



---

## Defense Transportation Electronic Business Committee Meeting Minutes

23–24 FEBRUARY 2010

### INTRODUCTION

The Defense Transportation Electronic Business (DTEB) committee met on 23–24 February 2010 at LMI in McLean, VA. The briefings for the meeting are available on the DTEB website at the following hyperlink: [Briefings](#).

Capt Telithia LaRoche, United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM), the military co-chair of the DTEB committee chair, called the first day of the meeting to order at 9:00 AM Eastern and made brief introductory remarks. The meeting attendees then introduced themselves.<sup>1</sup>

### REVIEW OF MINUTES

Capt LaRoche 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 January 2010 X12 trimester meeting held in Seattle, WA. He noted that attendance was noticeably low. The XML Task Group (TG1) of X12I (Transportation) did not meet, and the Motor Task Group (TG3) met via conference call on 19 January. He added that X12 is finalizing details of the virtual trimester meeting scheduled for June 2010.

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please contact Frank Napoli ([FNapoli@lmi.org](mailto: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—February 2010 DTEB meeting](#). Click the “Attendees” button at the bottom of the page to view the attendee list.

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.

---

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 reported that X12I (Transportation Subcommittee) reviewed 47 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. Also, this X12 meeting revisited the question of “floating” code tables, where code tables are maintained and revised in isolation from particular X12 version/releases. At a special forum convened to discuss the issue, a straw vote taken on whether to adopt this proposal resulted in a 50/50 split—signaling no hope of attaining consensus; X12C is exploring other methods to adopt floating code lists without affecting partners who do not wish to use floating code lists.

Other items reported by Mr. Napoli:

- ◆ Details of a proposed June 2010 “virtual meeting” are still pending
  - May 17–June 16, 2010 (virtual meetings will be spread throughout the time period; X12I meets June 9).
- ◆ X12I approved a new rail-developed EDI transaction set (TS 603) to exchange Transportation Equipment Registration information. This is a completely new transaction set.
- ◆ The formal process has begun to submit CICA Technical Specifications, Syntax, and Design Rules to ANSI for approval as Standards.

Mr. Napoli fielded a number of questions from the committee. Here are summaries of the questions and Mr. Napoli’s responses:

- ◆ Are CICA messages in use? So far, only internally to organizations. Movement is underway to simplify the CICA architecture. No commercial inter-organizational use thus far.
- ◆ Are sample CICA messages available? Mr. Napoli will check for availability. Schemas are available on X12 website; XML Spy (for example) could be used to generate examples. [Editor’s Note: Mr Napoli has contacted members of the X12I subcommittee to solicit any sample CICA messages. As of 10 March 2010 all responses have been negative.]
- ◆ What should DTEB opinion be regarding floating codes? Some commercial partners prefer strict standard with borrowed/migration codes, as necessary. DoD would benefit, but would have to gain agreement from commercial trading partners (particularly US Bank). Commercial partners deal with many trading partners with embedded hard codes (hard-coded translators).

- 
- ◆ Is use of the new TS 603 mandatory? The 603 is not mandatory but is available, if desired. SDDC noted that DoD rail cars may participate in new TS 603 registration method via Transentric, the contractor that manages the DODX railcar fleet.
  - ◆ Will CICA be required for DoD use? No, CICA is one among many XML standards.
  - ◆ Where are companies going when they leave X12? There is no clear trend of a single replacement data exchange standards organization.

## UPDATE ON VAN INTERCONNECTS FROM X12

The scheduled briefing by Lori Barnhill, BAH, on the value-added network (VAN) forum at the X12 meeting in Seattle was dropped from the agenda. This subject may be addressed at the next DTEB committee meeting.

## DATA MAINTENANCE REPORT

Bill James, LMI, provided an overview and a handout 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 October 2009 DTEB meeting:

- ◆ 16—Approved (by vote or no vote required [NVR])
- ◆ 1—LMI review
- ◆ 4—Voting
- ◆ 2—Disapproved
- ◆ 2—Withdrawn
- ◆ 1—USTRANSCOM review.

