



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

June 27, 2008

IN REPLY
REFER TO

DLMSO

MEMORANDUM FOR JOINT SMALL ARMS COORDINATING GROUP MEMBERS

SUBJECT: Joint Small Arms Coordinating Group (JSACG) Meeting, June 11, 2008

The attached minutes of subject JSACG meeting are forwarded for your information and appropriate action. The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office point of contact is Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, JSACG Chair, DSN 427-0677, (703) 767-0677, e-mail: Mary.Jane.Johnson@dla.mil.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald C. Pipp", written over a circular stamp or seal.

DONALD C. PIPP
Director
Defense Logistics Management
Standards Office

Attachment

cc:
DUSD(L&MR)SCI
Meeting attendees



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

June 27, 2008

IN REPLY
REFER TO

DLMSO

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Joint Small Arms Coordinating Group (JSACG) Meeting, June 11, 2008

The Defense Logistics Management Standards Office (DLMSO) chaired a meeting of the JSACG, June 11, 2008, at the McNamara Headquarters Complex, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The JSACG Chair, Ms. Mary Jane Johnson, facilitated the group's discussions of issues pertaining to the DOD Small Arms Serialization Program (DODSASP). The agenda is at Enclosure 1. A list of attendees is available at the JSACG Web page. Additionally, briefings and handouts provided at the meeting are available as links to the meeting agenda on the JSACG Web page at: <http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms0/Programs/Committees/JSACG/jsacg.asp>.

Brief Summary of Discussions:

1. **Combining DLSS/DLMS Manuals.** The Chair noted that recent changes in the publishing procedures of WHS may impact DLMSO publication process. Further, DLMSO currently maintains two complete sets of publications, one set for the Defense Logistics Standard System (DLSS) manuals, e.g., Military Standard Requisitioning and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP), Military Standard Transaction Reporting and Accounting Procedures (MILSTRAP), Military Standard Billing System (MILSBILLS), etc.; and one set for the Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) manuals. The process of maintaining two sets of manuals, which contain essentially the same information for different transaction formats, is resource intensive and duplicative in nature. As the DoD Components migrate to a DLMS environment, DLMSO is looking to combine the DLSS and DLMS manuals. This would require DLMSO to maintain visibility of DLSS peculiar terminology in the DLMS text where needed. In preparation for this shift in the DLMSO publication process, all DLSS code lists and formats are being moved to the DLMSO website (refer to http://www.dla.mil/j-6/dlms0/elibrary/TransFormats/140_997.asp for matrix of DLMS Supplements and their MILS equivalent with links for all applicable formats). The JSACG Chair is also the MILSTRAP Administrator, and her goal is to publish a final reissuance of MILSTRAP, which will be the baseline for combining MILSTRAP with the DLMS manual. A sample of a combined MILSTRAP/DLMS chapter for materiel receipt acknowledgement (MRA) was provided to the group to give them a feel for how a combined chapter would look. **ACTION:** DLMSO will pursue combining the MILSTRAP DODSASP chapter with DLMS in the near future, as another sample chapter to provide the group.

Attachment

2. DOD Small Arms Registry Investigation Statistics. Mr. Charles Royal, Army Logistics Support Activity (LOGSA), presented an overview of the small arms investigative inquiries processed at the DODSASP Central Registry which is maintained at LOGSA. The inquiries are received from various civil and Federal law enforcement agencies, as well as Component field offices. The statistics for FY 2007 indicated over 3,100 inquiries, with an overall match rate of 35 percent. Matches can only be achieved for items that were at some point registered on the DoD Small Arms registry. Mr. Royal's presentation reflected inquiry statistics for FY 2002 through 2007. In FY 2002 there were 3,643 inquiries. In FY 2004, the inquiries decreased to 2,140 and have remained above 2,140 in subsequent years. Mr. Royal also reported that LOGSA routinely queries the Loan and Donation Registry (items on loan or donated to organizations such as Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, law enforcement agencies, etc.) for certain small arms and related items. There have been a number of hits on this data base with a minimum number involving weapon transfers to law enforcement agencies.

3. Update on Reconciliation of Air Force Small Arms at Defense Distribution Depot Anniston Alabama (DDAA). Mr. George Gray, DLA, provided an update on the USAF small arms stored at DDAA. DDAA has the small arms storage mission for Army and Air Force. As background, Mr. Gray noted that 94,345 USAF weapons received at DDAA in 1995 were not sight verified. DLA and USAF could not reach agreement on funding for DDAA to sight verify the weapons, which DLA estimated would cost \$2.1 million in 2006. In order to address the problem, DLA is performing the sight verification process as part of the disposal process for the 71,206 weapons which USAF identified as excess for disposal. To that end, an agreement was reached last year between DLA and USAF to process 1500 disposal release lines per week. To date 29,633 of the 71,206 excess weapons have been disposed, with 41,573 remaining. In addition, there are approximately 23k weapons not identified as excess which still require sight verification. No agreement has been reached to date on the sight verification process, cost, and funding. Mr. Van Poindexter, the new USAF representative to the JSACG, indicated he will address this issue. The USAF/DLA reconciliation effort is ongoing and progress is being made.

