

## Defense Transportation Electronic Business Committee

### Meeting Minutes

13 DECEMBER 2010

## INTRODUCTION

The Defense Transportation Electronic Business (DTEB) Committee met on 13-14 December 2010 at LMI Headquarters in McLean, Virginia. Dr. Leon Wilson, United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) J6-AD Branch Chief, Acting Director, J6 AD Enterprise Integration Lab, 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. Mr. Harry Gore and Ms. Dena Bellack, LMI meeting hosts, provided administrative remarks, initiated participant introductions,<sup>1</sup> presented the agenda, and turned the meeting over to Mr. Will for a brief discussion of the review process for the previous meeting's (29-30 June 2010) minutes.

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

## REVIEW OF MINUTES

Ms. Bellack distributed copies of the June 2010 meeting minutes. Participants were asked to review the minutes this evening and come to Tuesday's meeting prepared to discuss/approve as appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please contact Glenn Little ([Glittle@lmi.org](mailto:Glittle@lmi.org)) at LMI if you need contact information for any of the attendees; you can access the DTEB meeting webpage by following either hyperlink: [USTRANSCOM ITS Link](#) or [Archived DTEB site link](#). Click the "Attendees" button at the bottom of that page to view the attendee list.

---

# SECRETARIAT REPORTS

## ASC X12 COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Jared Andrews, LMI, briefed the group on the October 17-22 2010 ASC X12 Committee meeting he attended with Ms. Sandra Claverie (USTRANSCOM J6) in Cincinnati.

### Data Maintenance

The X12I (Transportation) committee reviewed 45 Data Maintenance (DM) items. Many aren't EDI-based, but X12 assigns them tracking numbers to provide visibility. The majority of DMs are for tracking Context Inspired Component Architecture (CICA) message development. Only one (regarding the issue of borrowed codes) potentially affects DTEB: we use version 4010, but frequently we need a code that has been added to a future version without having to migrate. X12 has been trying to find a solution.

Previously X12 considered a proposal to let code tables float, unattached to versions. The new proposal is to allow industry to come up with an implementation convention (IC), agree on the action (e.g. add these codes to the previous version of 4010), and submit it to X12, who would publish it as an updated 4010. The modified versions would then become "X12 standards." 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 X12 currently publishes Implementation Guides, (IGs) for the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). Originally, X12 said they publish standards rather than guides, but after some "arm twisting," they agreed to publish guides. This proposal arises from that model. The way the DM stands today, X12 would publish the IGs, meaning that users would have to purchase them from X12. The DTEB Committee could try to negotiate this with X12.

In healthcare, interested parties must buy them. The maintenance process also has to go through X12, so there are issues surrounding the idea. DLA supports the move and is studying it from a logistics management standards perspective. We hope that in 1-2 years we might be able to say to X12, "We have our own ICs, can we submit them to you for approval?" and continue using them without requiring that people buy them. X12's primary concern is trading partner lawsuits, (e.g. if someone sends an incorrect code on an insurance claim, it can result in patient/doctor lawsuits, etc.) Lastly, if this is done through ICs, X12 can say it's an official, valid code. If someone else manages it, they can't make that representation.

X12 has stressed that no one *has* to do this. If you don't want floating codes, you may use the ones in the book. If you want floating codes for your industry, you can use this route. The hope is that with this change, X12I and X12F will come on board.

---

## Attendance

The X12 meeting attendance was very low (6-7 transportation representatives, two rail carriers, FedEx and UPS), due primarily to decreased budgets and the fact that the EDI standard is stable. There was low interest within X12I to develop CICA messages. In response to Connie McCoy's query as to whether FedEx and UPS are considering implementing CICA or XML, Mr. Andrews responded that they are using proprietary XML and not planning to implement CICA unless their customer base requests it. Mr. Napoli noted that several years ago the barge community developed and distributed several CICA-based schemas to trading partners. The feedback was that the schemas were too complex to be useful. As an example, the proprietary schema was 30 pages, and the CICA schema was 950 pages. There are a number of proposals to simplify the CICA architecture.

For this meeting, The XML Task Group did not meet; the Motor (TG3) and Customs (TG9) Task Groups met via telecon; and the Barge Task Group (TG4) did not participate (ostensibly due to a leadership transition). The participants agreed that future X12I meetings should be held virtually unless XML development workshops are held.

## X12 XML Update

Most subcommittees think it's too difficult to develop schemas under current CICA design and architecture rules. Some are considering making changes to the architecture. Others are questioning the changes. The Data Interchange Standards Association (DISA) recently developed software that converts EDI transactions to XML schemas; however, the schemas don't follow the CICA architecture and design rules. X12 is concerned that the schemas will be used as standards. The insurance industry has several transactions on the X12 website that they refer to as standards, but they're just schemas.

Mr. Napoli mentioned that DLA has not invested heavily in CICA for XML. Tommy Lyons submitted all the data dictionary items to the United Nations Centre for the Facilitation of the Administration, Commerce, and Transport (UN/CEFACT). They're now part of the UN/CEFACT library and available, but DLA didn't actually develop schemas. On another note, there are two reasons why DISA is generating schemas:

- ◆ HIPAA requires that trading partners under HIPAA use X12 standard transactions. The original intent was EDI X12 standards, but some trading partners couldn't do EDI and wanted XML. This is an attempt by DISA to say, "Here's an XML schema that uses the X12 dictionary and follows the X12 architecture, so it's simple to map back and forth."
- ◆ Most commercial companies publishing translation software have a built-in capability to generate these (isomorphic) schemas. Because other software products are doing that, DISA didn't want to encourage HIPAA customers to

---

buy something else. DLA Logistics Standards Management Office uses the EDIFECs SpecBuilder software to generate isomorphic schemas.

The next X12 meetings are as follows:

- ◆ Jan 30 – Feb 3, 2011 (Seattle, WA)
- ◆ June 2011 (Virtual)
- ◆ October 2011 (Pittsburgh, PA).

After the October Pittsburgh meeting, no physical meetings are booked for X12, so future meetings may be in an all-virtual format.

## IC AND DM UPDATES

Bill James, 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 June 2010 DTEB meeting:

- ◆ 15 DMs Submitted
- ◆ 13 Approved (by vote or No Vote Required (NVR))
- ◆ 2 Disapproved
- ◆ 0 Voting
- ◆ 0 Withdrawn.

NVR deals with corrections, typos, spelling, obvious misstatements, etc. Programmatic changes require votes. Present practice would have us not bundle these, but rather make the changes as they're approved.

### Approved

#### DM 902

- ◆ 300A-Reservation (Booking) (Ocean)
- ◆ Renames Breakbulk Transportation Control Number (TCN) & Attributes.

