REPSHIP Working Group Meeting Minutes

26 AUGUST 2010

INTRODUCTION

Stakeholders from various DoD organizations and agencies met via teleconference to discuss and plan the implementation of the Due-In (856A) and Nodal Status (315N) Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Implementation Conventions (ICs) to support the Report of Shipment (REPSHIP) process for Nuclear Weapon Related Material (NWRM) and Arms, Ammunition, and Explosives (AA&E) shipments. The 856A Due-In serves as the REPSHIP message while the Nodal Status 315N serves as the REPSHIP Notice Receipt message and Shipment Unit Receipt message. The 856A and 315N ICs are available on the DTEB website at the following link: 856A and 315N ICs. In addition, the Due-In information will be provided to the Air Force's Enterprise Data Collection Layer (EDCL) using a DTEB-developed temporary XML schema.

Jared Andrews, LMI (support contractor to USTRANSCOM), facilitated the meeting.

POLICY UPDATE

At the July meeting, Mr. Andrews agreed to reach out to the AA&E Transportation Subgroup and receive their input and guidance on several REPSHIP policy related issues. The AA&E Transportation Subgroup comprises stakeholders from each of the Services, USTRANSCOM, SDDC, and DLA. The Subgroup is viewed as the owner of DTR Chapter 204 and 205 where REPSHIP policy for NWRM and AA&E is located.

Mr. Andrews presented the issues to the AA&E Transportation Subgroup at their meeting on 24 August which was held at DLA HQ (Fort Belvoir, VA). Each issue, with its corresponding discussion at the Subgroup meeting, is presented below.

1. The DTR does not currently require intermediate nodes, such as ports, to generate REPSHIPs for outbound shipments.

Mr. Andrews reported that the current Concept of Operations (CONOPS) for automating the REPSHIP process required any activity that touches shipments moving under Transportation Protective Service (TPS) to generate REPSHIPs, REP-

SHIP Confirmations, and Receipts. However, the current REPSHIP policy does not require this. The DTR policy requires that the origin shipper send REPSHIPs only to the ultimate consignee, and where possible, to the initial transshipment point, e.g., air or sea port of embarkation (POE). Mr. Andrews reported that systems which are used at intermediate nodes may be reluctant to implement an automated REPSHIP and receipt process if the DTR does not require it. Mr. Andrews asked the Subgroup whether the requirement should be added to the DTR. The Subgroup did not believe that the requirement should be added to the DTR because it would be too labor intensive for activities to generate REPSHIPs and receipts manually for every TPS shipment. However, the Subgroup did agree that systems should work toward the goal of automating the REPSHIP and receipt process between all nodes.

2. If the consignee or receiving activity arranges to pick-up the shipment from the shipping activity, is the shipping activity required to generate and send a REPSHIP to the consignee/receiving activity? Is the consignee/receiving activity required to report shipment receipt back to the shipping activity once the item is delivered to their location?

The Subgroup agreed that a REPSHIP and shipment receipt would not be required in this situation.

3. Are REPSHIPs required for unit moves? For unit moves, the deploying unit is both the consignor and the consignee so there would not be a need for the unit to send a REPSHIP to themselves; however, unit move material often moves through air or seaports (APOE/SPOE). Should the deploying unit generate and send REPSHIPs to the APOE/SPOE? If required, unit move systems such as TC-AIMS and MDSS II may have a requirement to automate the REPSHIP process.

The Subgroup was unsure if unit moves required REPSHIPs to the POE. One participant noted that the unit move community uses Installation Transportation Officer (ITO) systems, such as GFM or CMOS, to move their items to the port and added that perhaps those systems should generate the REPSHIP instead of the unit move systems. Major Erik Fagerheim, SDDC, agreed to follow-up with the unit move community and determine if there is a requirement to send REPSHIPs to ports. If it is a requirement, it should be specified in the DTR.

4. The DTR requires TOs to send NWRM shipment notifications via email to the following recipients: Origin and destination NWRM Action Officer organizational e-mail account, Munition Accountable Supply Officer, depot or contracting receiving, as appropriate. However, the DTR does not list the data elements that must be passed in the NWRM shipment notification email

Michael Hanson, Air Force, took the action to determine if the NWRM specific data elements should be added to the DTR or the Air Force Instruction (AFI).

5. The required REPSHIP data elements appear in Figure 204-8 of DTR Chapter 204 (HAZMAT). However, REPSHIPs are not required for all HAZMAT. REPSHIPs are only required for items that move under a TPS. The shipping requirements for items that require TPS are listed in DTR Chapter 205. Should Figure 204-8 be moved to Chapter 205 to make it clearer which types of material require REPSHIPs?

The Subgroup agreed that the figure should be moved to DTR Chapter 205. Betty Yanowsky, DLA, took the action to add the figure to DTR Chapter 205 and submit the new draft to USTRANSCOM J5 for formal coordination.

