

TPPS Oversight Council Minutes

Date: July 17th, 2012 – 0830 to 1530 ET
Place: Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Transportation Policy) – Alexandria, VA

This document contains information exempt from mandatory disclosure under the FOIA. Exemptions AP3.2.1.1.2 and AP3.2.1.1.5 apply. See <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/520001r.pdf> for additional information.

Opening Remarks – TPPS Co-chairs

- OSD [McNulty] opened up the meeting by requesting an open discussion on recommendations on how to make the Bi-weekly Automated Process Conference Call more effective.

Proposed Bi-weekly Tuesday Meeting Agenda

New Accounts

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] presented a proposed change to the bi-weekly meeting agenda. He suggested that the format for the agenda should be changed to a PowerPoint presentation instead of a color-coded Word document.
- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] explained that the purpose of presenting new account updates is to provide the service area POCs with a status update on the account setup process and address action items. Oftentimes, there are disconnects between the service area, US Bank, DFAS, and other parties involved in the new account setup process. Therefore it helps if all the updates are vetted through one team who monitors and presents account setup updates to the POCs.
- US Bank [Webb] agreed that new account updates are worthwhile as the help desk often receives new account requests from users who are unfamiliar with the process.

BRAC and Closed Accounts

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] reported that on occasion accounts that need to be closed do not actually get closed until a much later time. This poses a risk as transactions could post to these accounts. Therefore, providing a routine status updates on closed accounts to the service area POCs and communicating planned closed accounts is important. Additionally, a forwarding account is needed for closed accounts in the event that there are residual transactions after the account is closed.
- US Bank [Webb] added that having a forwarding account for a closed account will be particularly important when the DoD regionalizes HHG accounts. When a site shuts down, US Bank needs approval from DFAS before actions can be taken to close the account. However, a plan is need to ensure the account balance is reconciled before closure and the forwarding account is aware of residual transactions. A certifying officer is responsible for reconciling the balance and cannot depart his or her position until the account balance is zero. By having a forwarding account, US Bank will know who to redirect the carriers in the event a transaction needs to be paid.
- Navy [Jones] stated that the requirements and transfer of responsibilities for the certifying officer when a site is closed needs to be documented. There is no

documented standard procedure for closing an account and forwarding account setup. Even though an account balance is zero, the TSP still has the right to charge the account. The council also has to consider record retention for auditability.

- GSA [Jack] commented that the guidance needs to be developed from the user's perspective.
- OSD [McNulty] suggested that the closed account process that is codified should be transparent.
- OSD [McNulty] asked if it is worthwhile to the services to report accounts that have not had activity. DFAS IBM [Akinmade] responded that this information is tracked and reported to the service POCs as they are identified. US Bank [Webb] added that US Bank tracks this as well.

****OSD [McNulty] responded that he will work with Tim Vandagriff to develop standard operating procedures on the BRAC and closed account process through the ICWG. He will also look to see where the ICWG fits into this process as far as auditability is concerned. The issue will also be addressed in the Road Show that is coming up soon, which will share the "best of breed" with all DoD organizations.**

FRT and HHG Metrics Reporting

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] explained that the metrics reports show an overview of how the transactions were processed through the automated payment process so that the services can work towards improving electronic percentages.
- OSD [McNulty] inquired if it is possible to trace transactions to determine which electronic transactions were paid manually. DFAS IBM [Akinmade] confirmed that it is doable but requires input from DFAS.
- US Bank [Webb] brought to attention that the electronic percentages on the metrics charts are misleading. They do not show electronic transactions that were paid manually by DFAS. The services need to focus on the backend payment processing percentages at the account level and research why an electronic transaction was paid manually and identify the source of the issue as most are unaware. He implored the sites to research the true cost of transactions that were paid manually.
- DFAS [Soderlund] conveyed that DFAS is making an effort to research and minimize the errors that cause an electronic transaction to be paid manually by going to various sites and providing training sessions. Previously the focus was electronic processing; now the focus is on process improvement.
- Navy [Jones] commented that DFAS provides them with post payment reporting which has been beneficial as the Navy, through research, has been able to process more electronic disbursements. The Navy was able to identify offenders at the agency level and issues with their ERP implementation.
- Navy [Jones] explained that when an electronic transaction is paid manually, the entire invoice is impacted thus further adding to the cost of manual payment processing.
- USAF [Perron] asked if it is possible for the metrics to provide issues with a transaction or invoice because without another level of detail, the services are unable to fix issues. Navy [Jones] responded that the metrics only points you to the direction where the problem lies; the service has conduct additional research.

****DFAS IBM [Akinmade] to work with DFAS [Soderlund] to obtain post payment reporting information..**

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] suggested that the frequency for the Automated Payment Process meeting be changed to monthly instead of bi-weekly format. A monthly meeting would provide a better picture of the account statuses as some metrics are only available monthly. US Bank [Webb] commented that they can provide some metrics residing with US Bank bi-weekly if needed.
- Air Force [Perron], Navy [Jones], Army [Taylor] and USMC [Jean] concurred with a monthly meeting format. OSD [McNulty] agreed that a monthly meeting is a good idea once the necessary data is provided so that the services have time to work issues.

