

**CATALOGING USER SURVEY
HQ CASC
BATTLE CREEK, MI
PREPARED BY TED STEPHANS
1986**

A: SURVEY

The following procedures were used to evaluate the responses:

1. Where respondents did not identify their logistics function, their responses were discarded.
2. Respondents were allowed to provide more than one comment in question 1. Therefore the number of responses may exceed the number of respondents to the question.
3. Any respondent who chooses not to respond to any one question is excluded from the total count for that question only. For example, there 132 respondents who identified their function as Cataloging and Standardization. However, when asked whether they are familiar with the uses of RNCC and RNVC, only 123 provided a response (108 circled "yes" and 15 circled "no"). The number of "yes" responses and "no" responses to that specific question, rather than to the 132 Cataloging and Standardization activities who responded to the questionnaire. This was also done to exclude respondents who commented "**we don't know what these codes mean and don't see any use for them**" as explained below.
4. Any other comments or responses provided by respondents who circled comment 2a: "**we do not know what these codes are and do not see any use for them**" were disregarded. Any further comment from this group are considered without value.
5. Only additional comments that were considered significant and/or relevant were recorded.
6. Private contractors were not included in the count. However, their responses are on file.
7. Comments, descriptions of problems encountered, and suggestions were printed together.

OBSERVATIONS:

1. Some respondents seems to have refused to respond to some questions as evidenced by the sequence of their responses. They skipped to the next question after they answered the previous ones.
2. A number of respondents failed to answer the questions at the back of the questionnaire. Maybe I should have indicated that there was a continuation on the next page.

TABULATION:

Cataloging and Standardization

Respondents: 132

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
6 or **5%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to be able to use them.**
11 or **8%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
101 or 77%
 - d. Other comments.
17 or 13%
2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 123 Yes 108 or 88% No 15 or 12%
3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 122 Yes 109 or 89% No 13 or 11%
4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 117 Yes 84 or 72% No 33 or 28%
5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 109 Yes 26 or 24% No 83 or 76%
6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 97 Yes 10 or 10% No 87 or 90%

Competition Advocate

Respondents 28

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
6 or **21%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
3 or **11%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
8 or 29%
 - d. Other comments.
12 or **43%**

2. Are you familiar with their uses?

Respondents 21 Yes 16 or 76% No 5 or **24%**

3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?

Respondents 22 Yes 15 or 68% No 7 or **32%**

4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?

Respondents 16 Yes 11 or 69% No 5 or **31%**

5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?

Respondents 17 Yes 6 or **35%** No 11 or 65%

6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?

Respondents 18 Yes 3 or 19% No 13 or 81%

Procurement/Acquisition

Respondents 97

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
49 or **51%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
10 or **10%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
27 or 26%
 - d. Other comments.
13 or 13%

2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 44 Yes 31 or 70% No 13 or **30%**

3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 47 Yes 33 or 70% No 14 or **30%**

4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 35 Yes 18 or 51% No 17 or **49%**

5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 35 Yes 4 or 11% No 31 or 89%

6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 44 Yes 15 or 34% No 29 or 66%

Item Managers

Respondents 314

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
139 or **44%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
85 or **27%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
69 or 22%
 - d. Other comments.
19 or 6%
2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 166 Yes 91 or 55% No 75 or **45%**
3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 172 Yes 90 or 52% No 82 or **48%**
4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 133 Yes 60 or 45% No 73 or **55%**
5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 126 Yes 19 or 15% No 107 or 85%
6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 126 Yes 12 or 10% No 114 or 90%

Retail/Base Supply Operations

Respondents 353

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
136 or **39%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
88 or **25%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
94 or 27%
 - d. Other comments.
32 or 9%
2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 199 Yes 127 or 64% No 72 or **36%**
3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 216 Yes 124 or 57% No 92 or **43%**
4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 182 Yes 104 or 57% No 78 or **43%**
5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 177 Yes 29 or 16% No 146 or 64%
6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 176 Yes 23 or 13% No 153 or 87%

User/Supply Customer

Respondents 1038

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
574 or **55%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
228 or **22%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
178 or 17%
 - d. Other comments.
72 or 7%

2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 545 Yes 262 or 48% No 263 or **52%**

3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 465 Yes 140 or 30% No 325 or **70%**

4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 426 Yes 182 or **43%** No 246 or **57%**

5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 313 Yes 59 or **19%** No 254 or 81%

6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 286 Yes 34 or 12% No 252 or 88%

Other

Respondents 29

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them .**
11 or **38%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
9 or **31%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
9 or 31%
 - d. Other comments.
1 or 3%

2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 20 Yes 12 or 60% No 8 or **40%**

3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 21 Yes 12 or 57% **No** 9 or **43%**

4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 19 Yes 9 or 47% **No** 10 or **53%**

