

DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ELECTRONIC BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

29 AUGUST 2011

INTRODUCTION

The Defense Transportation Electronic Business (DTEB) Committee met on 29 August 2011 at the Global Reach Planning Center (GRPC), Scott AFB, 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. Mr. Will made brief opening remarks and thanked everyone for attending. He also mentioned that attendance was lower partially due to storms on the east coast. Mr. Pete Varone, USTRANSCOM J6-AD, meeting facilitator, provided administrative remarks, initiated participant introductions,¹ presented the agenda, and turned the meeting over to Mr. Will to introduce the J6A Division Chief, LtCol Daryl Hurst (USMC).

LtCol Hurst introduced the week long data summit by outlining the need for better data. Data formats are still a problem and DTEB can help in this area. After LtCol Hurst finished kicking off the four day Data Summit, Mr. Varone led the committee in a brief discussion of the review process for the previous meeting's (07-08 June 2011) 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 at the end of these minutes.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Copies of the June 2011 meeting minutes were made available via the DTEB website and also provided as handouts at the meeting. Participants were asked to review the minutes overnight and come to Tuesday's meeting prepared to discuss/approve as appropriate.

DTEB IC AND DM UPDATES

Mr. Clayton Dulaney, USTRANSCOM J6-AD, 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 June 2011 DTEB meeting:

◆ 6 DMs Submitted

¹ Please contact the DTEB Support Staff (DTEBCommittee@ustranscom.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.

- ◆ 3 Approved
- ◆ 1 Disapproved
- ◆ 1 Withdrawn
- ◆ 1 In Voting

Approved

DM 1018

- ◆ 300A RESERVATION (BOOKING) (OCEAN) VERSION 0
- ◆ Accessorial charges do not require unique indices; request all accessorial codes be identified under a single index (15-01) and deletion of indices 16 - 20.
- ◆ Addition/change of new accessorial codes to comply with SDDC and IBS implementation of accessorial charges.

DM 1021

- ◆ 858B TRANSPORTATION CONTROL AND MOVEMENT DOCUMENT VERSION 1
- ◆ Corrects issue with dual code value definitions in N9 segments / usage for 'QN'.
- ◆ At index 57-01, replace code value 'QN - Stop Sequence Number' with code value '6A - Consignee Reference Number'
- ◆ Use DOD definition of "Use '6A' to denote Consignee Distribution (CDIST) Code Qualifier".

DM 1022

- ◆ 858M TRUCK-WATER-AIR MANIFEST VERSION 1
- ◆ Corrects issue with dual code value definitions in N9 segments / usage for 'QN'.
- ◆ At index 57-01, replace code value 'QN - Stop Sequence Number' with code value '6A - Consignee Reference Number'

Use DOD definition of "Use '6A' to denote Consignee Distribution (CDIST) Code Qualifier".

Disapproved

DM 1019

- ◆ 856A RECEIPT/SHIPMENT-CONSOLIDATION/DUE-IN/REPSHIP VERSION 1
- ◆ Addresses 32 character RFID tag lengths by changing the location used for passing RFID information from the REF to the MAN segment.
- ◆ The maximum length supported by the REF segment is 30 characters and will not support a 32 character RFID tag length.
- ◆ This DM has its own agenda item.

Withdrawn

DM 1020

- ◆ No IC associated
- ◆ Used as a test case to update DM User Guide

In Voting

DM 1023

- ◆ 856A RECEIPT/SHIPMENT-CONSOLIDATION/DUE-IN/REPSHIP VERSION 1
- ◆ SCAC as defined by the NMFTA and as already defined elsewhere in the 856A and other DoD ICs as 2 to 4 characters.
- ◆ The action of this DM aligns SCAC at index 77-04 to the standard implementation.

General Discussion

Concerns were raised over whether DM 1019 warrants further discussion. This issue is discussed later.