Late Certification

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] recommended identifying the accounts that certify late by service.
- DFAS [Soderlund] explained that the guidance differs in the DTR citing both calendar days and government business days.
- US Bank [Webb] stated that this is a policy issue that the TPPS Council needs to address. The contract states calendar days.

****OSD [McNulty] will review discrepancy in how different policy documents define the number of days before a site is considered late in certification and work to standardize policy.**

Unlinked E-Bills

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] recommended identifying sites that use unlinked e-bills on a monthly basis. The plan is to include the site name and account number in the report so the services can clearly identify the sites and potential trends.
- OSD [McNulty] explained that the purpose of this report is not to identify culprits but to highlight issues to be worked.
- US Bank [Webb] suggested using the last five digits of the account number on the report to protect account information.

Incremental Data Load and Other Issues

- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] summarized the slides to explain the type of information that is included in the incremental load data and other issues sections.
- DFAS IBM [Akinmade] also discussed suggestions made by DLA (Morrow) in previous meetings to take over responsibilities of perhaps hosting the ICWG calls. He states that IBM has no problems with such responsibility but certain constraints do need to be worked out before such task can come to fruition. DFAS IBM [Akinmade] talked about resource limitation on the IBM team which is already a hindrance to taking on additional work. He also alluded to the scope of the IBM contract being a limiting factor as well perhaps considering that the ICWG meetings delves into a lot of areas that aren't within the scope of work that IBM currently provides contractually.

****DFAS IBM [Akinmade] to discuss with TPPS co-chairs, Tim McNulty and Ken Soderlund, IBM's role in the ICWG.**

- OSD [McNulty] responded by acknowledging all that was said and recommended perhaps the Council put off any such discussion until the new TPPS Contract has been awarded.
- OSD [McNulty] did acknowledge that funding has been obtained to move forward with ICWG efforts such as analyzing pre-payment reviews and data mining but OSD is working to write up the contract.

****TPPS Council to provide feedback on potential agenda items for Automated Payment Process conference call.**

US Bank Update – Global Payments Network

US Bank Team

- US Bank [Webb] stated that Richard Sinavong will be taking over Grainne Fennell's position in Europe.

Updates

- US Bank [Webb] indicated that US Bank has provided DFAS the annual data storage bill through September 30, 2012 to apportion to the Services. Coast Guard and Department of State are paid up through May. If the contract is renewed, the storage bill would continue.
- Phase 3 rollout of Non Temp Storage began last week and Phase 4 is anticipated to begin in August; ideally clean-up of transactions would occur in September.
- Navy [Jones] asked about the status of reimbursements to US Bank. US Bank [Webb] responded that there are issues; this is provided in the delinquency report. Also, PPI will be waived for the initial phase.

Payment Manager

- US Bank [Webb] explained that they are working to transition freight users to Payment Manger as a result of DoD's request to move away from a client install environment. Although there is no definite deadline, Old Transportation will be sunset and New Transportation will be replaced by Payment Manager which is more user-friendly. The proposed Payment Manager rollout and training schedule by service is provided in the slides.
- US Bank [Webb] reviewed the new features of Payment Manager that can be customized to each user's needs; Payment Manager was also enhanced to increase speed.
- US Bank would like to target October 1 to have all freight users transitioned to Payment Manager. He continued by stating that once Payment Manager is rolled out after October 1, users will only have the option to use Payment Manager.
- US Bank [Webb] will communicate directly once the rollout and training schedule are approved and provide status updates.

****DFAS [Soderlund] requested US Bank [Webb] to add DFAS to the September 6th and October 4th training for Payment Manager.**

- SDDC [Patterson] alluded to some internal challenges with their Ocean shipments that they already discussed with the Bank. Part of such problems consists of latency times and processing speed of the current software being utilized. He inquired about software fixes deployed within Payment Manger that might help fix some of their issues.

****SDDC [Patterson] requested a meeting with US Bank to discuss issues with payment processing within Payment Manager.**

- US Bank [Webb] indicated that Microsoft will no longer support Internet Explorer 6 (IE6) therefore US Bank is monitoring sites that use IE6 and communicating recommended upgrades.
- Navy [Limjoco] stated that currently, new account users who have not yet been trained on Payment Manager do not have access to New Transportation and must request access through the help desk. US Bank [Webb] responded that in

January, the TPPS Council agreed to provide new users access only to Payment Manager to prevent unnecessary training on New Transportation. USAF [Perron] commented that new USAF users receive training only on Payment Manager.

