

NEW BUSINESS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
305	Plasma TVs	American Moving and Storage Association Acquisition and Services Branch
306	Plastic Totes	American Moving and Storage Association Operations Team
307	Digital Certificates	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
308	Military Service Locators	American Moving and Storage Association Operations Team
309	Cross-filing of Rates	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
310	Item 616 (Rate Filing Procedures) – 60% Differential Cap in M/T phase	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
311	NTS Payment	American Moving and Storage Association Acquisition and Services Branch
312	Traffic Distribution	American Moving and Storage Association Personal Property Systems Team
313	JPPSO-COS Traffic Distribution	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services
314	Agent Representation	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
315	Carrier Removals	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
316	New Carrier Approvals	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
317	Carrier Approvals	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
318	Tours of Duty	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services (USAF and DA)
319	Signing of non-government forms	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
320	Long Deliveries out of SIT	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
321	Clearing Containerized Shipment	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
322	Current/Active TMA's not listed on SDDC's website	American Moving and Storage Association Policy and Business Process Team
323	Force JPPSO GBL/BL Production Failures	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services (USAF)
324	DTR-(Page IV-A-2, para n.(2)) Letters of Intent (LOI)	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
325	DTR-(Page IV-B-15) Manner of Packing (Crating)	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
326	DTR – (Page IV-B-7) - Inconvenience Claims	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Claims Services Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
327	DTR - Page IV-B-10) Pickup and Delivery Dates (Direct Delivery)	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
328	MI (9/23/03) Agenda #294 - SIT Extensions	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Services
329	DTR (Appendix N) – Transit Time Guide	Household Goods Forwarders Association Operations Team
330	DTR (Page IV B 10-12, Para V.9) Pre-Notice Pick-up/Delivery Times	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
331	DTR (Page IV O, para c) Quality Assurance (Invalidated LOIs)	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
332	DTR (Page IV B 5, para J) - In-transit Visibility	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Team
333	DTR – (Page IV 0 12-13, para 3c) Shipment Evaluation	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
334	Signed Delivery Receipts/ Inventories as Proof of Delivery	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Claims Services
335	Shuttle Transfers – Safety and Liability Concerns	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Services
336	DPM Contracts that have carrier liability of sixty cents per pound per article	Household Goods Forwarders Association Acquisition and Services Branch

ITEM: 294

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services/Operations Team

SUBJECT: Retroactive Conversion/SIT Expiration

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: There is a continuing problem with destination PPSOs not making timely decisions backed by required documentation to extend SIT on shipments prior to the authorized period of SIT expiring. The carrier has a right to know on which shipments it retains legal liability. The GBL states that SIT is authorized for up to 90 days, or more. Once the last day has passed and the base has not provided a written extension, the interstate nature of the shipment is terminated and the storage is converted to commercial storage at the member's expense. However, we have had instances of the destination PPSO advising that SIT probably will not be extended but they refuse to "convert" the shipment to member's expense until they reach the member, often after SIT has expired. This is an ongoing problem, which has been discussed at other M/I's in the past.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should once again provide guidance to all PPSO's that prior to the expiration of SIT on a shipment, they need to provide disposition instructions to the carrier, either extending the SIT for a defined period of time or converting the shipment to member expense or NTS at government expense, per DTR 406.A.2.c. This section states: "When SIT is extended beyond the first 90 days, the TO shall notify the carrier of the extension and the projected termination date. A copy of the DD Form 1857, Temporary Commercial Storage at Government Expense, or inbound arrival/expiration notice letter, if automated, will be provided to the carrier for each extended 90-day period. When a shipment remains in storage beyond the SIT entitlement period, carrier liability shall terminate at midnight of the last day of the SIT period, the PPGBL character of the shipment shall cease and the warehouse shall become the final destination of the shipment." Retroactive extensions are not permitted and PPSOs need to be reminded of that fact.

SDDC RESPONSE FROM 23 Sep 03 MI. The issue is addressed in the new DTR, which became effective 6 Aug 03. Where the current provision is that the SIT will automatically convert at the end of the specified time period, the revised provision contained in Chapter 406A.2.c states "carrier liability will terminate at midnight of the last day the carrier or warehouseman receives written notice from the TO that the entitlement has ended." This indicates affirmative action by the PPSO to terminate the SIT. Without such action, the SIT continues at government expense and the PPGBL/BL character of the shipment continues. A TMA providing clarification on what constitutes the written documentation will be provided to all PPSOs. A copy of the TMA will be placed on the MTMC Web site.

SUMMARY: SDDC and the military services will discuss this issue at the next Personal Property Coordinating Council (PPCC).

Recommend an e-mail or letter constitutes written documentation.