Mr. James solicited approval votes, noting that many DMs submitted do not receive any votes. He further noted that a single negative vote halts the approval process and returns the DM or Implementation Convention (IC) to USTRANSCOM for resolution of the difficulty or final disapproval of the proposed DM or IC. Three DMs (878, 879, and 880) are currently in “negotiation” to reconcile disapprovals by GATES at this time. Personal property shipment codes as documented in the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR), TMDS, and the DTEB ICs are not synchronized; DM approval is pending synchronization of the codes.

---

The committee is awaiting an Integrated Booking System (IBS) response on 300A changes proposed in DM 875.

The committee noted that the implementation date requirement in a DM submission is often an obstacle to a positive vote, even though the date is useful for synchronizing adoption of the change(s) in the proposed DM. The DM submission procedure has been changed to delete the mandatory inclusion of an implementation date. However, this implies a more active DTEB committee role in facilitating multi-system synchronization, notwithstanding lack of organizational resources.

Disapproved DMs will be moved from Voting to USTRANSCOM Review on the LMI website to avoid confusion on the status of the DMs. Depending upon resolution, the DM may be re-voted, or new DMs will be drafted.

USTRANSCOM will push to have DM requestors actually write the DM.

The DTEB committee will be more aggressive in investigating abstentions when there is reason to believe the system is affected.

## AUTOMATED CARRIER INTERFACE (ACI) UPDATES

### Motor ACI

Mr. Napoli reminded the committee that the motor carriers had agreed to a hiatus in Motor ACI meetings while they evaluated how implementation of the Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative (DTCI) would affect their business with DoD. Now that DTCI is in operation, there remains a need for interface coordination between DoD and carrier operations not covered by the DTCI program. The next Motor ACI meeting will be 17 March 2010.

Mr. Napoli covered two old actions items:

- ◆ Carrier PRO number field is available in the EDI bill of lading (BoL), but government shipping systems do not have that number to populate the field at the time of BOL generation.
- ◆ Consignee names had been truncated in some DoD BoLs—this issue is resolved, and the action item should be closed.

The group discussed the Global Freight Management (GFM) In-Transit Visibility (ITV) module. This module is patterned on the IBS small ocean carrier reporting. Carriers log into the website and type in update information for their BoLs. More than 100 carriers are using the service; it is working well. All BoLs (not just GFM) are included in this program (CMOS, Distribution Standard System [DSS]), which was implemented in 2007. The status information is sent to all EDI 214 recipients; the application translates the webpage input into X12 214 messages. For DTCI, Menlo handles all status reporting, not the individual carriers. Carriers receive information on the program when they register as a DoD carrier.

---

The GTN representative agreed to supply a list of non-complying motor carriers to SDDC.

## Rail ACI

The longstanding conversion of National Motor Freight Classification (NMFC) hazardous material codes to Standard Transportation Commodity Codes (STCC) is still in coordination.

The group noted that the government must have a single unified set of requirements from carriers. The industry is well organized, and when broad participation is present, there is usually little problem getting unified requirements. Problems sometimes arise when a single railroad is working independently with a government agency; sometimes a carrier may have unique shipment (e.g., idler cars)—can lead to one-off requirement.

## Ocean ACI

The Ocean ACI is on the “back burner” because of limited resources at USTRANSCOM and SDDC. The administration of this ACI is an SDDC responsibility. SDDC has reviewed the open ocean action items and provided them to IBS for a response. SDDC will forward any response to USTRANSCOM.

## TTN/TEM UPDATE

Mike Ashton, GTN/IGC, provided an overview and update of the Transportation Tracking Number (TTN)/Transportation Tracking Account Number (TTAN) program instituted to better track actual movements versus planned movements during operational plan execution. He noted that the program began as a way to address duplicate Transportation Control Numbers (TCNs) on unit moves and then expanded to include Unit Line Number (ULN) and Plan Identification (PID) linkage using unsecured lines of communication. IGC will feed the Joint Operational Planning and Execution System (JOPES) TTAN movement information to help track plan execution. A TTN/TTAN test (under tightly controlled conditions) was accomplished 2–4 November 2009.