US Bank Training

- US Bank [Webb] stated that since the annual Financial Supply Chain Conference was cancelled this year, US Bank can provide other training opportunities. The contract states that a conference mode of training has to be provided; if the DoD elects for an alternative option, then there needs to be correspondence amongst all parties. US Bank [Webb] brainstormed training ideas including strategically placed regionalized mobile training, using facilities at installations or make training service specific.
- Navy [Jones] agrees with regional training as long as it's well communicated.
- OSD [McNulty] agreed the regional training idea; however he declared that no decision on training can be made at this point due to the upcoming contract deadline. Once the new contract is awarded, this topic can be revisited to determine funding and best approach.
- US Bank [Webb] stated that any opportunities to leverage other conferences for in-person training will be communicated but we need to ensure participation and feedback if US Bank is investing in creating training opportunities.
- DFAS [Soderlund] concurs with US Bank's recommended training topics.

Account Review Plan

- US Bank [Webb] stated that he and Jeff Lineberger will be performing annual face-to-face detailed account reviews to analyze spend, carriers, outliers, PPI, etc. The account reviews can be tailored based on the services' needs. Internally, account reviews are also conducted quarterly to identify issues, trends, rolling balances, etc.
- Navy [Jones] inquired about the status of the Data Analysis tool. US Bank [Webb] responded that US Bank is migrating to Cognos and so there will be no new adjustments to WebFocus because of the investment in Cognos. Reports created in New Transportation can be moved over to Payment Manager. However if users are on Old Transportation, they will have to recreate their reports in Payment Manager.
- US Bank [Webb] added that once the DoD database passes certification, US Bank will work with the TPPS Co-Chairs to gain approval on a Cognos roll out schedule. US Bank would like to identify "super" users for testing before rolling it out to the rest of the DoD community. Cognos is already rolled out to commercial users and so training is already developed.

Offsets

- US Bank [Webb] explained that when GSA conducts an offset, the recouped funds are sent to the Treasury and not the services. In order for the services to recoup these funds, they need to identify the carriers who continuously bill the government erroneously.
- GSA [Jack] communicated that GSA has a methodology using special issue codes within TARPS where they identify the different types of overcharges and can provide that information if needed. The services can contact GSA to obtain reports on their overcharges.

****OSD [McNulty] would like the services to provide the TPPS Council the date**

and time for when they will setup a meeting with GSA to acquire their overcharges information.

- US Bank [Garcia] conveyed that they receive requests on the overcharges as well and that oftentimes the claims go to different departments within the TSP. Is it possible to add the codes as the offsets eBills are created so that US Bank can include that information for the TSPs as well as provide it during the account reviews? GSA [Jack] replied that GSA does not have the resources to provide this information as it would be very time consuming. Currently, GSA performs this in a manual environment. The TSPs are aware of their overcharges because GSA issues a notice of overcharges to the TSPs to allow them an opportunity to dispute the offset. If there were an automated process to pull from TARPS, then GSA would be able to provide the special issue code detail. However, until the EDI process is automated or GSA is caught-up, GSA does not see it necessary to go into that level of detail in the offset eBill process.
- OSD [McNulty] asked if it was possible for the service POCs to be notified as well when GSA issues a notice of overcharges to a TSP. OSD [Beecroft] responded that a report would be best because using letters can be disjointed.
- OSD [Beecroft] suggested that a quarterly report across-DoD would be helpful.
- ****GSA [Jack] to provide the quarterly report to OSD [McNulty and Beecroft].**
- US Bank [Garcia] added that they can run a report based on carrier information or site trends and add it in the metrics for the account reviews, but only GSA can provide the detail to the granularity of the special issue codes.
- GSA [Jack] added that not all offsets are performed in the system; for example, some TSPs send manual checks. There are ways that the carriers can be stopped from submitting overcharges such as reporting habitual offenders to SDDC for the carrier review process who can then suspend services.
- GSA [Scott] relayed that the TSPs receive a Notice of Overcharges. They have 30 days to take action or dispute. If they do not take any action within 30 days, GSA will issue a Demand Letter which includes the collector's contact information regarding their overcharges. After another 30 days, GSA sends a listing of all their outstanding overdue overcharges. Essentially, the TSPs have 90 days to address their overcharges before the offsets process begins. If GSA is unable to recoup funds through the offsets process, the TSP is turned over to Treasury. Dispute resolution is headed by George Thomas on the GSA team.
- USCG [Jones] commented that all payments must be certified by a certifying officer. There are several players contributing to the issue and so training is critical. This could be mitigated on the front end.
- OSD [Beecroft] brought to attention "The Do Not Pay Initiative" by the Bureau of the Public Debt of Treasury which is designed to reduce improper payments by facilitating paying agencies (National, State, or Local Governments disbursing federal funds) access to critical information to identify and prevent improper payments. This initiative has not been rolled out yet but DFAS is aware. The information provided through this initiative may help impact future decisions. DFAS also uses Business Activity Monitoring (BAM) which conducts pre-payment reviews of commercial pay. GSA can provide POC information on both of these initiatives

Direct Procurement (DPM)

- US Bank [Webb] advised that there is room for improvement with DPM as it is manual today. He welcomed the opportunity to discuss ways on reducing costs

with DPM and see what role US Bank can play. He recommended a session with SME's to white board the DPM process and develop an improved process that leverages current NTS features. US Bank (Webb) believes this area holds the greatest potential for savings.

