implemented by SDDC. Ms. Daverede noted that the Air Mobility Command (AMC)-DDC IPT is planning to establish a working group to look at improving both the TDR and Supply Discrepancy Reporting (SDR) processes. She added that Don Sigel, AMC, coordinates the AMC-DDC IPT.

VERSIONING AND SYNCHRONIZATION INTRODUCTION

Mr. Will gave an introduction and general overview of the versioning and synchronization issues that the DTEB committee has been working to address and resolve.

Mr. Will indicated that the DTEB committee must come to agreement on how to standardize the versioning for ICs, XML schemas, etc. (both approved and still in the development cycle). The DTEB committee must also identify ways to (better) synchronize the implementation of EDI, XML, and web services throughout the DTS.

Mr. Will then outlined the reasons why versioning and synchronization are an issue. They include:

- ◆ systems have separate configuration management bodies and implementation schedules,
- ◆ systems do not communicate firm, timed requirements for implementation,
- ◆ implementation development by one system may result in a data change request that a potential trading partner system doesn't need or will have difficulty implementing,
- ◆ there is currently no consistent way (except by date) of versioning ICs or XML schemas,
- ◆ the DTEB committee does not currently vote to approve ICs containing some, but not all, approved DMs,
- ◆ there is no way to obtain an IC or schema that implements some, but not all, of the available data change requests or approved changes,
- ◆ if more than two systems are developing to become trading partners at the same time, they may not all be willing to implement the same data change requests, if several have been approved.

Mr. Will indicated that the DTEB committee should initially focus on the versioning and synchronization of only EDI ICs. After the DTEB committee resolves the EDI IC versioning and synchronization issue, other data exchange formats, such as XML and web services, will be addressed.

Mr. Will asked the committee members their thoughts on whether both the ICs and the instance documents should identify the version number. Mr. Napoli believed that version number should be in the instance documents. If the version number is not included, the translator will not be able to determine which map to use.

DSS SYNCHRONIZATION ISSUES OVERVIEW

Bob Jones, DLA J6, provided an overview of DSS issues. DSS is an automation system that supports core distribution functions for DLA Distribution Centers and other trading partners. Those distribution functions include materiel release order (MRO) processes, receiving, storage, stock selection, packing, and shipping (freight and small parcel).

Mr. Jones discussed DSS':

- ◆ electronic interfaces to other systems,
- ◆ key EDI transactions,

-
- ◆ system change process,
 - ◆ release schedules,
 - ◆ status of DTEB ICs, and
 - ◆ versioning issues/recommendations.

Please see Mr. Jones' slides on the DTEB website for more detail on each subject.

A discussion ensued regarding DSS's release schedule. DSS currently has two releases per year. The participants discussed whether increasing the number of releases per year would help systems implement DMs and ICs in a timelier manner. Sheryl Matter, DLA, stated that they've considered and assessed doing more than two releases per year, but have found two to be optimal.

Derrick Curtis, AMC/GATES, added that the security accreditation process for GATES can take up to 6 to 8 months, and lengthens their release period significantly.

DTEB IC VERSIONING

Mr. Will proposed a solution for versioning ICs. The final solution, with input from the committee members, is as follows:

- ◆ Create "baseline versions" of all ICs subsequent to trading partner agreement on the DMs that should be placed in the baseline version. Any existing DMs that are not included in the baseline version will be put into a DM pool and will be considered for future versions of the ICs.
- ◆ DMs that are submitted following the creation of the baseline versions will continue to be submitted via the DTEB website for functional review and approval. Submitters and voters will not be required to insert an implementation date for the DM.
- ◆ EDO/DTEB will review the initial submission and verify the list of systems that could potentially be affected by the DM in the submission. These systems will be annotated on both the DM submission form and the DM voting notification e-mail.
- ◆ Following functional approval, the DMs will be placed into the DM pool, so that they can be considered for addition within future IC versions.
- ◆ A DM Working Group will be established, which will comprise system Configuration Control Board (CCB) leads, who will review the pool of DMs at least one month before each scheduled DTEB committee meeting. This review will include recommending which DMs should be included in which versions of impacted ICs. The Working Group's recommendation