#### DM 903

- ◆ 856A-Receipt/Shipment-Consolidation/ Due-In Notice
- ◆ Adds REF segments for ULN and UIC.

---

## DM 904

- ◆ 856A-Receipt/Shipment-Consolidation/ Due-In Notice
- ◆ Adds a REF segment for Military Traffic Expediting (MTX) Number (rail).

## DM 905 (NVR)

- ◆ 304B-Verified Shipping Instructions (VSI) Notification
- ◆ Remove extraneous pages copied from the 304A master.

## DM 907 (NVR)

- ◆ 404A-Rail Carrier Shipment Information
- ◆ Changes LS segment attribute to M AN 1/4.

## DM 909 NVR

- ◆ 404A-Rail Carrier Shipment Information
- ◆ Corrects Table 6 index references.

## DM 910

- ◆ 315N - Transportation Node Status Report
- ◆ Adds codes DEL and DEC to Table 6.

## DM 911 (NVR)

- ◆ 858E-DoD Vendor Shipment Information
- ◆ Corrects a typo – HA to HS for Coast Guard.

## DM 912

- ◆ 300A-Reservation (Booking) (Ocean)
- ◆ Adds a conditional N903 for TTN.

## DM 913 (NVR)

- ◆ 858B - TCMD
- ◆ Deletes SEGMENT CONDITION for DE at Index 121-03.

---

## DM 746 (NVR)

- ◆ 220A-DTCI Transportation Service Response
- ◆ Adds an L11 segment for Shipper Offer Record Number
- ◆ Renames B901 DTCI Coordinator Internal Order Number.

## DM 766

- ◆ 303A-Ocean Booking Cancellation
- ◆ Adds codes D and R to distinguish between cancellation and prior-to-booking cancellation.

## DM 789

- ◆ 315A-Status Details (Ocean)
- ◆ Changes user notes at Index 2-07 & 2-08 to distinguish between Equipment Number and Initial.

## Disapproved

### DM 906

- ◆ 300A-Reservation (Booking) (Ocean)
- ◆ Adds code '18' for TTN.

This was the second rejection of this action. It was disapproved, then DM 912 superseded DM 906, and was approved as indicated above.

### DM 908

- ◆ 858B-TCMD
- ◆ Changes the N9 segment (Special Handling Code) requirement from Mandatory to Conditional.

## IC Maintenance Summary

Though we had 15 items of activity, these are the ICs that were affected and have been modified since the last DTEB meeting.

## 10 Resulting from Approved DMs

- 
- ◆ 220A
  - ◆ 300A, 303A, 304B, 315A, 315N
  - ◆ 404A
  - ◆ 858B, 858E
  - ◆ 856A.

This activity occurred between July and October. Since then, we've approved some DMs that have yet to be documented in the appropriate IC. We're awaiting the process for handling versions, which will affect IC implementation.

### ICs in Final Review Cycle (Ongoing)

- ◆ 920A – Transportation Discrepancy Report Request
- ◆ 920B – Transportation Discrepancy Report Response
- ◆ 920C – Transportation Discrepancy Report Claim.

These are not yet fully developed. We're waiting for GFM to decide whether to implement them as EDI or turn TDR into a Web Service or other solution.

Mr. Will asked whether GFM had decided to adopt EDI for TDR processing. Nancy Lopez Cruz, SRA/SDDC G-6 Data Management Office, responded that they are awaiting the results of a Six Sigma process evaluation. Mr. Steve Lord, Army G4, noted that the GFM Configuration Control Board (CCB) has been discussing TDRs, and this subject did make their "Top 10" list.

## Commercial Carrier Interfaces

Mr. Gore provided an update for three Automated Carrier Interfaces (ACIs):

### Motor

We attempted to have a motor telecon prior to the June DTEB meeting. All the participants were either Government or military contractors, with no participation from the carrier industry. Following that telecon, we canvassed all known motor carriers to determine the interest level for re-energizing a Motor ACI. That received no response. We have not had a subsequent meeting, nor do we plan to do so in the near future.

---

## Ocean

The last meeting was face-to-face in March 2008. Yet there have not been any issues of sufficient priority to warrant another face-to-face or telecon meeting. There have been requests to meet, but neither USTRANSCOM nor SDDC has the resources to do so. Ms. Lopez Cruz noted that SDDC is assessing how they might be able to re-engage the Ocean ACI. She will update the group when/if any movement occurs.

## Rail

GFM has made the 5030 version release of the 404A IC available to carriers. We don't yet know the "take" rate. Migration to 5030 solved many long-standing problems with rail carriers being able to use the 404A, specifically with over-reporting of HAZMAT and providing detailed HAZMAT info useful to the rail industry. Ms. Lopez Cruz added that GFM completed the coding and the rail community is aware it's available to use. Most open items were closed by virtue of the 5030 release. The remainder need to be reviewed to either close or validate. She will provide updated information as soon as practicable.

# Synchronization Task Group Meeting Update

Dr. Wilson updated the group on the latest Synchronization Task Group (STG) activities. The STG held a meeting November 8, after which Ms. Lopez Cruz, Mr. Gore, CDR Murphy, Greg Goldbach, USTRANSCOM J5/4, and Dr. Wilson designed a brief for senior leaders. They have not yet presented them to Mr. Osborn, Mr. Rogers, or other senior leaders, but they talked to Mr. Kinney, J6-A Division Chief, who committed to briefing the next General Officer Steering Group (GOSG) on December 16. He will articulate the STG's challenges to provide greater visibility with the senior leaders.

In addition, CDR Murphy has investigated whether J6-I might have a mechanism to help influence the Services, but as yet has not found anything. The challenge of getting partners on the same IC implementation timeline remains.

Mr. Will asked Jim Burns, OSD-TP, whether OSD has taken the REPSHIP capability to Mr. Osborn. Mr. Burns responded that Lisa Roberts of OSD Transportation Policy talked to Mr. Osborn about implementing and synchronizing REPSHIP, but synchronization in general could have been read into that. Mr. Osborn did take on REPSHIP and we should hear something soon, but he will be leaving USTRANSCOM for the Department of Energy. Dr. Wilson added that Mr. Osborn has in fact already left USTRANSCOM. Mr. Burns indicated to Ms. Roberts that he would bring up the subject through the Distribution Steering Group (DSG).

Jim Wakely, HQ AF/A4LM, noted that there has been no feedback on the USTRANSCOM side. His office is trying to get General Fedder, HQ AF/A4L, to email Mr. Peters, Mr. Stanton, General Johnson, and others on the J6 side to indicate

---

that we'd like to see progress on this. Dr. Wilson added that Mr. Kinney is experiencing similar synchronization problems at Agile Development, thus perhaps he'll be inclined to forward the DTEB's cause at the GOSG. Mr. Will added that AT21's "Movement Request Tracking and State Change Visibility (MRTSCV)" is an area that may overlap with synchronization.