- OSD [McNulty] stated that DPM cannot be further discussed until a decision is made on the contract.

Ocean

- OSD [McNulty] provided a brief background on Ocean. There was a detailed plan to bring Ocean in to the Automated Payment Process. However there were issues with Phase 1 outbound containers. As a result, Phases 2 and 3 have been on hold.
- US Bank [Webb] talked about the SDDC initiatives completed and next steps in the process for Ocean. The DoD is moving towards the matching model as it is the commercial best practice. He talked about a standard EDI 310 that US Bank is working on to allow matching model for all carriers. He stated that the EDI is probably about a week to ten 10 days from being completed to the point where all parties can provide thumbs up. US Bank will continue to work on improving the process in relation to the SDDC initiatives during their weekly meetings.

Delinquent Accounts

- US Bank [Webb] noted that the chart on the slide is as of 7/9/2012 and that the balances for the delinquent accounts are not current.
- Navy [Jones] commented that the accounts listed on the slides are closed accounts. Navy is working with Corps of Engineers and AAFES to clear up the delinquent balances as DFAS cannot pay these charges. Also, some of the charges are old and are now surfacing now that there is no new business. Navy is creating standard operating procedures for monitoring accounts on a monthly basis.

Questions

- Navy [Gottlick] asked US Bank [Webb] when he expects Payment Manager to be completely web-based.
****US Bank [Webb] is unsure and will provide an updated to the TPPS Council.**
- Navy [Limjoco] asked if it is possible to make the notes feature a mandatory block when creating eBills. US Bank [Lineberger] responded that the notes section is just an added feature.

Navy Improvement Initiatives – Processes and Controls for Third Party Payments

- Navy [Jones] opened the presentation discussing the Navy updates and following issues:
- Invalid TACS
 - Navy is working on requirements to have a feeder of all valid TACs submitted to Navy's ERP system. Navy is also working to have a complete download of all valid TACs.
 - US Bank [Webb] asked if there will be a validation process. Navy [Jones] responded that they will only receive a feed of those TACs are that designated as valid in TGET. US Bank (Webb) indicated that some Army invoices are received by DFAS that have not been certified by a properly authorized certification officer.

- Navy [Jones] commented that invalid TACs and LOAs are getting in the way of the Navy process and suspending transactions, causing delinquent payments.
- Invalid Accounting Records
 - Once there is a valid TAC, there must be some funding associated to the TAC; if not, then one is noncompliant with policy.
- Pre-Validations Not Approved
 - Navy is currently researching into different areas where pre-validations did not receive approval in a timely manner. Pre-validations are related more towards the manual transactions.
- PSIs with Ongoing Carrying Balances
 - Navy is researching statements with ongoing carrying balances. In some instances, payments have been made but have not yet posted. Navy is working to train their certifying officers on how to reconcile their own invoices.
- PSIs with Payments Greater than the New Balance
 - Navy is working with DFAS to identify potential overpayments and improve the process so that invoices are paid in a timely manner and without overpayment.
 - Navy [Jones] asked if there are payments received by US Bank that have not reconciled to an account. US Bank [Webb] responded that this can happen when account posting information is not received.
 - Navy [Jones] commented that these payments must be reconciled to an account. US Bank [Webb] responded that when there are unnamed dollars, US Bank goes to DFAS to trouble shoot as well as conduct research internally.
 - Navy [Jones] added that there needs to be a formal process which documents how to address unnamed dollars. US Bank [Webb] stated that they are open to suggestions for new ideas on this process.
 - OSD [McNulty] inquired about the frequency of unnamed dollars and availability of a written process. US Bank [Webb] responded that the current process is to reach out to DFAS. Currently, there are no unnamed dollars.
 - US Bank [Webb] indicated that there are credits in the systems. US Bank and DFAS actively review and reconcile credit balances.
 - OSD [McNulty] asked if the DoD moved away from partial payments. US Bank [Webb] explained that partial payments still occur and are due to invalid or unfunded LOAs which contributes to rolling balances. The Department of State and USCG had a similar issue but changed their payment model to a "Pay and Chase" model where they pay US Bank and recoup the funding later to be able to earn rebates as opposed to paying PPI.
 - Navy [Jones] commented that DFAS has an agreement with Navy not to short pay invoices. OSD [McNulty] asked if the other Services can have this agreement with DFAS. DFAS [Soderlund] explained the ability to make partial payments is tied to the Entitlement System. One Pay does not allow partial payments. The thought process behind partial payments is that the interest will be less with partial payments versus accruing interest on the full amount while waiting for funds to be obligated.