See Item 328

SDDC RESPONSE FROM 17 May 04 PPCC. After coordinating with GSA, TOPS, and Personal Property Systems it has been determined that one of the following options will be utilized: 1) the number of days for SIT will be removed from the GBL or 2) annotate the GBL with the maximum number of days allowed. In both cases the shipment will remain government in nature until the Transportation Office sends the carrier written notification that the shipment will be converted. The written notification will be in the form of a GBL correction notice SF1200. The only exception will be civilian shipments where the GBL will state maximum of 180 days of SIT it authorized. This will not circumvent the present rulings by service of requesting the appropriate extension for SIT conversion.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 17 May 04

ITEM: 295

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Bulky Articles

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: Item 412 in the new RSD8 has been modified so that the commercial tariff has no application for bulky items that are authorized to be shipped but do not have a charge associated with them listed in the RSD8. This goes against commercial practice in that there are commonly occurring items that should have a bulky charge (big screen TV's for example). This unfairly reduces the compensation available to the hauling agent handling such bulky articles.

RECOMMENDATION: That MTMC reinstate the language that referred to the commercial tariff for bulky items not listed in Item 412, add those items to the D-8, or explain why such charges should not be payable.

RESPONSE: In researching D-8, Item 412 based on manufacturers dimensions and shipping weight a comparison was made. Using the manufacturers dimensions the individual items were cubed and using 7 pounds per cubic foot a cube weight was established and compared to the manufacturers shipping weight to determine which was the lowest weight. In the interest of fairness either actual weight or cubed weight, whichever is the lower, was used to establish whether the individual item would be considered as a bulky item and an additional fee would apply. If the actual weight is more than the cubed weight a bulky article charge is not justified.

Regarding the questions of special handling, if an item requires special handling and is not listed in Item 412, carriers may request additional labor charges from the responsible PPSO. Additional labor can be authorized to ensure items can be moved safely and to prevent possible damage to the item(s) or injury to the moving crew. In an effort to simplify and remove confusion at the local transportation offices, bulky articles will be located in one place and that source will be the Domestic Solicitation.

Closed 23 Sep 03

SUMMARY: Industry requested an analysis of this item be provided at the 3 Mar 04, MI.

Requested analysis is attached.

Analysis on Cube VS Actual Weight

Item	Depth	Height	Width	Total Cube	Cubed @	Actual	Delta	Bulky
					7 # per cu.	Weight	7 # per cu	Item
					7 # per cu.	Weight	VS Act wt	Yes/No **
4 wheeler	78.4	42.8	46	89.33	625.28	536	-89.28	Y
4 wheeler	57.6	31.8	35.6	37.74	264.15	269	4.85	N
4 wheeler	42.4	24.4	29.2	17.48	122.38	193	70.62	N
WT -89 VS. 76 Majority of WT rules Bulky article fee would apply								
Riding Tractor	75.8	40.2	54	95.22	666.57	959	292.43	N
Riding Tractor	75.8	40.2	48	84.64	592.50	859	266.50	N
Bulky article fee DOES NOT apply								
Snowmobile	118	48	36	118.00	826.00	460	-366.00	Y
Snowmobile	118	48	36	118.00	826.00	507	-319.00	Y
Golf Cart	115	56	56	208.70	1460.93	1150	-310.93	Y
Golf Cart	92.6	46.5	48.6	121.10	847.72	560	-287.72	Y
Bulky article fee would apply								
2 Horse Trailer	120	72	84	420.00	2940.00	Data NA	#VALUE!	N
2 Horse Trailer	138	72	90	517.50	3622.50	Data NA	#VALUE!	N
2 Horse Trailer	173	96	96	922.67	6458.67	2780	-3678.67	Y
Utility Trailer	36	96	144	288.00	2016.00	610	-1406.00	Y

All the above Trailers ARE not an Entitlement.

Item	Depth	Height	Width	Total Cube	Cubed @	Actual	Delta	Bulky
					7 # per cu.	Weight	7 # per cu	Item
					7 # per cu.	Weight	VS Act wt	Yes/No **
Jet Ski 1 Person	89.8	29.6	27.6	42.46	297.19	351	53.81	N
Jet Ski 2 Person	113.8	44.4	40.2	117.55	822.82	613	-209.82	Y
Jet Ski 3 Person	122.8	46.5	40.2	132.84	929.89	717	-212.89	Y
Majority of WT qualifies, Bulky article fee would apply								
Scull 12.5	149	45	45	174.61	1222.27	88	-1134.27	Y
Kayak 12.4	148	24	13.5	27.75	194.25	40	-154.25	Y
Canoe 13	156	42	42	159.25	1114.75	55	-1059.75	Y
Canoe 13.10	166	44	44	185.98	1301.87	58	-1243.87	Y
Canoe 14	168	48	31	144.67	1012.67	39	-973.67	Y
Jon Boat 14	168	56	15	81.67	571.67	144	-427.67	Y
Jon Boat 10	120	56	15	58.33	408.33	116	-292.33	Y
Jon Boat 14	168	58	25	140.97	986.81	151	-835.81	Y
Jon Boat 13.7	163	56	22	116.21	813.49	125	-688.49	Y
Dingy 7.11	95	47	18	46.51	325.57	75	-250.57	Y
Dingy 8.3	99	52	21	62.56	437.94	71	-366.94	Y
Dingy 10	120	36	61	152.50	1067.50	111	-956.50	Y
Dingy 12.2	146	72	24	146.00	1022.00	149	-873.00	Y