Brent Bingham, USTRANSCOM J6, countered that the "states and statuses" discussions with which Mr. Kinney has been involved have been from a data exchange and common development perspective rather than the STG's rollout perspective. Mr. Will responded that the reason for requesting Mr. Kinney's help is that AT21 and Agile Development have significant visibility at USTRANSCOM. Though in the early stages of development, soon they'll impact systems and expect systems and interfaces to change, therefore they will experience the same issues as DTEB. By including DTEB in his discussions, he may be able to provide DTEB with some of the "horsepower" behind AT21 and Agile Development.

## IC VERSIONING WORKSHOP

Mr. Will chaired the IC versioning discussion, the primary goal of which was to assign version numbers to specific ICs. He offered the following definition for versions: one or more DMs that at least two trading partners agree to implement in a reasonable period of time. Mr. Will's presentation included a series of charts depicting transactions with associated ICs, DMs, and trading partner implementation status provided by DLA and FACTS. The assumption for the exercise was that any DMs older than those in the charts were to be deemed part of the baseline for each IC.

Mr. Will inquired as to participant preferences for baseline numbering (Version 0 vs. Version 1.0). With no opinions expressed, the group agreed to Mr. Will's subsequent suggestion to use Version 1.0 to denote IC baselines. Mr. Will also suggested that the baseline will include each IC from the point of initial development and all DMs prior to those under discussion today, regardless of whether any systems have implemented them (see the IC Versioning Workshop slides at the link on page 1). The logic is that most systems have already implemented them, and those who haven't should consider implementing them to come up to the baseline as their first goal. DMs from today's discussions will become subsequent versions.

Mr. Bingham disagreed with the premise for Version 1.0, stating that until there is an agreement between two or more partners to implement an IC, it can be voted and approved, but can't yet be named Version 1.0. Dan Dibble, USTRANSCOM J6A DISA Field Office, mentioned that since some implementations are already in place, we should establish the least common denominator (earliest version in place), and if nothing has been implemented, the current version could be the baseline. Mr. Will countered that this group can stipulate that Version 1.0 consists of a given IC and all DMs up to (but not including) those that are discussed today.

---

## 315N (DM910)

- ◆ Adds codes DEC and DEL to the 315N to terminate a TCN
- ◆ Approved

The difference between these and the current 315 relative to receipt of cargo is simply the addition of these codes to terminate the TCN.

IGC is in testing for this and should be ready by July 2011. Dennis Kochert, DLA 6JU DA DDC, mentioned that DSS hasn't received a requirement for this, so it is TBD. This prompted a discussion of which organizations have implemented (or plan to implement) DM 910 to the 315N. The following list indicates the responses:

- ◆ SDDC representing GFM (Nancy Lopez Cruz)] - no plans to implement 315N in the near future (presently considered out of scope)
- ◆ LOGSA - just started looking at the 315, and has made no determination yet as to whether they'll implement. If LOGSA was to implement, it would be in perhaps June, 2011. Mr. Will inquired whether LOGSA would be a trading partner for IGC in July 2011 if LOGSA implemented the 315N. Elizabeth Mason-Jones, LOGSA, indicated that they get their feed directly from DAAS, thus IGC would not be relevant
- ◆ HQ USAF - From an in-transit perspective, if this isn't in the version 7.4 build, CMOS would probably not produce it until 2013 at the earliest. Michael McDown (CMOS) posed several as-yet-unanswered questions regarding the purpose.

A conversation ensued regarding whether DM 910 should be included in the 315N baseline. Mr. Will felt that DM 910 should not be included in the baseline because no one has implemented it, and asked whether on that basis, the group could progress the versioning to 1.1 or a reasonable alternative to include DM 910 (and DM 874, which is also discussed on the presentation slide). Mr. Gore noted that including DMs 910 and 874 in the baseline would give systems something toward which to build, adding that IGC and potentially LIBD can receive as soon as someone can send. Currently, CMOS, DAAS, and DSS have implemented the 315N.

In response to a question from Cheryl Thompson, LOGSA, asking whether subsequent versions of the 315N would be published prior to systems requesting it, Mr. Will indicated that based on prior agreement, the practice might be to publish both the baseline and the new version 1.1 indefinitely. This model would be followed going forward, however versions prior to the established baseline would not be published. This evolved to a discussion of whether DMs would be bundled in specific versions, and whether this new version should be called version 2.0 to accommodate sets of trading partners agreeing to implement. Mr. Will stated that for now, adding DM 910 to the 315N will constitute version 1.1.

---

## 315N (DM 874)

- ◆ Does not impact DSS
- ◆ No JOPES Unit Moves
- ◆ Approved.

Defense Transportation System (DTS) unit move systems at government nodes will use the 315N to convey the TTN, along with transportation nodal status. Accordingly, the 315N must contain the TTN. IGC is separately developing the ability to receive the TTN and TTAN in the 315N, with expected implementation in the July 2011 timeframe. LOGSA intends to also use the TTN when employing the 315N.

Mr. Burns mentioned that the TTN already exists in the 856A, which is a foundational document that establishes TTN content, including active or passive RFID and content level information. Given that circumstance, Mr. Burns questioned the added value of having the TTN in the 315 rather than providing status updates through the 856A as one string of data. Mr. Will responded that LOGSA has decided that they only want the 315N, and they receive some of the information normally contained in the 856A from elsewhere. Ms Mason-Jones added that LOGSA uses only the 856A consolidation/deconsolidation—not the 856A due in—and to receive it all would constitute a resource burden.

Mr. Gore noted that for the current 315N, the TTN is reported only where the TCN isn't available. The user note requires that users report one within priority order, and the TCN is first. Mr. Burns added that if LOGSA is looking for TTN information through the 315N, the user note should be changed.

A conversation then ensued about this set-up and how to accommodate something other than an occasional fill in for lack of a TCN. Mr. Napoli mentioned that the IC states that users may send as many N9 segments as they would like.

Mr. Burns asked whether relating the TTN's string of numbers to the TCN might pose a security issue. Mr. Napoli felt that it did not pose a security issue, and Mr. Burns rejoined that we already do it in the 856A and perhaps others. Gordon Albritton, CMOS, stated that CMOS will be passing the TTN value in the 315N, and if the TTN is not present, they will pass the TCN value. Their worldwide 315N implementation is scheduled for December 2011, with several test sites implementing prior to that.

Mr. Kochert noted that the impact of DSS being used for more than what it does now will be hard to assess. Karen Palmer, DLA 6JU DA DDC, added that the development order must originate from DLA HQ.

Mr. Will stated that the implementation possibilities for DM 874 are different enough from DM 910 that they should be kept separate for versioning (315N version 1.2).