IC Maintenance Summary

10 IC's have been modified since the last DTEB meeting as a result of previously approved DMs:

- ◆ 6 Version 0 IC's created and posted

- 214A, 300A, 315A, 315N, 858E, 858M
- ◆ 4 Version 1 IC's created and posted
 - 214A, 315A, 858E, 858M
- ◆ Inclusion of recently approved DM items in IC's is an upcoming topic for discussion during the IC Versioning Workshop.
- ◆ Modifications will result in the creation of one version 1 IC and three version 2 ICs.

COMMERCIAL CARRIER INTERFACES

It was reported that there has been no USTRANSCOM or SDDC resources available to coordinate ACI meetings-and there are no pressing issues. SDDC is not entertaining ACI coordination until after the USC07 contract is awarded.

IC VERSIONING WORKSHOP

Mr. Will chaired the IC versioning discussion, with the primary goal to reach consensus on which DMs to include in the next version of ICs.

300A

Approved DM for Version 1

- ◆ 1018 – Accessorial code additions / consolidation of indices – Approved 8/1/2011

856A

DM for Version 2

- ◆ 1023 - Change SCAC at 77-04 from Min/Max 4/6 to 2/4 – TBD (Still in voting though assured to be approved)
- ◆ Voting on inclusion in Version 2 will be solicited during the next REPSHIP/STG Teleconference.

858B

Approved DM for Version 2

- ◆ 1021 - Corrects issue with dual code value definitions in N9 segments/usage for 'QN' – Approved 8/8/2011

858M

Approved DM for Version 2

- ◆ 1022 - Corrects issue with dual code value definitions in N9 segments/usage for 'QN' – Approved 8/15/2011

DM Disapproval Discussion

Mr. Will presented for discussion the topic of what constitutes a valid reason for disapproving a DM item. His views on the subject follow:

An unwritten rule for functional voting on DTEB Data Maintenance (DM) actions is that a disapproval vote must be accompanied by a valid business process or technical reason for the disapproval. Recently a DM was disapproved without viable reason (business process or technical). Disapproval was based on estimated work and impact to system. The DTEB Chair feels that a single system not wanting to implement a DM is not a valid reason for the new capability to be denied to the rest of the Committee. Whether or not to implement should be a versioning and synchronization issue, not a functional benefit issue. Recommend we formalize the rule that a disapproval vote must be supported by a valid business process or technical reason for disapproval

The opposing view presented by some in the committee was that hardship placed on an implementing system(s) should be a valid reason for disapproval if the functional need for the change is in question at the time it is submitted. Unlike the 858B and 858M which also had changes to accommodate 32 character RFID tags, DM 1019 would create a mapping change within the system since the RFID tag identifier would have to move to a different segment of the 856A.

The DTEBC charter lays out a negotiation process for validity of disapproval. Many people stop voting and/or commenting after a vote of 'disapprove' has been cast. Because of this, a negotiated decision with the DM author, disapprover, DTEB co-chair, and DTEB support staff could potentially leave out stakeholders. A review of this process needs to be done, and was taken as an action item.

Currently, neither the DTEBC charter nor the DTEB site requires a reason for disapproval. This was taken as an action item.

SYNCHRONIZATION TASK GROUP WORKING SESSION

Mr. Will led the working group session with results put into PowerPoint slides that can be accessed [here](#). Due to travel funding and storm imposed low participation, there was little discussion and little synchronization data was gathered. Mr. Will indicated that additional data would be gathered through email solicitation and coordinated during monthly REPSHIP/STG teleconferences.

PROPOSAL TO END MEETING EARLY

Mr. Varone proposed to the Committee that since the meeting was well ahead of schedule that the DDCOI update be moved up on the agenda and the following day's meeting be cancelled. There were no objections.

DTEB WEBSITE UPDATE

Mr. Clayton Dulaney, LMI, provided an update on the DTEB website.