Emmet Lung, SRA, noted that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) has endorsed—but not mandated—DoD-wide TTN implementation. Jim Burns, LMI/OSD[TP] added that a formal policy change regarding TTN/TTAN is pending coordination, and that the outcome is unknown. However, it is likely that OSD policy will make TTN/TTAN mandatory.

## TTN IC UPDATE

Mr. James provided an update on the incorporation of TTN/TTAN into DTEB ICs. There were no questions or comments.

---

## GFM RATING AND RANKING WEB SERVICES (RRWS)

Global Freight Management (GFM) system personnel provided a briefing on RRWS. This is a web service developed and deployed by GFM to provide rating and ranking to DoD shipper systems. The briefing covered how the system was built, challenges and issues, interface coordination between GFM and CMOS, lessons learned, and next steps. Please see the briefing slides for detailed content.

Here is a summary of the questions, responses, and comments that arose during the briefing:

- ◆ What is the difference between Web Services Description Language (WSDL) and the traditional Interface Requirements Design Document (IRDD)? Mr. Napoli noted that WSDL is machine-to-machine, while the IRDD involves human reading and compliant coding.
- ◆ The Freight Acquisition Shipping Tool (FAST) is the web-enabled application used to create bills of lading within the GFM suite of systems.
- ◆ XML tag names were selected to reflect IC 858R and customer usage.
- ◆ SDDC will work with the Distribution Data Community of Interest (DD COI) on standardized tag names. (The DD COI didn't exist when this application was developed in GFM.) However, these new tag names will be for future work. The currently implemented screens will not be changed.
- ◆ The concept upon which RRWS is built originated in the Theater Distribution Management Capabilities-Based Assessment Team (TDM CBAT).
- ◆ How does XML affect storage space? Thus far, there has been no problem with storage space. Because the XML input does not constitute legal documents, the data payload may be stored as zipped text or portable document file formats.
- ◆ Does the use of XML cause a bandwidth problem? Thus far, there has been no bandwidth problem. Messages are often limited to, for instance, five carriers at a time, and they contain very few characters.
- ◆ Could this system enable the use of Spot Bid between CMOS and GFM? This capability is currently not available. However, the system could provide this capability with additional development. This service was designed with expansion in mind using the Apache Synapse as a "clearing house" for multiple web services.
- ◆ What types of shipments does this system handle? RRWS handles motor freight.
- ◆ GFM is working with commercial small package express (SPE) carriers to develop a standardized XML schema to exchange shipment data for US-

---

TRANSCOM's domestic and World-Wide Express (WWX) SPE contracts.

- ◆ How are customers identified? Customer ID is part of the registration process with CMOS.

## CMOS INTERFACE TO GFM RRWS

Gordon Allbritton and Gordon Fitzpatrick, CMOS PMO, provided a briefing on the interface with the GFM RRWS via telephone. They noted that CMOS has been using EDI rating and ranking via the Defense Automatic Addressing System Center (DAASC) for many years. The CMOS design is transparent to users, with a Java client picking up the request and generating the XML payload with a suspense time of six minutes. Six CMOS test sites are currently using RRWS, and rollout to 200+ sites is expected in 2010.

Here is a summary of the questions, responses, and comments during this briefing:

- ◆ How does this process work with the Industry Information Processor (I2P) module of CMOS? I2P is for small parcel service; this RRWS application is for large cargo movement only. These will continue to be two separate processes and entities.
- ◆ Does this service have implications for DTEB? Does DTEB index WSDLs similarly to the currently cataloged EDI ICs and some XML schemas? Mr. Will agreed to take these questions back to USTRANSCOM J-6 for coordination and resolution of governance, version control, etc.

## ITV/TRANSPORTATION NODAL STATUS CONOPS UPDATE

Mr. Raney 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.

Participants noted that the deployment/unit move overview portion of the CONOPS is based upon Army procedures (e.g., use of the Unit Deployment List) and should be generalized to cover all services. Mr. Raney will research and rewrite this portion of the CONOPS, as required.