---

This led to an extensive conversation focused on determining the appropriate versioning paradigm. Originally, DTEB assumed systems would implement chronologically, but that has not always proven to be the case. Some have tried to leapfrog, and then had problems exchanging with trading partners. Part of the challenge is that the DTEB committee has no authority to compel trading partners to implement versions. One recommendation was that rather than multiple versions, we would have the current implementation and the to-be-implemented version.

The attempted implementation of the 858B highlighted this issue. DSS and FACTS tried to implement, and GATES didn't start off that way. As they tried to implement, DSS found needed changes and wrote three DMS, and FACTS did the same with other changes. Each implemented the changes they had originated but not the ones that the other had originated, so we had 6 approved and published DMs at the same time. The assumption was that if systems approved a DM they'd implement it, but they didn't.

The group did not reach agreement on the versioning approach, but discussed pros and cons of different approaches per the following:

- ◆ One approach would stipulate that versions are not sequential in terms of building upon prior content. Each version would stand on its own. The prelude to each version would state which prior versions and DMs are included. In this approach, versions would not be cumulative, e.g. version 1.2 might not contain version 1.1 content.
- ◆ A corollary to the above would be to have an additional version, e.g. version 1.3, combine the content of versions 1.1 and 1.2. This would lead to exponential growth in the versions.
- ◆ Changes to earlier versions (e.g. new DMs added to version 1.1) could constitute a new version (e.g. version 1.2).
- ◆ Perhaps we version first as 1.0, then for each small change, use decimal increments such as 1.1, etc. Then we could change to the next major version (from Version 1 to Version 2) when we include all of the earlier versions in it.
- ◆ Systems could leapfrog versions. The TTN idea is a good example. Regardless of where systems are in the 858R or 858B development, systems will have to implement TTN because there is a Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum JROCM that says systems have to support the TTN. It doesn't matter whether you can support other things like DECC (Defense Enterprise Computing Centers?). You have a senior-level mandate saying you have to support it.
- ◆ If versions are discretely determined as a result of DMs (e.g. if version 1.1 supports DM 910 and version 1.2 supports DM 874) it's unclear whether, when the next DM comes out, it's applied to one and not the

---

other. Regardless, it would pose an administrative burden. Maintenance costs may trump any decision on DTEB's part. The burden would fall on the implementers, so it could complicate things if different versions have different changes without including previous changes.

- ◆ Backward compatibility is an issue. Those who have not implemented a DM, or might never, might not want the entirety of particular versions. Without backward compatibility, however, implementers might have to develop and implement multiple versions to catch up.
- ◆ Versioning nomenclature could be extended to include further subdivisions (e.g. versions 1.2a and 1.2b).
- ◆ Software production typically includes previous versions in subsequent releases. This approach would perhaps be easier to understand and maintain, but might lead to some more-rapidly developing systems working on vastly different versions than others.
- ◆ Regardless of the eventual methodology, DTEB will need an explicit set of rules governing the versioning.
- ◆ The versioning issue may boil down to DTEB's document (IC) rather than to the system's version of record. The IC tells us what's approved. Then we need to know what DMs the systems have implemented or when they will implement. For example, DLA Logistics Standards Management Office publishes one version of the document per EDI version, so for the 856R they have a 4010 and 4030 version, but other than that what systems have implemented is irrelevant. When DLA Logistics Standards Management Office releases one or more approved DLMS changes, they publish a new document. LOGSA, for example, then implements what matters to them and not the other parts.
- ◆ Systems could perhaps claim compliance without developing for the DM if the DM has no impact on the system. This could lead to problems in the future if another system plans to transact with a "compliant" system and develops toward that goal, only to find that the receiving system in fact is not capable of accepting a particular DM.
- ◆ DTEB should consider a versioning paradigm consistent with XML versioning protocols.
- ◆ Functional approval doesn't imply system implementation. Implementation schedules might be very long for one partner, and very short for another. Multiple DMs per version could prolong development time until release for some systems.
- ◆ By waiting to announce a new version until we have synchronized implementation agreement, we lock-step the community. DMs could be approved pend-

---

ing the next version change. They could then be incorporated into a production IC for synchronization across the community.

- ◆ For implementing new versions, partners need to know what has to be done and when, and whether there is a mechanism that allows partners to continue to trade with one another if one partner makes a change ahead of another.

## DTEB WEBSITE MIGRATION UPDATE AND DEMO

Mr. Bingham provided an update on the DTEB website migration to the .mil domain. The intent was to keep the same look and feel as the LMI site. The ITS-DEIM DE-CoDe and ITS DTEB Restricted websites are ready for use, with an anticipated 20 December 2010 cutover. The cutover will include 2-5 days of downtime while content is transferred. The banner public page (<http://www.transcom.mil/dteb>) will be activated on or about 3 January 2011, however the DTEB public website is delayed until at least May 2011. During the interim, DM or IC changes will be pushed to the trading partner community via appropriate listservs.

The LMI DTEB website will be decommissioned upon cutover, however depending upon the results of USTRANSCOM/LMI discussions it may remain as a public read-only archive after 31 Dec 2010. Mr. Napoli, Ms. Lopez Cruz, John Mannino, GFM, Emmet Lung, USTC J5/4, and Mike Crawford, HQ AMC/A4T (SRA) performed beta testing on the site. USTRANSCOM has addressed all the concerns raised by the testers. The comment matrix is available by email for interested persons. Comments from this discussion will be included. Please inform Mr. Bingham if you require changes.

The current site includes a feature whereby when one creates a notification or adds a document to the website, the outgoing email automatically generates a hyperlink that takes the user directly to the appropriate page upon login. Ms. Lopez Cruz commented that the email announcing the DTEB meeting did not provide the link. This was apparently not in the comment matrix, however Mr. Bingham took an action to address it and Ms. Lopez Cruz took an action to send Mr. Bingham the comment.

Mr. Bingham described the IC change process on the website. Only the final version of ICs will be posted on the public space. There is no interactive capability on the public page. All voting members should have a registered account (non-public page). Guest members may not vote anonymously. In that regard, there is a different process and slightly greater administrative effort required for non-CAC-enabled users without USTRANSCOM logins. Mr. Napoli noted that this could pose a problem, in particular with the Ocean ACI, because they've always used the ACI forum as the location where they're built. In a recent example, carriers needed to discuss whether a set of five codes being sent in status reports from DTCI carriers to DTCI coordinator Menlo should be included in the reports. To do so, the carriers had to be participants on the DTEB website and access discussion boards regardless of whether they were voting members. He added that the question of ID should be moot, because most carriers have an ID whether they log on as guests or not. If there is a process where they can

---

get IDs, the issue is resolved. Ms. Lopez Cruz mentioned that carriers are contractually required to view the ICs.