Resolved Issues

- ◆ Users unable to see DM items other than in-voting and historical
 - Code Issue
 - Verified as resolved 8/25/2011

Outstanding Issues

11 tickets in IRMDR

- ◆ 441
 - Need to delete single attachment from list of many
- ◆ 442
 - Need capability to add attachment(s) to "Send Group Emails"
- ◆ 443
 - Adding multiple attachments to a document
- ◆ 444
 - Character limitation when submitting a DM item
- ◆ 446
 - Updating of DM items should reset status and trigger notification emails
- ◆ 447
 - DM's dropping out of view / not routed to folders
- ◆ 448
 - Handling of the To: block in system generated emails

- ◆ 457
 - Sort order for document management
- ◆ 460
 - Add Date Closed field to Action Items Form
- ◆ 462
 - Need posted documents to send notifications
- ◆ 463
 - IC Draft Submission "Select notify addresses" should include listserv name

XML Gallery

A new file structure for this section of the DTEB site will be implemented:

- ◆ 3 categories
 - DRAFT
 - IN-USE
 - APPROVED
- ◆ Will be discussed as a separate agenda item

Public Site Updates

- ◆ Lag time
 - Up to 2 weeks or more due to security, legal, and public affairs review of everything that is posted to the public site.
- ◆ Updates pending to bring site up to date with secure site as of 8/24/2011
- ◆ Secure site is still the official repository for DTEB products

Other Issues

After reporting on the current state of the DTEB website, Mr. Dulaney asked the committee members to share any outstanding site issues they had.

- ◆ Multiple versions of ICs (some will have 3 soon) clutters the list of available ICs, and the proposed solution is to give each transaction its own folder. This idea

was being considered by the DTEB Support Staff, but was also being delayed to see how significant the problem would be. An action item was taken to implement this into the site.

- ◆ Notification emails should include a link back to the document. Currently, notifications are being sent manually by the DTEB Support Staff. Once the process is automated, there will be links in the body. An action item was taken to ensure that links are included once notifications are fully automated.
- ◆ Calendar entries on the DTEB website are not sufficient for meeting invites. For the 8/29/2011 meeting, the DTEB Support Staff manually created meeting invites through Outlook. An action item was taken to automate the process with a DTEB calendar event triggering the sending of Outlook meeting invites.

An action item was also taken to post the briefing slides to the DTEB website by 8/30/2011.

DTEB XML UPDATE

Since the June DTEB Committee meeting, three XML products have been worked on:

Nodal Status XML

- ◆ Initially commissioned by DEDO based on rumors of requirements and was a last minute development by LMI with FY10 year end funds
- ◆ First true requirement was Air Force Data Services (AFDS) Nuclear Weapons Related Materiel (NWRM) Positive Inventory Control (PIC) Program O/A 10 Feb 2011
- ◆ Based on DTEB 315N...many DEDO Standard Terms used
- ◆ Urgency of requirement prevented conversion to DEDO standard schema
- ◆ DLA-TS translates in both directions between EDI and XML
- ◆ IOC: Estimated 19 Sep 2011

Due-In XML

- ◆ Commissioned by Air Force Enterprise Data Collection Layer (EDCL) 2 Feb 10
- ◆ Developed on a very short fuse by LMI (Initial draft schema delivered late March 2010)
 - Schema for system testing delivered 30 Apr 2010
- ◆ Based on 856A Due-In, but with many DEDO Standard Terms used

- ◆ DLA-TS translates in both directions between EDI and XML for trading between DOD shippers, receivers, EDCL and PIC
- ◆ IOC: Estimated 19 Sep 2011

Container Movement Report XML

- ◆ Commissioned by Army Container Asset Management System (ACAMS) Program Manager and HQ DLA 27 Apr 2011
- ◆ Developed by the Distribution Enterprise Data Office (DEDO)
- ◆ New requirement (not based on EDI)
- ◆ DEDO compliant schema and all tag names are Standard Terms
- ◆ Schema for system testing provided, and initial synchronization efforts begun on 27 May 2011
 - The most recent schema update (Version 2.5.3), based on a requirements refinement teleconference, was delivered 9 August 2011
- ◆ Initial trading will be from DSS through DLA-TS to ACAMS
- ◆ Schema is available for other shipper and receiver systems that have the requirement to provide container movement information to ACAMS
- ◆ First XML Schema created without an EDI counterpart.