- Navy [Jones] explained that it is an automated process where One Pay checks for the obligation nightly in Navy's ERP accounting system, STARS, to determine if the obligation is sufficient.
- Navy [Jones] added that the Navy is working with all certifying officers to ensure the review of the invoices is correct. DFAS has agreed to work with Navy and ensure that all the balances are within 60 days of being in balance. Navy is developing standard operating procedures to inform the certifying officers how to reconcile the invoice once the account is within 60 days.
- DFAS [Soderlund] commented that they are working with US Bank to review obligations. US Bank provides a daily file and DFAS reviews the open summary invoices to able to review and monitor obligations before certification.

Standardization

- Certifying Officer Training Events
 - Navy [Jones] stated that they are enforcing and requiring every certifying officer to take training annually and report completion. US Bank [Webb] asked if DFAS IBM monitors certifying officer training. DFAS IBM [Akinmade] responded that the team provides certifying officer training when accounts are first set up. DFAS [Soderlund] added that additional certifying officer training is available online; it is only required once.
 - US Bank [Webb] explained that per regulation, annual certification is required and so how are the services monitoring this requirement. DFAS [Soderlund] responded that they currently monitor certifications and ensure that the DD Form 577s are current and on record. They maintain hard copies as well as upload copies to Electronic Documents Access (EDA). However, it is up to the services to monitor the annual training requirement.
 - DLA [Applegate] explained they manage the yearly certification training requirement by setting certifying officer accounts to expire one year after the certification training is completed.
 - OSD [McNulty] commented that it would be helpful to provide the rationale as to the importance of certifying officer training and responsibilities.
- Override Process in DPS
 - Navy [Jones] found that DPS has override functionality which is believed to be causing issues with invalid TACs and LOAs. Navy plans to approach the TPPS Council in hopes that DPS can help clean up data before it's pushed to the TPPS.
 - US Bank [Webb] asked who at DPS is working this issue.
****Navy [Jones] is unsure but will provide a POC who helps to clean up DPS data before they get into US Bank Freight Payment System.**
- Counselor Training on TACs/LOAs
 - Navy [Jones] is working to train their counselors to ensure they validate TACs in TGET and recognize LOAs from other services and agencies. They have POCs for all the services and agencies for when they receive invalid LOAs. For Personal Property, it's been decided that they will not approve shipments until they have a valid TAC/LOA. Counselors have agreed to work with the service member or civilian to resolve issues.

- Best Practices – Balancing the SI
 - Navy is working with DFAS to bring all statements within a 60 day balance to ensure that there is no carrying balance on the accounts beyond 60 days.
 - Navy has asked their COs to review the open statement at least twice a week to push transactions to electronic processing and ensure that the transactions are corrected before the certification date.
- Strongest Emphasis – PP/HHG
 - Navy is using lessons learned from freight and applying these to HHG to improve the HHG process.
- HHG Electronic Invoicing
 - Navy [Jones] stated that one of their major objectives is to develop SOPs to ensure that proper procedures are followed and to capture challenges. The TPPS Council needs to ensure that there are SOPs for areas that they have oversight.
 - OSD [McNulty] stated that currently, there is no inspection on SOPs except for DIT.
 - Navy [Jones] responded that much of what has been implemented is not documented to ensure that we follow a plan. These are living documents and must be continually updated especially as plans change.
 - Navy [Jones] recommended using the monthly Automated Process conference call as a forum to conduct reviews or gain concurrence if there are no major changes.
 - Since working with DFAS, Navy has been able to improve electronic percentage from ~40% to ~60%.

****OSD [McNulty] would like Navy to share lessons learned and SOPs that are being developed.**

GSA Open Actions – Transportation Audit Items for Discussion

DoD HHG Offsets

- GSA [Jack] began by providing an update on the HHG offsets process. Since June 2011, 2,910 offsets worth \$1.7M have been entered into the system of which 1,596 offsets worth \$958K have been collected.
- In Phase 1, offsets were being collected by DFAS who in turn remits the funds to GSA through the IPAC process. 448 offsets were collected by DFAS and there are 95 still outstanding with the majority refunded to another LOA or expired due to the 3 year statute of limitations which will be written off. GSA is working with DFAS to reconcile these transactions. Phase 1 is almost complete. .
- GSA would like to inform the TPPS Council that the offsets EDI transmission functionality is imperative for the follow-on contract. US Bank [Webb] responded that to support this functionality, US Bank must expend funds to enhance the system to support the EDI transmission. US Bank [Webb] recommended using the TPPS Configuration Management Board once implemented to help prioritize enhancements once the contract is awarded.

Long Term Data Retention

- GSA [Jack] explained that there are 3 versions of the EDI 810. The old EDI 810 for freight is working; however 3 additional data elements were needed for HHG. US Bank provided a new EDI 810 for HHG which upon comparison to the original, GSA concluded was missing a lot of the data. US Bank [Webb] stated

that US Bank recently provided the latest version of the EDI 810 which may require additional adjustments.