Issues remaining, resolutions, and other questions include:

- ◆ One Due-In vs. Due-In Transmissions from each node
  - This issue remains unresolved.
- ◆ Use of both Due-In and Shipment Consolidation Notice

- 
- Only the Due-In transaction will be used; the Shipment Consolidation Notice will be removed from the CONOPS
  - DLA will continue its current use of the Shipment Consolidation Notice transaction.
  - ◆ Data Distribution Method (Push, Pull, etc.)
    - Discussion indicated that the CONOPS should provide no guidance in this area, but a USTRANSCOM decision on this issue is still pending.
  - ◆ Use of Shipment Unit Level Receipt Notice
    - The Receipt Notice transaction will be removed from the CONOPS.
  - ◆ Use of Receipt Notice at all in en route operations
    - The Receipt Notice transaction will be removed from the CONOPS.
  - ◆ GATES has not reviewed the CONOPS. Review and response from that system is pending.
  - ◆ The IC 856A code for the Due-In Notice is 14 (transmitted in the BSN01 element), and is also used for the report of shipment (REPSHIP) variation of the Due-In. Should the REPSHIP have a separate code?
    - This question was not answered.
  - ◆ GATES has not looked at the 315N transaction. The next version of GATES (6.0) will not be deployed until 2013.
  - ◆ Who is going to write the policy for all to implement this CONOPS?
    - This question was not answered.

## USTCJ6 “EDO TODAY” UPDATES

Mr. Will commented on the transfer of the DECoDe and the DTEB website to USTRANSCOM hosting. He noted that guest access (to accommodate commercial users, *inter alia*) is a mandatory feature for the website, and lack of guest access would be a “show stopper” for transfer of this site to USTRANSCOM hosting.

USTRANSCOM is in arrears with XML evaluation tools. There are many data elements not in the DD COI standard vocabulary, and that is holding up approval. Mr. Napoli agreed to retransmit the LMI XML tools paper to Mr. Will. [Editor’s Note: Jared Andrews re-transmitted a link to the XML Tools white paper to Mr. Will on 3 March 2010.]

---

The group discussed the need for trading partner work groups to develop XML schemas, vice top down data engineer development in isolation. Mr. Ashton noted an example of a failed XML schema implementation because the data engineers working in isolation failed to understand the operational requirements of the schema.

The group discussed the outbound supply receipt process and noted that worldwide implementation is set for July 2010.

The group discussed the ongoing effort sponsored by the Business Transformation Agency (BTA) to standardize DoD unit of measure (UOM) codes and descriptions. The community intends to adopt the United Nations Center for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) standard. Mr. Ashton noted that the shift to UN/CEFACT UOM would cause massive upheaval in IGC programming and should not be pushed (retroactively) unless absolutely needed.

Ms. Davarede advised that a new Naval Aviation directed returns process is pending. The Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) manual change is in coordination, and an Approved Data Change is pending. This process will avoid duplicate TCNs for issue and return, even though the item document number is the same for both issue and return.

Ms. Lopez Cruz discussed the new USTRANSCOM Configuration Change Request (CCR) process changing to involve only internal J-6 approval, with submission to the community for review. If the community has problems with the original approved submission, then a new CCR must be generated and submitted.

## DLMS MIGRATION SYNCHRONIZATION AND METRICS

The group viewed and discussed the current metrics. The central GATES site will be ready to receive 856A Shipment Consolidation Notice transactions from the DLA DSS via DAASC on 6 March 2010.

GATES may not be able to implement DM 863, which re-formats how HAZMAT type pack code data is conveyed in the 858B (TCMD), until version 6.0, which is targeted for a 2012–13 release.

Mr. Will agreed to follow up with the GATES PMO to try and expedite implementation of DM 863.

CMOS expects to be ready for the 940/945 transactions on 10 June 2010. The system is planning on implementing the 858M and 858B transactions in July 2011, but these programming requirements are not yet on contract.

Heidi Daverede, DLMSO, asked if these metrics included DLMS/DTEB transactions for which no equivalent MILS transactions exist; Mr. Will replied that they do not.

---

## CONVENE DAY 2

Mr. Napoli called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM Eastern. He reviewed administrative procedures, and Capt LaRoche opened the floor for consideration of the meeting minutes from the last DTEB Meeting.