Ready to Receive Additional Requirements

DTEB/DEDO are ready to receive other XML user requirements, either conversion from EDI or new requirements. Additionally, DTEB is also ready to receive recommendations/ requirements for web services for the Distribution Enterprise.

Staffing through DTEB Process

DTEB is coordinating to have all Distribution Enterprise XML schemas vetted through the established DTEBC review and voting process, but lack of available resources hasn't permitted much progress.

DTEB has also recently provided recommendations for tools to help the DTEBC in reviewing XML schemas and instance documents

Publication on DTEB Site

DTEB is coordinating for the DTEB web site to become the publication site for DTEB/DED0 schemas as well as other Distribution Enterprise schemas developed under DED0 oversight. For example:

- ◆ TCMD for use with TTN from unit move planning systems to GATES
- ◆ Satellite tag info from satellite companies to DOD
- ◆ Various AT21 agile development schemas

The XML Gallery section of the website will change from ‘ Internal’ or ‘External’ and then ‘Draft’ or ‘Approved’ under each to include only the following three categories:

- ◆ Draft (In development, neither in-use nor approved by DTEBC)
- ◆ In-Use (In use but not yet approved by DTEBC)
- ◆ Approved (Approved by DTEBC whether in use or not)

DM 1019 DISAPPROVAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Varone presented, as an option, that the DM be approved but not included in the versioning process. This would improve responsiveness should the need arise to implement 32 character RFID tag lengths. The majority opinion of the Committee was that the DM was unnecessary at this time and should just be dropped, since the 856A can already accept lengths up to 30 characters.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Mr. Varone led a brief discussion on the June minutes. A discrepancy was found in that GATES did not commit to implementing any specific list of DMs at the meeting. An action item was taken to update the minutes to reflect that they had committed to the list after the meeting.

The minutes were then approved as modified.

DDCOI UPDATE

Ms. Connie McCoy, USTRANSCOM provided an update/overview of the Distribution Data Community of Interest (DDCOI) activities since the update at the last DTEB meeting.

Enterprise Services Roadmap

USTRANSCOM and TCCs have taken different approaches to identifying data services. The combination of the two approaches will lead to an Enterprise Services Roadmap everyone can work towards.

FIPS to ISO Country Code Conversion

The conversion from FIPS to ISO country codes will be carried out in three phases:

- ◆ Phase 1
 - DoD/Military IC-only
 - Suspense: 30 September 2011
- ◆ Phase 2
 - Federal government wide
 - Suspense: TBD
- ◆ Phase 3
 - Implementation options
 - Suspense: TBD

Ms. McCoy then put out a call for possible topics to be addressed at next DDCOI during the Data Summit.

SERVICE/AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES (INCLUDING MILS TO DLMS STATUS UPDATE)

Service updates were as follows:

Army

- ◆ Not available

Navy

- ◆ Not available

Marine Corps

- ◆ Not available

Air Force

- ◆ Not available

SDDC

- ◆ Nothing outside of usual coordination

DLA

- ◆ Not available

FACTS

- ◆ Not available

Others

- ◆ GATES had no issues.
- ◆ IGC had no issues.

ACTION ITEMS

1. The DTEBC charter lays out a negotiation process for validity of disapproval. Many people stop voting and/or commenting after a vote of 'disapprove' has been cast. Because of this, a negotiated decision with the DM author, disapprover, DTEB co-chair, and DTEB support staff could potentially leave out stakeholders. DTEB Support Staff to review this process, and DTEB co-chair to modify charter as needed.
2. Currently, neither the DTEBC charter nor the DTEB site requires a reason for disapproval. DTEB co-chair to modify charter as needed.
3. DTEB Support Staff to create structure within the DTEB site to accommodate multiple versions of a single transaction.
4. Mr. Dulaney to ensure that links are included in notifications once they are fully automated.
5. Mr. Dulaney to submit ticket for requirement to automate the process with a DTEB calendar event triggering the sending of Outlook meeting invites.
6. Mr. Dulaney to post the briefing slides to the DTEB website by 8/30/2011.
7. Mr. Dulaney to correct and post June minutes.
- 8.** Set a date/place for next DTEB meeting.