6. REPSHIPs must be sent manually if a receiving activity is not DLMS capable. CMOS begins a timer immediately after the REPSHIP EDI message is sent to the receiving activity. If the receiving activity's system does not report receipt of the REPSHIP message back to the shipping activity within 1 hour, then CMOS alerts the TO that they must send the REPSHIP to the receiving activity manually.

   Another method that the REPSHIP working group has discussed is creating a central table which would list all the DODAACs that are 856A/315N capable. The table would enable TOs to know beforehand if they could rely on the EDI message or had to send the REPSHIP manually.

The Subgroup agreed that systems should work to implement the first method (i.e., send the message and start a timer) noting the second method would be too difficult to implement and maintain.

7. Automated REPSHIP messages are not sent to the receiving activity until just before or right after shipment departs; therefore, the REPSHIP message cannot be used as the mechanism for performing advance planning. The DTR's advance planning guidance is as follows: "TOs must contact the destination activity to confirm they have the ability and intent to receive and secure the shipment". The DTR language implies that the shipment should not depart until positive confirmation is received. Advance planning is currently being performed via phone or email.

   Shipper systems could potentially automate the advance planning process; however, shipper systems would need direction from the policy/functional community to pursue.

The Subgroup agreed that systems should not attempt to automate the advance planning process via EDI. The Subgroup preferred that TOs continue to perform the advance planning process by phone or email.

MULTIPLE DUE-INS FOR MULTI-CONSIGNEE SHIPMENTS

This topic addressed the possible need to include a flag in the Due-In which would indicate whether the Due-In is intended for an ultimate consignee or for the transshipment point. This issue is a result CMOS's practice of generating and sending multiple Due-Ins for multi-consignee consolidated shipments. CMOS currently creates a "tailored" Due-In for each consignee within the consolidated shipment. The consignee Due-In only includes the TCNs that are actually bound for that consignee (it does not include the highest level consolidation TCN or the TCNs that are bound for other consignees). CMOS also creates a Due-In that documents the entire consolidation (i.e. includes both the highest level consolidation TCN and lower-level consignee TCNs) and transmits this Due-In to the transshipment point. Mr. Andrews noted that the REPSHIP CONOPS did not intend for systems to generate multiple Due-Ins; however, he acknowledged that the REPSHIP CONOPS was not clear in this regard. When the CONOPS was developed and published, it was envisioned that systems would only generate a single Due-In transaction that documented the entire consolidation and that the single Due-In would be sent to both the ultimate consignees and the transshipment point. It was envisioned that the consignee's system would disregard the TCNs that were not being shipped to their location and would only suspense the TCNs that were.

Mr. Andrews noted that he was concerned that GTN/IGC may have difficulty processing multiple 856As, especially if an indicator is not present to identify whether the 856A is intended for the transshipment point or the ultimate consignee. Mike Ashton, GTN/IGC, agreed that it may cause problems. Mr. Will recommended convening a meeting between GTN/IGC, DSS, CMOS, and DLA Transaction Services to discuss the issue. Mr. Andrews agreed to coordinate the meeting.

DSS, CMOS, AND DLA TRANSACTION SERVICES IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

Representatives from CMOS, DSS, and DLA Transaction Services (formerly DAASC) provided a status update on their implementation of the automated REPSHIP CONOPS.

Dennis Kochert, DSS, reported that DSS has rolled the capability out internally and that DSS is also exchanging production REPSHIP messages with several CMOS activities/locations.

Bernard Crosby, CMOS, reported that CMOS has been exchanging production REPSHIP messages with DSS activities/locations since 26 July. He added that 1000s of REPSHIP messages have been passed for CMOS to CMOS shipments.

DLA Transaction Services did not provide a report, but did respond that the Air Force's EDCL is receiving XML Due-In Notices for only one DODAAC, as planned.

IGC STATUS

Mr. Ashton reported that IGC is implementing the Due-In and plans to go live in September or October 2010. He added that potential funding for the Transportation Node Status Report (EDI 315N) has been identified and the financial reprogramming is being coordinated.

OTHER SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

John Mannino, GFM, reported that GFM is submitting the REPSHIP project to its Configuration Control Board (CCB) for consideration and prioritization.

DATA MAINTENANCE TO DUE-IN

Mr. Andrews reported that LMI recently submitted a Data Maintenance (DM) request through the DTEB website to add Military Traffic Expediting (MTX) tracking number to the Due-In transaction in support of REPSHIP. MTX tracking number is a required data element for REPSHIP messages per the DTR; however, it was omitted when the REPSHIP data elements were originally added to the Due-In transaction. Mr. Andrews noted that the voting period for the DM expired and no approval votes had been cast. Mr. Will indicated that he would vote to approve the DM and added that system implementation of the DM would be addressed at the kick-off meeting of the Synchronization Working Group.

WRAP-UP/NEXT MEETING

The next REPSHIP working group meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 23 September from 1400-1530 EDT. A dial-in number will be provided in advance.