will then be vetted and the results approved at each DTEB committee meeting for addition to future IC versions. A new version of an IC will be recommended if at least two CCB leads agree to implement at least one DM from the DM pool. [The stipulation immediately above this sentence allows for more than three versions of an IC in a year. Also, EDO is going to stipulate that DTEB will meet whenever DDCOI meets, and that is supposed to be four times a year.] Each baseline IC will be version 1. Subsequent versions will be titled version 2, 3, 4, etc. Occasionally, there may be emergency DMs that must be immediately considered for implementation before the next scheduled DTEB committee meeting. If at least two CCB leads agree to begin implementing the emergency DMs prior to the next scheduled DTEB committee meeting, a new “sub-version” will be created. Sub-versions will be titled 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, etc.

- ◆ Section 1 of each IC will be updated to include a DM change log which will identify the new DMs and associated version numbers, along with a detailed description for each DM that was added since the previous version.
- ◆ Baseline and subsequent versions of each IC will remain posted on the DTEB website.

A discussion ensued regarding baseline versions. Mr. Will stated that there may be a need for a single IC to have multiple baseline versions if more than two trading partners are exchanging a particular IC.

A discussion ensued regarding whether systems are capable of supporting multiple versions of a single IC in a production environment. Representatives from both FACTS and DSS stated that they are capable of supporting only a single version. Mr. Napoli pointed out that this could be an issue if, for example, DSS’ trading partner A can accept version 1, but trading partner B can accept version 2. The committee agreed that in this situation, if DSS is only capable of generating version 1, then trading partner B would have to wait until DSS migrates to version 2 or a later version to receive the needed data. If DSS is capable of generating version 2, then trading partner A would simply “drop the data on the floor” that they are not capable of receiving.

Mike Ashton, GTN, stated that he liked the new version procedures except for sub-versioning of the ICs for emergency DMs. Mr. Will tentatively agreed with Mr. Ashton and agreed to perform more analysis.

Mr. Will also noted that the initial DM functional review and approval period will be extended (it is currently typically set at two weeks) and will close just prior to when the CCB leads meet one month prior to the next scheduled DTEB committee meeting.

The committee agreed that the new versioning procedures should be annotated in a guide. LMI agreed to document the new procedures in a guide and send to the committee for formal review and approval.

CONVENE DAY 2

Mr. Napoli called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM Eastern. He reviewed administrative procedures, and CDR Murphy opened the floor for consideration of the meeting minutes from the last DTEB meeting.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The members approved the February 2010 minutes as written.

SYNCHRONIZATION BRIEF

Mr. Will and CDR Murphy provided a briefing that outlined a proposal for enhancing synchronization between systems. Please see the slides on the DTEB website for a detailed overview of the proposal.

The committee agreed that while the new versioning procedures will aid the synchronization process, versioning alone would not solve synchronization. There are still many challenges, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- ◆ Some systems perceive DMs and new ICs as priorities, while their trading partners do not.
- ◆ As the distribution portfolio manager, USTRANSCOM has direct authority over transportation working capital fund (TWCF)-funded systems, but not non-TWCF systems.

CDR Murphy stated that process and program managers should push their requirements (via USTRANSCOM components, USTRANSCOM-AQ or other functional sponsor) through the Enterprise Requirements Review Council (ERRC) Corporate Governance Process (CGP). He also added that it's imperative for program managers to have functional buy-in from their operators and functional staff in order to receive higher priority from the ERRC. It is also helpful if process, program, and/or system managers "come to the table" with some funding. Systems must also plan ahead and get their submissions into the ERRC as early as possible—USTRANSCOM is already working on the FY12 budget. Finally, CDR Murphy stated that receiving buy-in from USTRANSCOM J3-I (currently Ms. Lori Farnsworth), is also very helpful as they can bump the requirement up to the General Officer level. CDR Murphy also stated that USTRANSCOM has provided funding to non-TWCF systems in the past based upon operational mission requirements.

Mr. Will had recommended that a synchronization authority be established, and now recommends that the DM Working Group will also serve as a Synchronization Working Group to fulfill the synchronization authority need. Mr. Will proposed that the combined Versioning and Synchronization Working Group be co-chaired by EDO and (with tongue in cheek) the system/program representative that has the

most to lose from lack of synchronization at any given time. Tina Woodbury, SDDC, asked who would organize and administer the working group. Mr. Will stated that the EDO does not currently have all necessary resources to organize and administer the working group. Dr. Leon Wilson, USTRANSCOM J6, stated the working group would be voluntary and thought it would be very helpful if the systems could help administer the working group. Annette Griffin, DLA, stated that she thinks an impartial authority would be better to lead and administer the working group.