4. Procedure for damaged weapons received at DDAA without documentation and procedure for obtaining serial numbers (SN) when the SN is illegible.

a. Procedure for damaged weapons received at DDAA without documentation.
BACKGROUND: On May 29, 2008, DLMSO participated in a teleconference with representatives from DLA, DRMS, Army, and Navy to discuss concerns with severely damaged weapons received at the DDAA with obliterated SNs. DDAA attempted to turn some of the weapons in to Defense Reutilization and Marketing Services (DRMS), with tags with handwritten SNs, however DRMS would not accept the weapons with SNs handwritten on tags. Some of the SNs on the tags appeared to represent the original weapon SN which is no longer recognizable on the weapon. DRMS indicated they had no way of knowing whether that weapon is truly the SN reflected on the tag. Initially during the telecon, the MILSTRAP Chapter 12, paragraph C12.2.3 procedures for obtaining a SN from the DOD registry when SNs were illegible were discussed, however the JSACG chair indicated the

topic would be added to the JSACG agenda for the June meeting. **DISCUSSION:** Initially included on the agenda as a problem with illegible SNs, JSACG discussion quickly determined that the bigger issue was that standard procedures were not being followed. Severely damaged weapons were being shipped to DDAA without advance notice and without any documentation. The weapons would be tossed in a box with other items that did have documentation. The weapons in question had no recognizable SN, and in some cases, based on photographs provided for JSACG review at the meeting, would require an arms expert to determine the identification of the make, model etc. The JSACG concluded that the problem appeared to stem from lack of Service enforcement of standard logistics procedures. Discussed was the responsibility of the unit to properly update the property book record and either turn in the remains of the weapon with an identifiable SN or turn in the remains of the weapon as scrap. In both cases the property book, Component Registry and DOD Registry are in sync. If the above process was properly communicated and implemented, the DRMS would receipt for the remains of a weapon with a SN or as scrap for remains of a weapon without a SN. In all cases the JSACG agreed that without the SN being engraved on the remains of the weapon at time of receipt, tags attached to the remains were unacceptable. The chair asked DLA to provide the Service JSACG representatives specific examples of weapons turned in without documentation for their Service so that they could research the problem from their Service perspective and assure that proper procedures are followed to prevent this from happening in the future. The question remained as to what should be done with the weapons already in DDAA possession. During the meeting, it was suggested that Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) procedures should apply to these unauthorized returns without proper documentation. [**SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING**, the JSACG chair discussed this approach with the DOD SDR Administrator, Ms. Ellen Hilert, but the SDR Administrator did not necessarily feel that SDR was the solution for the items in DDAA possession.]

ACTION:

- **JSACG Chair** will advise DUSD(L&MR)SCI and the Army executive Agent for Small Arms (Logistics) of the problem, due to the sensitivity of this issue.
- **JSACG** will review applicable guidance and procedures relative to this issue.
- **DLA** to provide the Service JSACG representative's specific examples of weapons returned to DDAA without proper documentation, for the Services involved.
- **Services JSACG representatives** to review information provided by DLA to assist in determining source of problem and corrective action needed. Recommend that **Service JSACG representatives** elevate problem for resolution within their Service after reviewing specific information from DLA.
- **JSACG Chair** will coordinate with the DLA and Service JSACG representatives to determine status of problem resolution and schedule a follow-on meeting specific to this issue if problem resolution is not evident and more options for resolution need to be explored.

b. Procedure for obtaining SNs when SN is illegible. During the May 29, 2008, teleconference, an Army representative indicated that when Army, acting as the DOD Registry, assigned SNs for missing/illegible numbers, they begin those SNs with 'ARM'. A Navy telecon participant mentioned Navy assigned SNs starting with 'NSCW'. The JSACG chair noted that IAW DOD MILSTRAP/DLMS procedures, the SNs were to be obtained from the DOD registry. It wasn't clear whether the 'NSCW' numbers originated with the DOD registry. At the JSACG meeting, Ms. Kathleen Row, Navy, indicated that at one time 'NSCW' numbers were obtained from Army, although it did not appear to be from the DOD Registry, but she didn't believe the 'NSCW' numbers were being assigned by Navy any longer. **ACTION:** The chair asked Navy to confirm whether or not Navy still used the 'NSCW' number. If the NSCW SNs are still being assigned, the Chair will ask for clarification on how they are used.