### Review and Approval of Minutes

The members approved the October 2009 minutes with the following correction and editor's note:

- ◆ Page 12 (John Schwartz): PDC 339 approved October 2009, implementation October 2010
- ◆ DM 858 for ammunition round count, Page 3: Disapproved because of conflict with DTR. (Annette Griffin) DTR change has been approved, awaiting publication. Out for final coordination (Navy last party to approve). DM back in USTRANSCOM review for resolution. DTR publication will overcome DM disapproval. Editor's note will be added.

With this correction and editor's note regarding DM 858, the minutes were approved. [Editor's Note: The October 2009 minutes posted on the DTEB website were updated 24 February 2010 to reflect these changes.]

## REPORT ON DTEB VOTING AND VERSIONING WORKSHOP

Messrs. Will and Napoli provided a report on the DTEB voting and versioning workshop. The group had an extended discussion regarding whether an implementation date should be mandatory on proposed DMs. Mr. Will concluded the discussion by noting that the implementation date will become optional in accordance with the prior voting and versioning workshop decision.

Mr. Will noted that because discussion of the voting issues consumed all of the time available, versioning was not addressed during the October 2009 workshop. Members will address versioning issues at a separate workshop to be held at Scott AFB, Global Reach Planning Center, 12–16 April 2010. This workshop will be face-to-face, supplemented with the Defense Connect Online (DCO) capability.

Mr. Napoli used the development domain of the DTEB website to show members how the website development team had implemented the changes agreed upon at the workshop. Members concurred with the changes as implemented, and Mr. Napoli said he would have the developers move them into production [Editor's Note: These changes have been completed in the production domain.]

In response to a question, Mr. Napoli agreed to check details on handling non-voter comments to proposed DMs and ICs. The group noted that simple e-mail messages to the appropriate people would be another option for non-voters to submit comments.

---

## IGC OVERVIEW AND DEMONSTRATION

Mr. Ashton provided an update and overview briefing on IGC followed by a demonstration of the ad hoc query tool available in that system. The query tool is built on Business Objects rather than using in-house developed software. The target date for deployment of full operation capability (FOC) for IGC is October 2010.

## REPSHIP FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS RELATED MATERIAL (NWRM)

Jared Andrews, LMI, provided an update on the current status of the REPSHIP/NWRM working group, associated changes to the DTR, and related DTEB IC DMs. Changes to chapters 204 and 205 of the DTR related to the new REPSHIP procedures are out for formal coordination at this time. [Editor's Note: Coordination has been put on hold while awaiting further guidance from OSD.] The current Defense Transportation Tracking System (DTTS) REPSHIP procedures will be eliminated once the CONOPS REPSHIP process is on line with all systems. Mr. Andrews noted that while the REPSHIP procedure using the standardized 856A Due-In and 315N Nodal Status reports is available, any "electronic" method (e.g., e-mail, fax) still may currently be used to comply with DoD guidance on NWRM REPSHIPS.

As the automated NWRM REPSHIP is adopted, trading partners need a method to identify locations that are able to receive 856A and 315N transactions. The current proposed solution is to provide some type of DoDAAC list or REPSHIP capability indicator in the DoDAAC database (DoDAAF). It may be appropriate for LMI to brief this requirement to the next meeting of the Department of Defense Activity Address Directory (DoDAAD) working group. If LMI participates, a read ahead will be required by 11 March 2010.

Ms. Griffin, DLA, noted that sunset issues must be addressed via the REPSHIP working group. Discussion ensued regarding the need for "tighter" language in the OSD memo requiring automated REPSHIPS.

## SERVICE/AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

**Army.** Mr. Maurice McKinney is the new DTEB representative.

**USMC.** Ms. Graham advised that the GCSS-MC is planning to use the DLMS 940/945 transactions pending clarification of associated business processes. AMS-TAC and GCSS-USMC are moving from user defined file (UDF) formats to standard transactions. The USMC supply community is engaged with the Supply PRC and DLMS process.