5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 18 **Yes** 6 or **6%** No 17 or 94%

6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 19 Yes 3 or 16% No 16 or 64%

Overall Total

Respondents 1,991

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?
 - a. **Don't know what the codes mean and don't see any use for them.**
581 or **48%**
 - b. Codes seem to be important but **don't know enough to use them.**
434 or **22%**
 - c. Codes are important and use them routinely.
486 or 24%
 - d. Other comments.
166 or 8%
2. Are you familiar with their uses?
Respondents 1,118 Yes 647 or 58% No 471 or **42%**
3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?
Respondents 1,065 Yes 523 or 49% **No 542 or 51%**
4. Do you think the definitions are clear enough?
Respondents 930 Yes 468 or 50% **No 462 or 50%**
5. Did you encounter any problem arising from their use?
Respondents 795 **Yes 144 or 18%** No 651 or 82%
6. Do you have any suggestion to change, add or delete any code?
Respondents 764 Yes 100 or 13% No 684 or 67%

SUMMARY

The following summarizes the responses to the key questions in the questionnaire that are important to attaining the objective of this survey:

1. Which of the following comments apply to you?

a. **We don't know what the codes are and do not see any use for them.**

(1) Cataloging and Standardization	5%
(2) Competition Advocate	21%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	51%
(4) Item Management	44%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	39%
(6) User/Supply Customer	55%
(7) Others	38%

OVERALL 46%

b. They seem important to our operation but we **don't know enough to be able to use them.**

(1) Cataloging and Standardization	6%
(2) Competition Advocate	11%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	10%
(4) Item Management	27%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	25%
(6) User/Supply Customer	22%
(7) Others	31%

OVERALL 22%

c. Codes are important and we use them routinely in our operation.

(1) Cataloging and Standardization	77%
(2) Competition Advocate	29%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	16%
(4) Item Management	22%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	27%
(6) User/Supply Customer	17%
(7) Others	31%

OVERALL 24%

2. Are you familiar with their uses?	YES%	NO%
(1) Cataloging and Standardization	86%	12%
(2) Competition Advocate	76%	24%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	70%	30%
(4) Item Management	55%	45%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	64%	36%
(6) User/Supply Customer	48%	52%
(7) Others	60%	40%
OVERALL	58%	42%
3. Do you take them into consideration during your research?		
(1) Cataloging and Standardization	89%	11%
(2) Competition Advocate	88%	32%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	70%	30%
(4) Item Management	52%	48%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	57%	43%
(6) User/Supply Customer	30%	70%
(7) Others	57%	43%
OVERALL	49%	51%
4. Do you think the definitions of the RNCC and RNVC are sufficiently clear for you to understand?		
(1) Cataloging and Standardization	72%	28%
(2) Competition Advocate	69%	31%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	51%	49%
(4) Item Management	45%	55%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	57%	43%
(6) User/Supply Customer	43%	57%
(7) Others	47%	53%
OVERALL	50%	50%

EVALUATION

1. The objective of the RNCC/RNVC questionnaire is to determine:
 - a. How important are the codes to each field activities.
 - b. Who routinely use the codes.
 - c. How much the users understand the codes.
 - d. What needs to be done about the codes (e.g., clarify the definitions, add more or reduce the number of codes, etc.)

2. The number of responses from each category of logistics function is highly representative of their number that might be encountered in the field. ***The highest number of respondents, 1,033 or 52%, came from the user level and the least, 28% or 1%, from the Competition Advocate.*** However, in terms of overall response to the questionnaire it is very poor. Of the over 12,000 copies mailed out, only 1,991 or 17% were returned. Nevertheless, the responses are indicative of what the personnel thinks of the RNCC and RNVC. The 1,991 respondents are broken down as follows:

(1) Cataloging and Standardization	132 or 7%
(2) Competition Advocate	26 or 1%
(3) Procurement/Acquisition	97 or 5%
(4) Item Management	314 or 16%
(5) Retail/Base Supply	353 or 18%
(6) User/Supply Customer	1,036 or 52%
(7) Others	29 or 1%

3. From the data gathered it is readily apparent that ***only a minority of the organizations in the logistics chain give importance, and probably even credence to the RNCCs and RNVCs.*** I would say a 90% positive response to any positive comment (e.g., 90% responding "we know what the codes are and use them routinely in our operation", or 90% responding that the "definitions are clear") would be a good indicator. However, that is *not* the case. The best responses obtained was from the activities identifying themselves as Cataloging and Standardization activities. Eighty-eight percent said that they are familiar with the uses of the codes and 89% said consider these codes during their research. ***It is extremely obvious that the RNCCs and RNVCs do not get enough attention.*** For example, 48% of the total respondents indicated they don't what the codes mean and don't see any use for them. ***This group includes 5% from the cataloging activities who assign these codes and 21% from the Competition Advocate who claim they use these codes to identify qualified vendors and products for the item of supply.***

4. I think the root of the problem is in the definition of the RNCCS and RNVCs. When asked whether the definitions are clear enough for the users to understand, a mere 72% of the catalogers answered yes. Overall, only 50% of the respondents think the definitions are clear enough. Also, of the total 90 written comments, 43 or 48% complained about the definition/explanation of the codes. This is an extremely poor ratio if we expect field activities to pay attention to these codes.