5. Use of asterisk (*) in weapon SNs.

a. Recently DLMSO responded to a DOD Inspector General phone call asking if DLMSO knew of a higher authority than Army Regulation (AR) 710-3 on structuring a SN, specifically the use of an asterisk (*), for the DOD Small Arms Serialization Program for confiscated foreign weapons which have unrecognizable or non-Arabic numerals as part of the weapon SN. DLMSO knows of no DOD publication offering such guidance. DLMSO's further research revealed that the requirement for the use of an asterisk in AR 710-3 was removed in February 2008. During the discussion DLMSO noted that there had been problems with DLMS transactions rejecting due to asterisks in data fields, when the asterisk is also used as a data delimiter. While asterisk would no longer be assigned to small arms SN for confiscated foreign weapons, there could still be an issue with legacy weapons in the system with asterisk in the SN.

b. SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING:

(1) Ms. Joan Shields, DLA, identified that a change was made to the Distribution Standard System (DSS) to address asterisks in the DLMS small arms transactions (DLMS 140A and 888A). DSS programs were changed to scan the SN for the 140A and the 888A, and if an * is found, then the program will set the data element separator to a HEX 1D instead of the current assignment of an *. This will allow the foreign weapons to utilize an * for their SN tracking.

(2) DLMSO determined that the DOD 4000.25-M, DLMS, Volume 1, chapter 6, paragraph C6.2.3.1.2., rules for the data element separator state that: "The value recommended by ANSI ASC X12, ASCII hexadecimal character 1D, **shall** apply for use to interchange DLMS transactions". Accordingly, in DLMS it is mandatory to use the hexadecimal character 1D rather than an asterisk for the data delimiter.

6. Draft Approved DLMS Change (ADC) 220 in Two Parts, Part I: Revise Definition for Small Arms to Address Light Weapons, and Part II: Visibility and Traceability of Captured, Confiscated or Abandoned Enemy Small Arms and Light Weapons. BACKGROUND: The JSACG chair provided draft ADC 220 to the JSACG for a final review after the 2007 JSACG meeting. No additional JSACG comments were received; however a comment was received from the proponent for DOD 4160-21-M, via

the DLA supply process review committee representative. **DISCUSSION:** The chair asked the group to review the outstanding comment, and advise no later than July 11, 2008, whether the MILSTRAP/DLMS definition should be approved as it read in draft ADC 220, or if further revision was needed to accommodate the outstanding comment which asked that caliber/millimeter cross-reference be identified and a distinctive cut-off for small arms ammunition made at .50-cal. The chair noted that the original MILSTRAP small arms definition had some caliber/millimeter information, but the JSACG intentionally removed it when revising the definition to address small arms and light weapons (SA/LW). It was also noted that the purpose of the ADC 220 definition is to define SA/LW specifically for DOD tracking and reporting requirements under the DOD SA/LW Serialization Program (DODSA/LWSP...formerly DODSASP). **ACTION:** JSACG to review draft ADC 220 SA/LW definition, and the outstanding comment, and provide the chair a recommended disposition no later than July 11, 2008.

7. Interface between Army DOD Registry and Defense Reutilization and Marketing (DRMS) Small Arms Serialization Program (SASP). Ms. Glenda Gibbs, DRMS SASP PM, presented an ongoing problem where DRMS is not receiving any MILSTRAP Document Identifier (DI) Code DSM, Weapon Serial Control Number (WSN), transactions from the Army. At one time the Army forwarded a monthly email with a file attached of DSM transactions Army generated for the month. When DRMS made a system conversion, they asked Army to submit the file on-line to DRMS. However, Army was changing their automated system at the same time and advised that they would address the file transmission issue once they completed their system transition. DRMS indicated the automated file transmission never occurred. DRMS also indicated that they believed that if the Army were to transmit DI Code DSMs to DRMS with the unit identification code (UIC) rather than the DODAAC, DAASC would not pass the transactions to DRMS because they edit on DODAAC in that field. The JSACG chair noted that the MILSTRAP DSM format allows for entry of either DODAAC or UIC. Accordingly an entry for UIC should process as a valid entry IAW with the DOD procedures. **ACTION: Army LOGSA and DLA DRMS** are jointly addressing this issue. The requirement is being reviewed and a LOGSA POC will be coordinating the effort and addressing it with the DRMS SASP PM. JSACG chair requests that Army and DRMS advise JSACG chair of progress as well as outcome and resolution, or if additional actions are required.