Many committee members expressed concern that the Synchronization Working Group would not be very helpful unless given significant authority.

Ms. Daverede stated that since Ms. Farnsworth is such a key person to get things championed within USTRANSCOM that Ms. Farnsworth be asked to co-chair the working group. CDR Murphy agreed to follow-up with Ms. Farnsworth.

TRANSPORTATION NODAL STATUS CONOPS UPDATE

Steve Raney, LMI, provided an update briefing on the Transportation Nodal Status Concept of Operations (CONOPS). The briefing covered completed changes, completed and ongoing coordination, pending issues, discussion, and the way forward. The completed changes have been incorporated as Revision 3 to the CONOPS. Those changes include the following:

- ◆ The net-centric “pull” orientation has been “softened.” Mr. Raney noted that while the long-term solution may favor a pull orientation, Revision 3 anticipates that trading partners will tailor communications channels to best suit their needs, including point-to-point/node-to-node links as required.
- ◆ The Report of Shipment (REPSHIP) procedures set out in Section 4 of previous versions of the CONOPS have been removed. The REPSHIP CONOPS will stand alone.
- ◆ Deployment/unit move procedures and system descriptions have been significantly refined in Revision 3 based upon extensive research and coordination with the unit move community since the previous version of the CONOPS.
- ◆ All expanded use of the 856A Receipt Notice capability has been withdrawn in Revision 3. The Receipt Notice is still described, and DLA CCP use of the Receipt Notice is cited. When consolidated loads are broken en route and at theater distribution points, this action will be communicated via the Transportation Node Status Notice and possibly new Due-In Notices to provide configurations of new highest level shipment units.
- ◆ All expanded use of the 856A Shipment Consolidation Notice capability has been withdrawn in Revision 3. The Shipment Consolidation Notice is still described, and DLA CCP use of this transaction is cited. En route consolidations will be communicated via the Due-In Notice.

Mr. Raney stated that Mr. Will is currently reviewing Revision 3 and assessing the best way to staff the CONOPS with the services and agencies. Mr. Will stated that is he leaning towards staffing the CONOPS through the Joint Staff.

The committee also agreed that the CONOPS should be designated For Official Use Only (FOUO) because it includes screenshots that contain mission data.

AUTOMATED CARRIER INTERFACE (ACI) UPDATES

Motor ACI

Mr. Napoli reported that in light of the Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative (DTCI), where the carriers deal directly with the DTCI coordinator for electronic business issues, there is not enough interest from the motor carriers to continue holding regularly scheduled Motor ACI meetings. Ms. Lopez Cruz stated that Motor ACI meetings should be held only on an as-needed basis. The committee agreed.

Rail ACI

Ms. Lopez Cruz reported that SDDC is working to address some issues with the 49 Series HAZMAT Standard Transportation Commodity Code (STCC) conversion table. As soon as SDDC G9 agrees with the proposed fixes to the 49 Series STCC table, GFM can begin sending 404s to the rail carriers via version/release 5030. She also noted that the fixes to the 49 Series STCC table would also resolve the “over-reporting of HAZMAT” issue.

Ms. Lopez Cruz also noted that SDDC is seeking to obtain a copy of the rail industry’s Customer Name Database so that it can be uploaded to GFM. She added that there is an open issue of whether the rail carriers will charge SDDC for the database.

Ocean ACI

The committee agreed that it would be very beneficial to hold an Ocean ACI meeting with the carriers in the near future; however, neither USTRANSCOM/EDO nor SDDC have enough resources to coordinate the meeting. CDR Murphy and Mr. Will agreed to coordinate and see if resources can be made available.

REPSHIP WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Representatives from DSS, CMOS, and DAASC provided an update on their implementation of the 856A Due-In and 315N Nodal Status to support the automated REPSHIP process.

Dennis Kochert, DLA/DSS, reported that DSS and CMOS have exchanged several test transactions, via DAASC, and that the interface seems to be working well. Michael McDown, CMOS, reported via teleconference that testing is progressing

well, but added that CMOS' worldwide release may slip until August 2010 because of security accreditation requirements.