Mr. Bingham responded that it had been his impression that anonymous access was deemed undesirable, such that people would need to login to view draft products. In Mr. Bingham's view the issue boiled down to two questions:

- 1) Carrier ability to participate at draft level
- 2) Willingness to log in rather than use the guest button.

Mr. Bingham then conducted a short demonstration of the website. The site has overarching tabs for Home, Draft submission, Documentation, Schedule, Communication, Voting, Reports, and Administration. The home page consists of bulletins, new items, calendar, and other update material. Users may view current and previous DMs, including a wildcard search capability. J6A points of contact are included to facilitate bringing it into the broader USTRANSCOM space. The site also includes a sortable action item history. Sort parameters include the responsible committee or workgroup. Each user can use the listserv to contact his or her respective community. The Reports section is still being developed, however the end functionality will include the ability to print reports generated by standard SQL queries.

Mr. Gore demonstrated several pieces of functionality, including account management, requesting assignment as voting member, and the processes by which Administrators make items available for viewing and users access them. Several participants had site functionality suggestions per the following:

- ◆ Put a link to subtabs on the main page to avoid navigating menus
- ◆ Allow voters to vote from the same page as the DMs they are reviewing.

Additional buttons appear at the bottom of the screen. Currently, suggestions for improvements can be submitted through the "Comments" button, however after discussion at this meeting, the group decided to rename the Comments button to "Webmaster" in an effort to avoid confusion with the intent of the "Report Issues" button.

Mr. Bingham listed the following concerns associated with development and deployment of the website:

- ◆ Letting the community know of the change, (this prompted a conversation regarding the available avenues for publicizing the move). Among the possibilities the group will consider using are the following:
  - ◆ Listserv
  - ◆ Email to all account holders (Mr. Bingham took an action to send an email to all known users, and Mr. Gore took an action to ensure that the

---

LMI data dump for the new DTEB website includes all the user email addresses)

- ◆ Note on the front page of the current site.
- ◆ Implementing the cutover process
  - ◆ Mr. Bingham asked whether the cutover could be performed as soon as the weekend of December 18-19, 2010. A conversation ensued regarding the challenges and implications of doing so. The primary concern is that carriers might not yet have access to the new site. In addition, the URL used by the carriers to access the site might be stipulated in their contracts, thus there is a question as to whether contract modifications may be necessary. Some of the options include:
    - ◆ Redirect users to the public page, which would give them access information with a note saying they'll need an account
    - ◆ Send a note through USTRANSCOM contracting to contract holders
    - ◆ Send an announcement on an SDDC carrier advisory that the DTEB website is changing over, with a URL for the new site. Greg Doyle, SDDC G6, volunteered to investigate whether that is feasible contractually. Ms. Lopez Cruz took an action to contact SDDC G9 to see whether an advisory is possible. Mr. Bingham similarly took an action to discuss the issue with J6.
  - ◆ Mr. Bingham took an action to have a government sidebar to finalize the timing and report to the DTEB. The cutover will be no sooner than Monday 20 December 2010.
- ◆ Prompt establishment of ITS accounts
- ◆ Dealing with the lack of the public page
  - ◆ The banner page will have a URL and directions for getting an account for the active page.
- ◆ Timely posting of DMs & ICs on a public page.

Meeting participants articulated the following concerns in addition to those discussed in Mr. Bingham's presentation:

- ◆ Pasting text into the website can result in character set mismatches and formatting issues. This was noted in the comments matrix, and Mr. Bingham agreed to discuss this after the meeting with Mr. Napoli. As a workaround, users have the option of attaching documents rather than pasting text.

- 
- ◆ DMs that don't require in-depth coding, etc., that could be approved immediately, could be expected to perhaps establish the posting date as the implementation date. The .mil version of the website does not allow this. Mr. Bingham took an action to determine whether the posting date can be used as the implementation date.

## VERSIONING WORKSHOP (CONTINUED)

Mr. Gore began the second versioning workshop session with a recap of the first session. The original proposal for the 315N (not yet formally approved by the DTEB) was that the baseline (version 1.0) will not include DMs 910 or 874, but version 1.1 will include both. In general, a version would consist of one or more DMs that trading partners agree to implement in a reasonable time. The versioning becomes a mechanism by which systems can advertise when they'll implement particular functionality.

Currently no system has agreed to implement DMs 910 or 874 to the 315N. IGC has agreed to receive the 315N. It is in the process of implementing, and will complete both DMs by 11 July 2011. LIBD is strongly considering implementing the 315N, and if they do, they'll implement both DMs. That is an argument to include both DMs in version 1.1, however since some senders may not implement both DMs, there is an equally compelling argument to place each DM into a different version. This resulted in a circular conversation similar to the first versioning session wherein the group discussed the theoretical approach to versioning. The following points highlight the items covered in the discussion:

- ◆ DTEB could survey systems to see what they can implement before assigning versions, but this could result in undue waits to finalize versions.
- ◆ In many cases, including that of the 315N, we have viable transactions regardless of whether we implement multiple DMs. In addition, all three of these data elements are conditional. The DMs simply add an element that already has a place even if not a specific data code. On the other hand, some changes *must* be implemented for systems to advance to the next version.
- ◆ The question arose as to why we need two trading partners to agree, as long as at least one system will send out the transaction (e.g. LOGSA ignores the parts they don't need and takes what they need). One reason is that new trading partners may choose to implement based on an assumption that others are using information from particular versions. This is an argument for having only one version on the Web. On the other hand, the 856A is an example of why we need agreement: when receiving information from one node and sending it to the next, if one system drops unneeded data there may be an issue if the next system needs it. Also, different systems have different implementation timelines.