8. Item Unique Identification (IUID) Update. Mr. Charles Lord, UID PMO, provided the group an update on small arms marking for IUID. Mr. Lord discussed a recent report from PM Soldier Weapons indicating that 80,000 small arms have been marked by contractors at the Anniston depot so far with good results; PM JAIT is sponsoring an Arms Room Automation Project at Ft Carson; and Army is looking at a pilot program to test maintenance/IUID tools developed as an integrated approach to updating the Small Arms Data Base and the IUID Registry as one action. Current marking effort at ANAD requires technician to update the two systems separately. Mr. Gray, DLA, asked if this IUID marking function at Anniston was being performed by the maintenance depot. During this topic, Mr. Gray also noted that to date, none of the shipments of small arms received from new procurement at DDAA had IUID.

9. Question on Use of Digital Signatures. The Navy Small Arms Registry is in the process of developing an automated system to communicate small arms transactions electronically between the Crane Registry and Navy and Marine Corps activities. Since many of the transactions require signatures, the hardcopy documentation (DD Form 1348-1) is currently being faxed or scanned and forwarded to the registry. This process has proven laborious and time consuming and often leads to shipments becoming delinquent in-transit due to the time it takes to reconcile documentation errors. To improve the accuracy and timeliness of these transactions as well maintain a valid accountability trail, the designers of the system are exploring various options to incorporate the use of digital signatures linked to the individual user's Common Access Card (CAC) PKI/PKE data. A digital signature would be used to track the accountability and the authorizing official approval process in lieu of the current Responsible Officer cover letter accompanying each submittal of the DD Form 1348-1. Since the registry is not aware of a similar concept in the other services and agencies, the Navy and Marine Corps representatives, Mr. Bruce Reese and Mr. Andrew Trout, respectively, solicited the members of the JSACG for any experiences or insight with like systems that may serve as a model for implementation. No specific recommendations were available during the meeting. Mr. William Chaplow, Army, offered to provide information or a point of contact after the meeting.

10. Next meeting: The Chair thanked the group for their participation. The JSACG meets annually and next meeting will be scheduled for April 2009.

PREPARED BY:


MARY JANE JOHNSON
JSACG Chair

APPROVED:


DONALD C. PIPP
Director, DLMSO

Enclosure

AGENDA
Joint Small Arms Coordinating Group (JSACG) Meeting
 June 11, 2008, beginning at 0900
 McNamara Headquarters Complex, Conference Room 4501
 8725 John J Kingman Rd, FT Belvoir, VA 22060-6217

Topic	TOPIC	LEAD
9:00	Opening Remarks	DLMSO
1	<p>COMBINING DLSS/DLMS MANUALS Recent changes in the publishing procedures of WHS may impact DLMSO's publication of the DOD 4000.25 series of Defense Logistics Standard System (DLSS) (aka MILS) and Defense Logistics Management System (DLMS) manuals.</p> <p>Additionally, current process of maintaining 2 sets of publications (DLSS and DLMS) is resource intensive, duplicative in nature, and no longer practical. This is an opportune time to discuss combining the DLSS and DLMS Manuals.</p>	<p>DLMSO Ms. Mary Jane Johnson</p>
2	DoD Small Arms Registry Investigation Statistics	<p>Army LOGSA Mr. Charles Royal Mr. William Chaplow</p>
3	Update on Reconciliation of Air Force Small Arms at Defense Depot Anniston Alabama (DDAA).	<p>DLA Mr. George Gray</p>
4	<p>Procedure for obtaining serial numbers when serial number is obliterated/ illegible.</p> <p>Procedure for processing weapons received at DDAA without documentation.</p> <p>Discuss problem of weapons being received at Defense Distribution Depot-Anniston Alabama (DDAA) with unrecognizable serial numbers and without documentation</p>	JSACG
5	Use of asterisk (*) in weapon serial numbers.	DLMSO
6	<p>DRAFT ADC 220 (staffed by PDC 134A) in Two Parts, Part I: Revise Definitions for Small Arms to Address Light Weapons, and Part II: Visibility and Traceability of Captured, Confiscated or Abandoned Enemy Small Arms and Light Weapons.</p> <p>ADC 220 Open Issue</p>	DLMSO
7	Interface Between the Army Registry and DRMS SASP	<p>DRMS Ms. Glenda Gibbs</p>
8	Item Unique Identification (IUID) Update	<p>9:15am UID PMO Mr. Charles Lord (by phone)</p>
9	Question on Digital Signature	USN/USMC
	Adjourn	