WRAP UP/NEXT STEPS

No firm date was agreed to or suggested for the next DTEBC meeting. DTEB would like to continue to coordinate meetings along with DDCOI, if possible. A survey for interest in having a DTEB only meeting in Nov-Dec will be conducted. Without further issues having been raised, Mr. Varone turned the meeting over to Dr. Wilson to close.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Wilson gave the closing remarks for the meeting. He noted several factors that contributed to the low attendance and urged the committee for more participation at the next meeting. He also made a case for a DTEBC meeting before year end, but remains undecided.



Mr. Will / DTEBC Co-Chair - USTRANSCOM J6

DTEB Committee Synchronization Task Group (STG) Workshop

29-30 August 2011



STG Workshop Agenda



- 300A
- 858B
- 858M
- 856A
- 315A
- 858E
- 214A
- Quad Charts and Other Tracking Records on the DTEB Web Site
- Questions, Additions, Discussion



300A – Ocean Booking – Version 1



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
IBS	1						1018
ISDDC	1						
IGC	1						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

“A” in front of date is actual or completed



858B – TCMD – Versions 0,1, and 2



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
DSS	0						1001
	1						896, 1010, 1014
	2						1021
CMOS	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as ACA	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as Shipper	0						
	1						
	2						
GATES	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



858B – TCMD – Versions 0,1, and 2 (Con't)



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
GFM	0						1001
	1						896, 1010, 1014
	2						1021
TC-AIMS II	0						
	1						
	2						
Marine Corps	0						
	1						
	2						
IGC	0						
	1						
	2						
	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



858M – Manifest – Versions 0,1, and 2



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
DSS	0						1002
	1						1005, 1017
	2						1022
CMOS	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as ACA	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as Shipper	0						
	1						
	2						
GATES	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



858M – Manifest – Versions 0,1, and 2 (Con't)



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
GFM	0						1002
	1						1005, 1017
	2						1022
TC-AIMS II	0						
	1						
	2						
Marine Corps	0						
	1						
	2						
IGC	0						
	1						
	2						
	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



856A – Due-In – Versions 0,1, and 2



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
DSS	0						
	1						1015, 1016
	2						1019, 1023
CMOS	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as ACA	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as Shipper	0						
	1						
	2						
GATES	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



856A – Due-In – Versions 0,1, and 2 (Con't)



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
GFM	0						
	1						1015, 1016
	2						1019, 1023
TC-AIMS II	0						
	1						
	2						
Marine Corps	0						
	1						
	2						
IGC	0						
	1						
	2						
	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



315A – Ocean Status – Version 0



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
IBS	0						1011 – New
							Ocean
							Status
ISDDC	0						For
							USC07
IGC	0						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

“A” in front of date is actual or completed



858E – Vendor BoL – Versions 1



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
DSS	0						1007 -
	1						Corrects
	2						dual code
CMOS	0						meaning
	1						for value ZZ
	2						
FACTS as ACA	0						
	1						
	2						
FACTS as Shipper	0						
	1						
	2						
GATES	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



858E – Vendor BoL – Versions 1 (Con't)



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
GFM	0						1007 -
	1						Corrects
	2						dual code
TC-AIMS II	0						meaning for
	1						value ZZ
	2						
Marine Corps	0						
	1						
	2						
IGC	0						
	1						
	2						
	0						
	1						
	2						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

USTC J6-AD

UNCLASSIFIED

“A” in front of date is actual or completed

innovate | collaborate | support | deliver



214A – Shipment Status – Version 1



System	Version	SCR/BCR etc Date	CCB Date	Begin Dev Date	Begin Test Date	IOC Date	DM(s)/Trading Partner/Comment
IGC	1						1013 - Adds standard X12 codes
ISDDC	1						to accommodate rail carriers
	1						

“P” in front of date (P-10/22/11) is proposed

“A” in front of date is actual or completed