- US Bank [Webb] explained that internally they've been working on a new file construct for HHG with delivery anticipated in the 3rd quarter. In the meantime, US Bank is working on providing the data to GSA in the EDI 810 format.
- OSD [McNulty] explained that the current contract requires US Bank to store freight and HHG data for 16 months with a storage charge for data beyond 16 months. OSD – Transportation Policy decided not to invest in a separate data repository and asked GSA to store the data per federal mandate. As a result, they have been working on an EDI process to receive data from the last 10 years. Data up to 16 months has been received for freight. However, HHG is on a different platform and so the data cannot be transferred in the same manner as freight. With the new contract, the provider will be required to store data for 6 years 3 months to meet mandated requirements. IGC may be used to store data.
- US Bank [Webb] added that GSA recently contacted US Bank to receive additional freight data.
- GSA [Jack] is requesting one EDI 810 format for freight and HHG. US Bank [Webb] responded that a singular format is not feasible because GSA is requesting additional data elements which require significant development work.
- GSA [Jack] explained that the data is not used for audits but to fulfill the long term data retention federally mandated requirements.

Status of Ongoing Actions with Award of New Contract.

- US Bank [Webb] explained that a transition period does not exist in the current contract. The offsets capability could be negotiated for the transition period. US Bank would no longer collect offsets beyond the transition period if the contract is awarded to another supplier since the account numbers are owned by US Bank.
- US Bank [Webb] added that when an account closed, any offset eBills applied to the account will not be collected because there is no activity. This needs to be taken into consideration with the HHG regionalization.
- GSA [Jack] asked if the sites have been informed regarding the potential of a different vendor. OSD [McNulty] responded that if there is a change in vendor, there is a transition period for up to one year which will need to be negotiated.
- GSA [Jack] commented that they are not auditing DTCL freight invoices. Also, auditors now have access to CAPS-W and IBIS to audit the Ocean bills in Syncada; the remainder are not being audited. Currently, there is no post payment review process for DTCL and Ocean shipments.
- OSD [McNulty] added that SDDC currently conducts prepayment reviews for Ocean shipments. Also, an IG report on DTCL was due out on July 9th but has not yet been finalized.
- GSA [Jack] requested information on civilian agencies billing through Syncada and to be notified as new accounts are created. DFAS and the agency must grant approval for GSA to access account information.

****DFAS IBM to add GSA to Automated Process conference call distribution.**

TPPS Oversight Council Minutes

Date: July 18, 201 – 0900 to 1200 ET
Place: Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Transportation Policy) – Alexandria, VA

This document contains information exempt from mandatory disclosure under the FOIA. Exemptions AP3.2.1.1.2 and AP3.2.1.1.5 apply. See <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/520001r.pdf> for additional information.

Navy/Marine Corps PCS Auditable Transportation Cost Initiative

Goals and Objectives

- USMC [Jean] began by providing a brief history on the PCS Auditable Transportation Cost Initiative and explained that the initiative arose out of the requirement to be able to provide an audit trail for PCS travels costs. The idea was to have logic that would transfer a data element from DPS to Syncada and then to the Entitlement Systems that uniquely identifies a Service Member. It was found that data populated in the Shipment Account Classification (SAC) field in DPS populates the Shorthand Alias 2 field in Syncada.
- USMC [Jean] explained that each Service Member is assigned a unique identifier, or unique Standard Document Number (SDN), which is associated to a specific Service Member's PCS orders. USMC requested that all Personal Property Shipping Offices (PPSO) enter the unique SDN in the SAC field in DPS in conjunction with the bulk TAC for the actual payment portion of the transportation costs. Users are then able to run reports in Syncada based on the unique SDN. The unique SDN would transfer to all systems and the USMC is able to provide an audit trail for travel costs associated to a Service Member.
- US Bank [Webb] asked if there is a unique SDN for each shipment type. USMC [Jean] stated that a bulk SDN is provided, in addition to the unique SDN, which identifies the shipment type.
- USMC [Jean] commented that this approach does not allow for TACs/LOAs to roll up on the Summary Invoice. US Bank [Webb] asked about the cost differential to the Services of not rolling up TACs/LOAs on the Summary Invoice. USMC [Jean] responded that transactions would still flow electronic and that the USMC is willing to absorb the cost of resulting individual line items in order to have an auditable trail.
- USMC [Jean] is proposing to the TPPS Council SCR 6771, a call logic interface between DPS and the Entitlement Systems based on Social Security Number (SSN) of the Service Member that would eliminate data entry errors by validating PCS orders, provide all data elements associated with funding and provide an audit trail of PCS costs associated to each Service Member.
- Navy [Jones] explained that their Entitlement System rolls up and disburses amount based on the BoL number which is the auditable document/amount within the Entitlement System. Navy concurs with USMC and is taking the process a step further by asking the Entitlement Systems and US Bank to include the Shorthand Alias 2 in the data feed to their Entitlement System.
- OSD [McNulty] asked if there is a link to DTS for the personal travel costs. USMC [Jean] stated that the USMC currently has an auditable trail for personal travel costs using the unique SDN. Navy [Jones] stated that Navy's DTS is

auditable as well.