- 
- ◆ Currently we put every DM in a separate version. We publish the standard in one document, with one version. Systems need to coordinate. Those who need certain data need to talk to the data providers. In practice, however, versioning came about precisely because systems have not coordinated.
  - ◆ To some extent, this conversation addresses the improper notion of versioning the system rather than the convention. The root of the problem is not versioning per se, but rather implementing ICs in a timely fashion. If PMs can agree on dates, versioning disappears as an issue. A viable approach may be to update the version of the document, saying that the DTEB has published more DMs. Senders are currently picking and choosing what to implement and send (e.g. including segments that USTRANSCOM doesn't use, such as in the 214A).
  - ◆ The group acknowledged the need—and Mr. Will confirmed that it would be filled—for a list on the DTEB website describing all the DMs that pertain to each IC version. On a related note, the group agreed on the need to list each involved system's transactional capabilities and versioning status on the site.
  - ◆ Ms. Thompson related a DLA Logistics Standards Management Office example: When LOGSA needs a new transaction set, they do samples from DAAS. If it's not in the standard that DLA Logistics Standards Management Office has created, they ask DLA Logistics Standards Management Office to provide it. The DLA Logistics Standards Management Office website contains a list of the approved DMs. Those that are unapproved are tracked by DM number, with status of "pending." Ron Broadfoot, USTRANSCOM IDE/GTN Convergence (Amx Inc), added that for IGC, when the DM comes out IGC does an impact study. Those that do have an impact are presented to the CCB, which decides whether to push the DM to a sustainment release, or (if it's a greater level of effort and an unfunded requirement) report it back to the originator. If it becomes a requirement, IGC releases it as a version release.
  - ◆ Mr. Will posited that if a system implements a portion of a version, it may still claim to have implemented the version, because all data elements are conditional. Mr. Napoli disagreed, noting that when ICs are published, the data elements are conditional, but not *optional*. An example is DM 874, for which the TTN must be included if it is a unit move. To send a message without it would be non-compliant with that condition.
  - ◆ The question arose as to whether DM status is based on approval or implementation. Three DM statuses were suggested—awaiting vote, approved, and implemented. Mr. Will responded that the DTEB is versioning ICs rather than DMs, and that DMs would not be included unless approved. Bill James, LMI, added that if we attempt to impose an implementation date with the approval, the process will come to a standstill. An example of the overall quandary is the 858B. DSS, in attempting to implement, suggested three DMs that they

---

could implement quickly. FACTS did the same thing with three separate DMs, but they couldn't implement DSS's until a year later, and vice versa with DSS relative to FACTS. This again leads to the question of what the version is. At present, these DMs are all in the published IC.

- ◆ Placing each DM into a different version would help systems implement only that which they need, however it could lead to unmanageable numbers of versions, which would lead to implementation issues. Mr. Napoli referenced a previous study where he documented an example that resulted in 36 versions of an IC. In addition, some systems have stated that they can't deal with more than one version at a time.
- ◆ Many organizations would like to implement, but have other priorities that prevent them from doing so. It boils down to funding, but there are other issues. If we add approved DMs to the IC and provide the developer some information relative to the impact of the requirement, it can help prioritize efforts. The IC needs to tell the minimum one needs to continue doing business.
- ◆ Other options include publishing one new version of the IC quarterly or annually. The drawback to rigid adherence to an arbitrary schedule would be that sometimes changes need to go out more quickly.
- ◆ Since the IC version and system version are different issues, to some extent the IC version may be immaterial. As an example, for ICs that are already in production, such as the 858R, LOGSA reviews the changes to see whether they impact LOGSA's current implementation before deciding on a course of action. The focus is keeping abreast of the impact of the changes.

After much conversation regarding the above, the participants agreed to articulate the following list of versioning options for further consideration:

- 1) Each new individual approved DM constitutes a new non-cumulative IC version.
- 2) DMs will be collected periodically to create a new version (specified number of DMs or interval of months).
- 3) Each IC is totally cumulative as of its publication date.
- 4) Versions are only published for DMs that are implemented by at least two or more trading partners (may have DMs that aren't used).
  - SDDC preference
- 5) Versions are created as IC trading partners emerge.
- 6) Publish only one version with all approved DMs and allow trading partners to choose which DMs they implement

---

Note: consider how to update administratively multiple IC versions.

Mr. Will took an action to poll the community's preferences for the above options.

Mr. Will took an action to communicate to the community the request to have PMs ask their CCBs prioritize all the DMs under consideration since their last CCB meeting. Though this will not determine implementation dates, it will give trading partners an idea of each other's priorities.

Many incomplete DMs are appearing that haven't been vetted by the functional community. The new process, which requires functional approval at the outset, may require more time than before. Previous timeframes typically have not been long enough to obtain proper comprehensive feedback.

## ACTION ITEMS

1. Ms. Lopez Cruz to send Brent Bingham her comment about including document URLs in the auto-generated emails from DTEB website changes.
2. Mr. Bingham to address offline the notion of including the URLs in the auto-generated emails from DTEB website changes.
3. Mr. Bingham to investigate whether DTEB website users can input an implementation date that is the same as the day they're inputting the DM implementation information.
4. Mr. Bingham to confirm the cutover timing.
5. Mr. Doyle to examine contract to determine whether an SDDC carrier advisory can announce the website cutover.
6. Mr. Bingham to investigate possibility of redirecting users to an area on the public page that provides access info, with a note mentioning the need to have an account (issue of carrier contracts referencing the DTEB website).
7. Mr. Bingham to send email announcing the cutover to all known DTEB users.
8. USTRANSCOM J6 to survey the DTEB community's preferences on the versioning options.
9. Mr. Will to communicate to the community the request to have PMs ask their CCBs prioritize all the DMs under consideration since their last CCB meeting. Though this will not determine implementation dates, it will give trading partners an idea of each other's priorities.
10. Mr. Gore to ensure that the LMI data dump for the new DTEB website includes all the user email addresses.

---

## ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Bellack asked that participants review the minutes from the June 2010 meeting for approval at tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Gore thanked the group for attending, reminded everyone of the start time and agenda for the 14 December meeting, and announced that the 14 December DCO URL will reflect the 14th in the body of the URL as opposed to today's date.

---

## Defense Transportation Electronic Business Committee

### Meeting Minutes

14 DECEMBER 2010

## REVIEW OF MINUTES

Mr. Will remarked that the custom is to open the second day of the multi-day DTEB meetings with a review of the minutes from the previous meeting (note: this is not from the 13 December portion of the current meeting, but rather the full 8 November Synchronization Task Group meeting). Mr. Will asked for feedback, comments, or corrections for the minutes. With none offered, a motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes as written.

## REPSHIP UPDATE

Jared Andrews, LMI, updated the group on REPSHIP (Report of Shipment) activities. On background, there is an OSD initiative to automate the REPSHIP and receipt process for Nuclear Weapons Related Materiel. REPSHIP provides advance notice of a sensitive inbound shipment. The REPSHIP requirement includes a corresponding notice that the consignee has received the REPSHIP Due-In notice, and an additional receipt notice that goes to the shipper to let him/her know that the shipment arrived in the correct quantity at the right place and time. The initiative has been underway for a year, and participation has been limited to two major shipper systems and IGC.

CMOS and DSS are exchanging Due-Ins at several locations. Three to four months ago, they discovered an issue; the Concept of Operations stated that for multiple-consignee shipments, the origin shipper would send an 856A documenting the entire container to each consignee, even though each only received their individual items from the container. Several months ago, DSS and CMOS considered an option to send tailored 856As to each consignee instead. CMOS had programmed that way. DSS is still awaiting direction from DLA HQ for DSS to make those changes.

Annette Griffin, DLA HQ Acting Chief Transportation Policy, noted that the proposed changes would have to be approved by the Configuration Control Board (CCB) because they were neither an agreed change nor part of the original agreement. On that basis, they are not included for implementation at this point. Dennis Kochert, DLA Information Operations, responded that though the arrangement was not part of original CONOPS, the current practice was impractical, so CMOS decided to send individual 856As to each consignee. Consensus was that HQ DLA should agree and generate a system change request for DSS.