Mr. Kochert noted that there has only been one major issue thus far in the testing period. DSS has received some 856A Due-Ins from CMOS that are missing the I loop, which is intended for passing line item information such as Requisition Number, NSN, etc. Mr. McDown indicated that the 856As with missing I loops were for non-MILSTRIP type movements. Many of the committee members questioned why CMOS would ever generate a non-MILSTRIP 856A for transmission to DSS. As such, the committee members thought that CMOS should be generating 856As that include fully populated I loops. Mr. McDown noted that these instances may be occurring due to bad source test data and thought that, once production data is used, the issue may be resolved. Mr. Kochert and Mr. McDown will continue to monitor the test transactions.

Wanda Kelly, FACTS, stated that the Navy was not using the 856A or 315N to support the automated REPSHIP process—the Navy has implemented a different method altogether. Mr. Burns agreed to contact Jo Policastro, Navy, to get more information on the Navy's REPSHIP initiative.

CODE SOURCE MODERNIZATION

Mr. Will provided background on the joint DLMSO/DTEB updated Mode/Method code table and current status of Distribution/DTEB community implementation. Mr. Will reviewed several DMs that seek to implement the jointly approved table.

Ms. Daverede noted that the supply transactions that DLMSO administers will cut over to the new code table on 1 October 2010. Mr. Will noted that coordination of the timing of this change is important across the seam between supply and transportation, and proposed that the synchronization work group that J6 will establish undertake resolution of this issue on an emergency basis.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES IN THE 858B

The committee discussed a few issues regarding the 858B.

The first issue is as follows:

- ◆ For a multiple piece TCN, both pieces over-dimensional, requiring air-advance: the Data Group 5001 Cargo Attribute/Dimension HL segment condition states: "repeat this loop for outsize general cargo that exceeds 84 inches in any one of the dimensions"
- ◆ The committee agreed that, for this situation, systems should repeat the Data Group 5001 Cargo Attribute/Dimension HL loop for each freight piece/dimension.

The second issue involved the Hazardous Type Pack Code. Ms. Kelly reported that FACTS has a fix/workaround for the issue. FACTS will code the Hazardous Type Pack Code as the 858B IC instructs for their interface with DSS, but will code it differently for their interface with GATES. She added that as long as FACTS limits the GATES workaround to the air-side only, and not the water-side, that GATES should also be able to handle the workaround.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Claverie announced that John Will is retiring 31 December 2010. A replacement has not yet been named. Dr. Leon Wilson stated that they hoped to hire Mr. Will's replacement prior to his retirement date so that there is some overlap. Ms. Claverie noted that a retirement luncheon will be held but a date is TBD.

SET DATES FOR NEXT MEETING

The date and location for the next DTEB meeting were not finalized. Mr. Will and Ms. McCoy will coordinate offline and determine if the next DDCOI and DTEB meetings should be held jointly. Ms. Griffin asked that the next meeting be held at one of the system PMO locations.

ADJOURNMENT

CDR Murphy thanked the participants for their contributions and adjourned the meeting shortly after 12:00 Eastern.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

1. LMI will coordinate with Mr. Vessel and provide a recommendation to USTRANSCOM on how it should proceed in regards to interfacing with FedBiz.
2. LMI will research whether posting .SEF files to public websites violates copyright law. If it is not in violation of copyright, the new DTEB website will require modification to support posting .SEFs.
3. LMI will document the proposed versioning procedures in a guide. The guide will be sent to the committee for formal review and approval.
4. The EDO/DTEB will begin taking steps to establish the combined Versioning and Synchronization Working Group.
5. CDR Murphy agreed to follow-up with Ms. Farnsworth and ask if she would be willing to co-chair the Versioning and Synchronization Working Group.

-
6. CDR Murphy and Mr. Will agreed to coordinate and see if resources can be made available to support an Ocean ACI group meeting.
 7. Mr. Burns agreed to contact Jo Policastro, Navy, to get more information on the Navy's REPSHIP initiative.
 8. Mr. Will and Ms. McCoy will coordinate offline and determine if the next DDCOI and DTEB meetings should be held jointly.