**USAF.** SMSGT Jeff Adcock explained that CMOS is working on TTN requirements in the 858B and other affected transactions. This capability is scheduled for

---

release 7.4, with some remaining work unfunded. He noted some concern regarding the correct treatment of partial and split TTN items. He noted that the TTN requirement has been approved, but there has been no corresponding plus-up in the Logistics Automated Information System (LOG AIS) budget.

**SDDC.** Tina Woodbury, SDDC, had no further updates beyond those supplied during the committee meeting.

**AMC/GATES.** GATES representatives emphasized the need for version discussions and for a “batching” of DMs to facilitate implementation within a regular system release framework.

**DLA.** Ms. Griffin discussed the importance of synchronization and the current lack of a coordinated system for ensuring and monitoring trading partner implementation of DTEB ICs and versions thereof. She advocated that program managers should attend DTEB committee meeting, and that they should give updates on IC implementation status and plans. The groups noted that the current DTEB DM system treats every change as an “emergency release,” vice batching and prioritizing these changes to conform to the real-world system of scheduled system software releases. Mr. Napoli offered that X12 holds DMs for release on a trimester basis. The group discussed this matter at length, reaching the consensus that USTRANSCOM should be in charge of synchronization among transportation systems. Mr. Will stated that the April 2010 workshop (see above) will be both a versioning and synchronization session.

**CMOS.** Nothing further to report.

**FACTS.** Doug Heberling expressed agreement with the need for better synchronization, but also noted that the systems still work fairly well together to coordinate IC implementations and changes thereto.

FACTS is testing 858B changes with DAASC at this time.

**IGC.** IGC is starting 315N work; the system is 856A capable at this time.

**Other.** No other organizations came forward.

## SET DATES FOR NEXT MEETING

Because several members needed to leave for return transportation, the group moved the next meeting date discussion ahead of the open action items. The next meeting may be held at a Defense Depot site. The dates under consideration are: 15–16, 22–23, 29–30 June and 13–14 July. Ms. Griffin will coordinate availability of DLA facilities and let us know which dates work best. [Editor’s Note: The June DTEB meeting will take place Tuesday 29 June and Wednesday 30 June 2010 at the Executive Conference room in Bldg 54 at DDC-New Cumberland.]

---

## OPEN ACTION ITEMS

### DT: 1000-3 – This item is closed

This action item, opened by GSA in October 2000, has been used to track several different issues since it was opened. Because GSA has not participated at the DTEB committee for some time, consensus was to close this item. If and when GSA renews its participation in the DTEB committee this item may be re-opened, or a new item opened as needed at that time.

### DTEB: 0609-1

Mr. Napoli reported that LMI can accomplish the necessary updates under its current contract and funding levels, subject to tasking from J6-AD. This item will remain open pending tasking and implementation of the changes.

### DTEB: 0609-2 – This item is closed

Ms. Woodbury reported that SDDC closely coordinates implementation of DMs to the ocean ICs with the ocean carriers and she does not believe there is any need to provide additional notification of implementation to them. Ms. Lopez Cruz will follow up with carriers. This item will be closed.

### DTEB: 0609-4

The DTEB committee has convened a voting and versioning workgroup; meetings are on-going—next scheduled meeting is 12 April 2010. This item will remain open to track the workgroup's progress.

### DTEB: 0209-1

Mr. Napoli reported that he had solicited input from members regarding the need for a generic request and response message and received only one response, which indicated it was probably a good idea. Mr. Ashton reported that DPS also believed this was a good idea and supported its implementation. He will provide Mr. Napoli with contact information for Betty Soto, the POC at DPS.

### DTEB: 0209-2

Mr. Napoli reported that status code "INC" has been added to the 315N IC with accompanying user notes indicating it shall be used to "close" a TCN. Discussion ensued regarding how to close a TCN using other, non-DLMS-compliant message formats. The question of how to indicate that a TCN had "died" in-route, and its contents were reconsolidated into another TCN was also discussed.

The members agreed that resolution of these issues should be included in the Nodal Status CONOPS.

---

## ADJOURNMENT

Capt LaRoche thanked the participants for their contributions and adjourned the meeting shortly after 12:00 EST.