Ms. Griffin added that it could be placed into consideration for the version 12.1 release, but it may be too late to include in version 12.1 development. The requirement

---

may therefore have to be vetted through the CCB for inclusion in the version 12.2 release. GFM's CCB recently met and ranked automated REPSHIP/receipt in their top 10 projects to pursue.

Air Force HQ and DLA are the main proponents of the follow-on receipt from the last transshipment node to the final consignee. It has the support of the Arms, Ammunition, and Explosive (AA&E) working group, who agree that this is the right way to go for REPSHIP policy. The DTR proposed change says that:

“The final transshipment node at OCONUS or CONUS activities including the APOD and SPOD must transmit a follow-on REPSHIP to the ultimate consignee to ensure the most recent RDD and carrier information is advanced on these shipments.”

The proposed DTR change request is going to Gary Conklin (USTRANSCOM J5/4) for coordination, and should come out soon for formal coordination. Jim Wakeley, HQ AF/A4LM, added that the Air Force is preparing it in coordination with Mr. Conklin. The Air Force has also worked directly with Air Mobility Command (AMC), who has written the requirement into their airlift foreign operations policy, so from the Air Force standpoint, the requirement is there already, but it's also wise to cover it in the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR). Mr. Wakeley added that as of 15 November, CMOS has stopped sending paper REPSHIPS to Air Force installations for Air Force shipments in the continental U.S. Thus far, it has worked well. The only issues are not with automation, but with Oracle 11G working on Hewlett-Packard servers. Occasionally it shuts down the communication processes on the servers such that they must be restarted. The biggest issue is that we put a requirement to check every two hours for inbound REPSHIP receipt notices to determine whether outbound REPSHIPS show as received at the downstream location(s), and the fixed time nature of that has caused problems. So it's administrative in nature, not the automation.

Mr. Wakeley's boss forwarded the expanded REPSHIP implementation package we discussed yesterday to General Fedder going to OSD and USTRANSCOM leadership.

## ITV/TRANSPORTATION NODAL STATUS CONOPS UPDATE

Mr. Will provided an update on Revision 3 of the ITV Transportation Nodal Status CONOPS. The latest changes were based on coordination with “Unified View (UV).” Their 2009 project was for ITV of unit moves. They selected our nodal status capability to do that. Currently they have a Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel and Facilities (DOTMLPF) Change Request (DCR) being staffed. Based on preparation of that DCR, the EDO added unit move functionality and functionality for TC-AIMS II into the CONOPS. Earlier CONOPS versions had

---

assumed a transaction push to next node model, but Revision 3 has softened it to push or pull.

Section 4 was previously a REPSHIP CONOPS, with total instructions for how to process REPSHIPS. Mr. Will didn't think that belonged in the Nodal Status CONOPS, but should stand alone., So Revision 3 does not contain some of the REPSHIP policy, procedures, and process that is not relative to the Nodal Status transactions.

We've had informal O-5-level staffing within and beyond USTRANSCOM. Revision 3 was released as an unapproved draft to accompany the UV-09 JCIDS DCR. Part of the delay was that Mr. Will was waiting for the complementary DPO Enterprise Implementation Specification (EIS) to be ready to go with it to Joint Staff formal staffing. Since EIS completion is still a ways off, Mr Will has submitted a staffing package to have the TRANSCOM J6 Director sign the CONOPS out to Joint Staff for formal staffing. The initial formal staffing will be "Planner Level Staffing." The staffing will request any ROMs for implementation that were not provided in response to the UV-09 DCR ROM request.

## SERVICE/AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES (INCLUDING MILS STATUS UPDATE)

Army G4 (Steve Lord)

- ◆ No issues as yet. Status on MILS migrations is unknown.

Marine Corps (Connie Graham)

- ◆ Marine Corps GCSS is working closely with DLA Logistics Standards Management Office, formulating the internal CONOPS on how to use DTEB transactions. Marine Corps Supply and Transportation do not appear to be communicating as of yet.
- ◆ The Marine Corps has not yet implemented any DTEB transactions, and is still in the Supply and Transportation seam transaction stage. (Mr. Wakeley indicated that they are in testing, and discussions are underway between CMOS and GCSS on the 940 and 945 outbound supply receipt transactions. They are aware that they need to move to DLMS standards including some DTEB developed seam transactions.

Air Force/CMOS (Jim Wakeley)

- ◆ The last Automated Identification Technology (AIT) global team meeting included a discussion with DLA Logistics Standards Management Office and J6 relative to the importance of data and data transactions. One of the questions was the possibility of using the 856A to replace the RFID tag informa-

---

tion CMOS currently sends the RF-ITV server to provide an update. When you “burn” a tag, you send a lot of information in a nonstandard transaction, so the question was the ability of the 856A to take the place of that non-standard transaction to allow CMOS to eliminate a transaction and help consolidate information. It’s a question for the USTRANSCOM AIT contracting team in addition to DLA Logistics Standards Management Office and DTEB.

- ◆ Frank Napoli, LMI, asked whether there was data in the RF tags that appear in the 858R bill of lading but not the 856A. Mr. Wakeley responded that that was currently unknown, thus the transactions will have to be compared to determine what might be missing and determine whether there is enough of a difference to warrant using the 858R to communicate with the RF-ITV Server rather than the 856A. The 856A is the only transaction that supports passive RFID, so this would allow the same capability for all of CMOS’s AIT correspondence. Right now there are more questions than answers. Since the Air Force is considering the 856A and 315N to address force movement based on the UV-09 DCR; the 856A is a key component of RFID implementation, and REPSHIP is part of the equation. Mr. Will noted that the effort should be to determine what is needed to accomplish the ITV Server mission. 858B TCMD data is currently in the data rich active tag. Since the 858R bill of lading is used for only CONUS shipments; and the 858B TCMD data is used for only intertheater shipments, the question is whether the ITV server and active tag should be enhanced to use the ITV data from the Nodal Status transactions which are to be provided for all shipments.

SDDC (Greg Doyle and Nancy Lopez Cruz)

- ◆ SDDC continues to work with the GFM community on the transportation mode code DM. SDDC planned to determine the impact of some codes not being in the new table, and is determining what they can agree on based on what has been provided while minimizing the impact on the proposed DM. They will be meeting soon and will update Mr. Will on the results of the meeting.

DLA (Annette Griffin)

- ◆ DLA recently had their Configuration Management Control working meeting to rank system changes for the upcoming 11.2 release. The bulk of the changes were on the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Reutilization Business Integration (RBI) program. The leadership had some concerns with implementing DTEB IC and DMs. DLA is waiting for trading partners to come on board. DLA Transportation Policy will go to the Configuration Control Board in February for approval to implement appropriate DTEB DMs and REPSHIP process changes. Implementation will probably not be before the version 11.3 release.