5. In conclusion, I feel there is not enough use of the RNCCs and RNVCs with two most probable explanations. One, these codes may not be that important to most field activities after all. Another, these codes might be important but *there is not much understanding and/or credibility* in order to gain appropriate attention from the users of the Federal Supply Catalogs. I personally feel it is because of the latter as supported by the statistics gathered and the prevalence of comments about the lack of clarity in the definitions. A list of the comments received is attached.

A: COMMENTS

DCSC Cat Stndz - def of RNCC/RNVC on the cover letter inadequate to expect good feedback. Definition should equal those in the MCRL.

- a. Need RNCC for non-government spec stnd
- b. Need new RNVC for informative ref nos.
- c. Need RNCC for international/NATO country specs and stnd

RL/Bs Sup-RNCC and RNVC should be separated more distinctly to differentiate one from the other. Definition should be more specific.

Rtl/Bs Sup-The combinations of codes ISC, RNVC, RNCC requires too much time to analyze. There are too many combinations to remember. AFP 72-5 explains the use, **however they are much too complicated.**

SM-ALC/XRS-Codes are important, but seldom have the time to use them.

AFPRO/EP/DET 49-Could know more about the codes. Need more detailed explanation.

OO-ALC/MMBPME-Works on the MCRLs on a daily basis but are not aware of the definitions or applicability of RNCC/RNVC.

OO-ALC/MMFD-Knows what the codes are but don't use them - never had any need to.

SM-ALC/MMRT-Limited usage.

Rtl/Bs Sup-Need definition of RNCC D.

3345 SUPS/LGSM-**Definitions are very confusing.**

Rewrite definitions to be understood by most users.

FB6201-**Designate items in two ways only, either procureable or obsolete.**

Md USAFA/LGSMD-**Hard to find sources for the military developed items.**

Delete codes and use clear text message.

Vermont ANG-**Definition of RNVC is easy to understand but RNCC is confusing .**

3419MW/LGSD-**Use less codes, Identifying or Non-Identifying .**

WR-ALC/Rtl/Bs Sup-**Definition of RNVC is vague.**

380AMS/MAAP-**Need more explanation of the codes and their uses, and where we could obtain more info for further research to assist in getting hard to find items.**

Det, BMD SATAF/RM-Codes are OK but description needs to be out in front of the MCRL.

3330DR5/MACML-**Expand on the definition of these codes.**

SM-ALC/CRX-**Delete code and use additional digit at the end of the NSN for the codes.**

Det1, CEVS (SAC)-**Cannot understand the need for the codes.**

428ME/LGSMR-Discrepancy between ML-C and the MCRL. E.g. MCRL might say obsolete and ML-C would have AAC D. Why not use the AAC instead of the RNCC and RNVC to make things simpler.

191CAMS-**A little more information would clear the definition .**

Det1, 1365AVS-**Codes are too complex and too many variables.**

WPAFB, Deputy for F-16-**Simplify codes for users.**

124TAC Recon Go (ANG)/LGS-**Need better explanation of the codes.**

3532 USAF Recruiting Sc-**Need shorter definition and easier to understand.**

319SVS/SVO-**Simplify definition and add more details.**

62AMS/MAAP-**Definition does not say anything.**

AFCSC/MMILC-Don't see any reason for the codes. ISC does the job.

Wisconsin ANG-Add codes in the AFM 67-1.

Meg Log Loring AFB-**Need training to understand the codes.**

Hq 111TASG, Penn ANG-**Codes are contradictory and confusing.**

RAMS/MAAD, Travis AFB-**Never noticed the codes until the telecon with LOSA.**

7CRS/MACP, Bergstrom AFB-**Thanks for letting know there are uses for these codes.**

363AVS/LGS, Hickam AFB-**Wrong items received in the past due probably to lack of understanding of the codes.**

81CAM/MAAF, Selfridge ANGB-**RNVCs not reliable. Codes are vague and difficult to understand.**

325 TTS, Tyndall AFB-**Apply more common sense in the definition.**

86 TAG/CAMS New Castle DE-**Use plain everyday language in the definition.**

Eur Tech Ops Area, APO NY-**Too complicated for man/user/customer level. Good only at IM level.**

FMS/MAAL, Reese AFB-AAC tells all I need to know.