- USCG [Jones] asked if all Services, like USMC, were using the SDN for PCS travel orders. USAF [Perron] states she doesn't believe they are as specific as the USMC proposal. Army [Taylor] is unsure and will have to reach out to Gene Thomas; USMC [Jean] stated that Army [Leon Smith] has been involved in the meetings. USCG [Jones] stated the USCG has a PCS working group.

****OSD [McNulty] requested for Army and USAF to provide action plan to meet FIAR audit requirement for PCS funding.**

- USMC [Gray] stated that bulk obligations for Freight and HHG should not be used as the funding cannot be tracked. USMC's interim process for transportation is to obligate the bulk amount but have detailed data to support the obligation.
- OSD [McNulty] inquired about a formal process to share lessons learned within the FM community. OSD [Beecroft] indicated that there may be sharing of information through the FIAR office.

****USMC [Jean] to provide list of independent findings/lessons learned to be distributed through the TPPS Council.**

- OSD [McNulty] stated that there should be a formalized process to share information throughout the community; lessons learned will be provided within the meeting minutes or as a separate document.
- A question was asked by one of the phone attendees whether USMC doing anything to tie the TCNs back to the SDN for organic shipments? USMC [Jean] stated that while FACTS is working to make system changes (including removing SSNs from the TCN), there have been early discussions to change the TCN (currently contains SSNs) to a unique 9 character data element created from the SDN (last 9 characters are the unique portion of the SDN) for organic shipments. However, USMC's efforts are currently focused on getting the information from DPS to Syncada.
- USMC [Imler] explained that USMC's process is unique in that their Entitlement System and Personnel System communicate. When an SDN is created in the Entitlement System, it's also created in the Personnel System so that the user can search on the unique SDN and tie it back to the Service Member based on when a Service Member's PCS orders were issued.
- USCG [Jones] explained that USCG has similar capability except they use an employee ID number to tie PCS costs back to a specific Service Member.
- Navy [Jones] is requesting concurrence/support from TPPS Council to help prioritize SCR 6771 when presented to the systems owners.

DoD Master Lease Contract

- USMC [Jean] began by explaining that SDDC issued an inquiry about DoD Master Lease Contract, specifically if leasing contracts for containers can be paid through the TPPS. USMC's understanding was that the TPPS is used to pay only transportation costs.
- US Bank [Webb] responded that US Bank has had several discussions with the USTRANSCOM Acquisitions Directorate (TCAQ) regarding payment of the DoD Master Lead Contract through the TPPS and concluded that it could be done under current umbrella contract. US Bank can create additional accounts specifically for containers where users would be able to pay leasing contracts electronically, conduct reporting on these accounts and provide an audit trail. US

Bank is actively working with TCAQ on this issue and believed this was being included in the RFP. Once released, US Bank can provide the information to the TPPS Council.

- USMC [Jean] asked if further action was required of USMC to move forward.
- ****OSD [McNulty] responded that TCAQ needs to provide guidance on container management.**
- OSD [McNulty] asked if the individual Services are involved with their own leasing contracts for containers. USMC [Jean] responded that the USMC does have its own container management team but these containers separate from the Universal Services Contract 07 (USC07).

Standard Financial Information Structure (SFIS)

2005 SFIS Memorandum

- FACTS [Smith] began by bringing to attention a memorandum issued by the Under Secretary of Defense [Comptroller] which requires systems containing financial information to be SFIS compliant by 2007.
- OSD [McNulty] asked if the SFIS policy is linked to the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan. FACTS [Smith] explained that SFIS will help the DoD become auditable. OSD [McNulty] stated that these efforts should either be parallel or a joint effort.

Requirement

- NAVSUP [Wenner] commented that FACTS is a repository for financial data and is not the authoritative source. However, the OSD Investment Review Board (IRB) is refusing to certify funds until the FACTS PMO provides a plan on when FACTS will become SFIS compliant. This is the second year that FACTS has not been compliant with this requirement. FACTS PMO would like for the authoritative data source, Transportation Global Edit Table (TGET), to become SFIS compliant because FACTS can receive data in any form. Once TGET becomes SFIS compliant, all feeder systems will become SFIS compliant.
- FACTS [Smith] explained that SFIS compliance is required by any system that supports financial transactions. Also, these systems must be able to capture and transmit SFIS data. TGET is coded to FA2 Implementation Convention (IC) and is not SFIS compliant.

Investment Review Board

- USAF [Perron] asked if TGET has plans to become SFIS compliant. DCMO [Shannon] explained that the OSD IRB certified TGET's funding in previous years to allow more time for TGET to develop a plan to become SFIS compliant.
- FACTS [Smith] commented that the FACTS PMO needs to understand TGET's plan to become SFIS compliant which would then transmit SFIS data to feeder systems including FACTS and Syncada. Navy [Jones] asked for clarification on whether all of TGET's customers would need to become SFIS compliant. DCMO [Shannon] explained that TGET has legacy and core customers; all core customers must become SFIS compliant. FACTS [Smith] added that at minimum, this requirement impacts the transportation, FM and acquisition communities.