JFCOM (Vince Coleman)

- 
- ◆ The closure of JFCOM has been announced. There is a degree of uncertainty regarding the future, but for the time being it is business as usual. The functions will remain regardless of the organization.

## JOINT DEPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION CONFERENCE MEETING REPORT

Mr. Coleman provided an update on the November Joint Deployment Distribution Conference (JDDC) Meeting:

The JDDC Conference Report, agenda, briefs, detailed notes and each briefer from the JDDC can be accessed from the JDDC Intelink Page at [https://www.intelink.gov/wiki/Joint\\_Deployment\\_and\\_Distribution\\_Conference](https://www.intelink.gov/wiki/Joint_Deployment_and_Distribution_Conference).

The purpose of the semi-annual 3-4 November, 2010 JDDC was to bring together operations and logistics planners from the Combatant Commands, Services, and Joint Staff to identify problem areas and recommend solutions to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Joint Deployment and Distribution Enterprise (JDDE). The JDDC is jointly chaired by JFCOM (Joint Deployment Process Owner [JDPO]), USTRANSCOM (Distribution Process Owner [DPO]), and the Joint Staff J-3 and J-4.

JDPO has engaged with the COCOMS since spring 2010 to determine what JDPO can do to enhance the deployment process. JFCOM has established JDPO teams to work on the following “Top 5” problems identified from the visits:

- ◆ Deployment/redeployment processes are outdated
- ◆ Component Commanders lack E2E visibility of flow of forces/sustainment
- ◆ Current systems can’t adapt to dynamic situations
- ◆ Verbal Orders of the Commanding officer (VOCO) aren’t defined in doctrine/policy
- ◆ There are too many systems.

Mr. Will asked whether the DTEB could participate in the team, given that Due-In and Nodal Status address lack of E2E visibility. Mr. Coleman replied in the affirmative and took an action to provide Mr. Will his contact information.

The Joint Logistics Enterprise (JLE) is trying to broaden its support to integrated joint processes across the DoD in addition to interagency, multinational and non-government organizations. Colonel Kremer from the Joint Staff Joint Distribution Division is the lead.

---

Adaptive Planning & Execution (APEX) is a JOPES collaborative planning and execution system that can quickly develop plans and seamlessly transition to execution. This came about through our involvement in the Haiti recovery effort. We were putting forces there, but using different systems. Lack of ITV drove this. We couldn't effectively manage the situation. We were originally briefed that this would take the place of JOPES, but we've since received a briefing that it won't take its place, but rather act as a component of JOPES.

Joint Publication 3-35, Deployment & Redeployment Operations—at one time JP 3-35 had its own section for redeployment. JFCOM thought it would be better to infuse it through all of the 3-35 and expand the discussion of rotation rather than exist in just one part of it.

Transportation Tracking Number Status—the USTRANSCOM TTN Program Management Office stated that the TTAN/TTN will link classified force deployment planning data with unclassified schedules and movement information while preserving OPSEC. The TTN will satisfy defined requirements in JP 3-35 & CJCSM 3122.02.

Rear Admiral Smith from JFCOM provided the Joint Force Protection (JFP) Tool update. The portal provides a single, integrated force projection picture linking Joint Planning and Execution Community members at strategic and operational levels to current, authoritative, relevant force projection information (e.g. from JOPES, GSORTS, GTN).

Expeditionary Theatre Opening (ETO) Document Change Request—Mr. Pearson from JFCOM provided the JDDC with this update. JROCM 231-08, dated 3 Dec 2008, directed implementation of the ETO concept. USTRANSCOM has completed a Front End Analysis and Doctrine Review. TCJ5/4 is working with the Services to identify potential ETO Forces.

General Faulkner of the Joint Staff J4 and General Bishop from JFCOM J4 provided the following key points (questions):

- ◆ Is it time to revisit the process owner concept?
- ◆ Is there still a need for two separate process owners, i.e. DPO and JDPO?
- ◆ Can we do a better job of defining the boundaries and clarifying roles between the DPO and JDPO?
- ◆ How do we fill the vacuum on the JDPO side of the governance structure?

## 13 DECEMBER ACTION ITEM REVIEW

Dena Bellack, LMI, reviewed the action items from yesterday's 13 December meeting:

- 
1. Nancy Lopez-Cruz to send Brent Bingham her comment about including document URLs in the auto-generated emails from DTEB website changes. (Complete)
  2. Brent Bingham to address offline the notion of including the URLs in the auto-generated emails from DTEB website changes.
  3. Brent Bingham to see whether DTEB website users can input an implementation date that is the same as the day they're inputting the implementation information.
  4. Brent Bingham to confirm the cutover timing. (Complete)
  5. Greg Doyle to examine contract to determine whether an SDDC carrier advisory can announce the website cutover.
  6. Brent Bingham to investigate possibility of redirecting users to an area on the public page that provides access info, with a note mentioning the need to have an account (issue of carrier contracts referencing the DTEB website).
  7. Brent Bingham to send email announcing the cutover to all known DTEB users. (Complete)
  8. USTRANSCOM J6 AD to craft a message asking system PMs to have their CCBs prioritize all the DMs that have emerged since their last CCB.
  9. USTRANSCOM J6 to survey the DTEB community's preferences on the versioning options.
  10. Harry Gore to ensure that the LMI data dump for the new DTEB website includes all the user email addresses. (Complete)

Mr. Doyle noted that we should work with USTRANSCOM Acquisition Directorate before sending anything out to carriers. Changes affecting carrier obligations would have to be handled contractually. SDDC could send the advisory, but the decision to have them do it is out of our purview. Changes to contractually-stipulated hardcoded URLs could possibly be construed as material change. Mr. Bingham will work with Mr. Doyle to get clarity on this issue.

Ms. Bellack and Mr. Gore will send the minutes for the 13 and 14 December meetings through the DTEB listserv.

## 14 DECEMBER ACTION ITEMS

1. Vince Coleman to provide John Will JFCOM initiative contact information.

- 
2. Brent Bingham to work with Mr. Doyle to get clarity on whether carriers can be directed to alternative URLs for DTEB issues without contractual ramifications.
  3. Dena Bellack and Harry Gore to send the minutes for the 13 and 14 December meetings through the DTEB listserv.

## ADJOURNMENT

The participants agreed to adjourn the meeting after the action item review. Mr. Bingham, Mr. Will, and Mr. Gore stayed after to discuss DTEB website cutover timeline and details. The next meeting will be in conjunction with the next DDCOI meeting in the Scott AFB area in early March on dates to be determined.