SAC/LGM, Offut NE-Works good as is.

ALC/MM-Develop a single coding system to replace both codes. Code should indicate the most acceptable to the least acceptable.

168 TAC FTR GP, Tucson AZ-**Because of the questionnaire we did some research and found out how helpful the codes could be.**

97BMW/LGSCX, Blytheville AR-**Definitions are too complicated. Found the codes to be inaccurate sometimes. Sometimes fiche says one thing but conversation with the IM reveals different info. Give some examples of how each code applies.**

199IGS/LGSM, TSGT Larson, Eilson AFB AR - **have problems with depot cancelling a requisition for an item with RNVC 2 and RNCC 2. Doesn't make sense unless the people loading these codes are in error.**

42AMS/MAAP, Loring AFB - RNVCs are clear but **RNCCs are not easy to understand.**

Retail/Base Supply - **Need clear definition and info on use of these codes.**

Hq 475ABW (PACAF)/LGSM - **Terminology is unfamiliar.**

83Sups/LGSC - **Coding is inaccurate.**

633SUPS/LGSCD - **Provide better definition of the codes.**

161TAC FTR GP/LGS, IN ANG - **Some of the codes are inaccurate. We are turning away from them.**

318FIS/MAMM. McChord AFB WA - **Don't think the codes are significant. Acft spares doesn't have that much variance.**

OO-ALC/MMA - **Codes do not identify needed info accurately.**

SA-ALC/CRV - **Would be glad to see standardization between the services. Codes are useful if assigned right.**

Depot Maintenance - **Cataloging seems contradictory at times.**

2803ABG/DSSCD, Newark AFS, CT - **are 6 months old when received and codes change by that time and therefore inaccurate. There we don't use it.**

DISC

Allow use of RNVCs other than 9 with RNCC D since a Drawing Reference Number is important to be added as a relationship reference to a specific item of supply. Bernadine Scott, DISC-SIBB.

RNCC 3 has been confused with meaning manufacturer of the item as opposed to the design control. This could be clarified or add code for manufacturer.

Add code that means Mfr of item of supply, but not design control.

Delete RNVC altogether since 99% of the time it is a 2.

When used with a multiple item of supply, the validity of various combinations can be confusing.

When several RNCCs and RNVCs are in one NSN, the proper combination of these are determined by the II type. This can lead to confusion especially when local management decisions vary with the published requirements.

Recommend reduction of RNCCs to 2 codes only, primary reference and secondary reference, and eliminate RNVC in its entirety.

Definition of RNCC 3 seems to clash with the definition of RNCC 7 the way they are used in DISC-SIAB, Ed Toolin, x3087.

Add a RNCC to reflect a Reference Number that the reference number is made from.

Have difficulty understanding terminology used in the definitions .

Definitions would be easier to understand if written in standard English not government language.

Definitions overlap and does not differentiate one code from the other.

SA-ALC/CREER-Problem with source controlled parts. Prime is not listed as potential source, only the vendor.

--Problem with interpretation of RNVC/RNCC 9/5 being used as a reason for not listing a prime contractor as an approved source. Both prime and vendor should be listed as qualified source.

WR-ALC/CRV-If these code were clarified, consistent and correct, possibly they could be of use.

SA-ALC/CR-Need code to identify proprietary rights.

Due to inaccurate coding I don't have a valid use for them.

Questionnaire would be more effective if addressed to E/S and IM.

4106MW/LGSCX-Less code with clearer meaning would be more useful.

934TAC ALFT GP/LGS-Need fewer codes.

631 CSG/DAPD-Hard to understand.

833SUPS/LGSCW-1-RNCC/VC definition not specific enough.

60MAW/LGSC-Not clear and hard to understand.

SM-ALC-MMCBEB(2) - Need simply worded definition with a concise description

of purpose and use.

SA-ALC/CRV-Respondents to this questionnaire who do not know these codes and their meanings and do not see any use for these codes cannot be employing proper research techniques and cannot be producing acceptable research results. -- Simplification/clarification of codes and their explanations would aid in retention of definition.

SA-ALC/MMIRAA-Definition not clear to the average equipment specialist. -- Reduce RNVC to codes 1 and 2 only and RNCC to codes 3 and 5 only.

Need clear explanation of codes and emphasize their importance.

3360AMS/MAAP-Need more education on how to use these codes.

2164TSS/LGGS-Can't decipher the codes.

6501RS/TIRMS-Codes has very little significance to the average user but probably useful to management personnel.

Det 12 2006TSG/LGCM-Need explanations of the codes in a separate fiche with each Federal Catalog Publications.

2176TSG/LGS-Need better definition and explanation of each use. Base Supply thinks they are used only in the manufacturing process and not for the identification of item. Explanation should be based on user.