Systems Impacted

- FACTS [Smith] stated that they performed a comparison between SFIS and FA2

and found differences between data elements which would require changes within the various systems in order to become compliant. Also, there are edits that are not being performed; this potential impact is unknown.

- DCMO responded that the SFIS requirement is being tracked through the OSD IRB. OSD IRB is performing a validation check again all systems that must be SFIS compliant and found that systems are compliant with SFIS business rules and configuration requirements but are not exchanging SFIS compliant data. OSD IRB released a draft memo regarding the Standard Line of Accounting (SLOA) initiative, a key enterprise-wide initiative which addresses auditability and interoperability within the FM functional strategy to standardize the financial data exchange in support of SFIS policy. This memo allows each component 120 days to provide an implementation plan.
- OSD [McNulty] asked if the FIAR office is aware of the SLOA initiative. Responses suggest that the SLOA initiative has been coordinated through the Director of FIAR, Joe Quinn. FIAR and SFIS are two distinct initiatives; SFIS ensures that the underlying accounting data is in accordance with USSGL and Treasury Financial Manual whereas FIAR focuses on internal controls of SFIS systems. Both initiatives are necessary for the DoD to become fully auditable.
- FACTS [Smith] is looking to TPPS Council for way ahead on how to devise a plan and appropriate POCs to begin discussions on how to become SFIS compliant as well as transmit SFIS data to feeder systems US Bank and STARS – One Pay. A plan is needed by April 2013 when FACTS goes before the OSD IRB for certification.
- USMC [Gray] commented that if the foundation is to be able to link back to Treasury, SABRS receives a daily feed from CMET. Navy [Jones] responded that CMET is no longer considered compliant.
- Navy [Jones] asked if any systems are currently SFIS compliant. DEAMS was offered up as one of such system.
- USMC [Gray] commented that it would be helpful if there was a list of systems that were SFIS compliant and those that need to become SFIS compliant in order to understand impact given that all interfacing systems must meet this requirement. DCMO [Shannon] responded that once the SLOA initiative memo is released, all components will be required to submit an implementation plan. All individual plans will be consolidated into a master schedule so that system owners can align their implementation efforts based on plans submitted by feeder systems.
- OSD [McNulty] commented that non-military systems such as US Bank could be impacted as well. DCMO [Shannon] stated they would need to understand US Bank's role in the process given that US Bank does not fall under the jurisdiction of the OSD IRB. The purpose of the initiative is to supplement or replace the current data standard. US Bank [Webb] stated that the freight payment system is a COTS product with pass-through capability but must be provided requirements. Navy [Jones] added that the initiative potentially impacts the way US Bank maps data.
- FACTS [Smith] added that any major system changes require Research Development Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) funds; FACTS is unsure where this funding will come from.

Synchronization

- OSD [McNulty] stated that components must also address funding within their

plans. DCMO [Shannon] added that DCMO and Comptroller's office will work closely with system owners to analyze interface specifications, determine scope, create a component level plan and synchronize the master scheduler.

****DCMO to set up meeting with TGET-BEIS Program Manager [Denise Provenzale], DFAS [Soderlund] and Enterprise Solutions and Standards Board to discuss the requirement for TGET and assess impact across the board.**

Internal Controls Working Group (ICWG) Update

Data Mining

- OSD [McNulty] commented that there have been discussions that IGC may support data mining efforts.

Way Ahead

- OSD [McNulty] commented that Navy previously led the ICWG which later transitioned to Richard Morrow. Any change in ICWG leadership is on hold until further notice as the emphasis of the ICWG could change due to the new contract. In the interim, OSD is trying to obtain funding to obtain contractor support for the ICWG.

TPPS Configuration Management Board

- US Bank [Webb] agrees with the concept for a formalized process to manage inputs from the Services for the TPPS Council to vote on and prioritize. This way, US Bank would be able to evaluate high priority tasks to determine the level of effort, allocate resources appropriately and address those tasks that have more of a Service-wide impact. OSD [McNulty] commented that the monthly Implementation Status Meeting could be used to provide status updates on prioritized tasks.
- IBM [Akinmade] commented that a framework had been developed for the Configuration Management Board (CMB) and is in place. However, a true CMB requires participation from within the TPPS community. When issues are presented, there should be board members to review the issues, assess the benefits to TPPS community and vote on priority.
- IBM [Akinmade] continued that although resources are limited within the IBM team, some level of support can be provided. However, the CMB needs support from the TPPS Council to be effective. The TPPS Council needs to establish a standard to include the role players within the CMB and appropriate timelines which issues should be addressed. Also, if other CMBs exist, at what point in time are issues duplicated. The CMBs should come together to determine how to vet issues or abolish all CMBs and create a centralized CMB.

****IBM [Akinmade] to provide CMB framework to DFAS [Soderlund].**

OSD [McNulty] commented that the CMB will play a key role as the new contract is rolled out. Any additional information regarding the CMB will be shared with the TPPS Council