Bulky article fee would apply

Big Screen TV 40"	35	38	16	12.31	86	93	7	N
Big Screen TV 48"	49	45	24	30.63	214	172	-42	Y
Big Screen TV 55"	50	50.5	26.25	38.36	269	237	-32	Y
Big Screen TV 65"	62	59	28	59.27	415	327	-88	Y

Big screen TVs over 48"

Bulky article fee would apply

Satellite Dish 7 1/2'	48	48	2	2.67	19	60	41	N
Satellite Dish 10'	72	72	2	6.00	42	90	48	N

Bulky article fee DOES NOT apply

Item	Depth	Height	Width	Total Cube	Cubed @	Actual	Delta	Bulky
					7 # per cu.	Weight	7 # per cu	Item
					7 # per cu.	Weight	VS Act wt	Yes/No **
Piano, Spinnet	44	58	21	31.01	217	499	282	N
Piano, Upright	48	60	24	40.00	280	530	250	N
Piano, Baby Grand	63	59	40	86.04	602	631	29	N
Piano, Parlor Grand	73	59	40	99.70	698	697	-1	Y
Piano, Concert Grand	108	63	41	161.44	1130	1100	-30	Y
Organ, Small	40	15	34	11.81	83	93	10	N
Organ, Large	48	25	42	29.17	204	263	59	N

**Majority of WT does not qualifies, Bulky article fee would not apply
Item 417 provides for additional charges for Piano/Organ handling and flight charges**

Hot Tubs	76.5	76.5	36	121.92	853.45	450	-403.45	Y
Hot Tubs	80	80	40	148.15	1037.04	750	-287.04	Y
Hot Tubs	80	81	40	150.00	1050.00	750	-300.00	Y
Hot Tubs	77	88	40	156.85	1097.96	750	-347.96	Y
Hot Tubs	89	89	40	183.36	1283.50	980	-303.50	Y

Bulky article fee would apply

**** Note: If the cubed weight exceeds the actual weight, then the Bulky article applies.
If the actual weight exceeds the cubed weight, then the**

**Bulky article DOES
NOT apply**

The following note has been added to the D-8 and D-9:

The PPSO may on a case-by-case basis authorize additional labor for loading/unloading items that may require additional labor, however; there should not be any additional labor authorized for piano, organs, or harpsichords since these items are covered under Item 417

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 297

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Batch Mail Dates

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: MTMC recently issued a Personal Property Advisory Message, which was supposed to help clarify some issues. Section 4 of that message refers to DD1780's that are dated within one batch mail period but not postmarked till the next, when the next batch mail period falls into a new evaluation cycle. The message states "shipments are counted in the evaluation cycle it was scored." Unfortunately, this leaves the area wide open for bases to score shipments, put a date on the form and then not mail them till long after the required batch mail date. The carrier is unable to forecast its TQAP scores and cannot make appropriate operational or rate filing plans. Section 4 of the message also goes on to state that "completed copies of the DD Form 1780 are to be batch mailed to the carrier by First Class mail on the 15th and the last day of the month, excluding weekends and federal holidays." Actually, the mailing should occur on the 15th or the 30th of the month, not the last day of the month. If PPSOs follow this latter advice, then there should not be any situation where a carrier is sent a score dated in one evaluation cycle but mailed/postmarked in another.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should once again simplify this whole process by use of the postmark on the envelope in which 1780's are received as the determining factor for which evaluation period they fall in and what the appeal period is, just as the carrier must meet the same postmark deadline in making sure its appeals are filed timely. Leaving it open as far as the date on the 1780 itself invites abuse and scoring/inclusion of shipments past the cutoff period for evaluation cycles.

RESPONSE: The ability to have TOPS print semi-annual TQAP scores on the last day of the cycle is already available, and therefore does not require a modification to the system. PPSOs have the capability to request TOPS print TQAP scores for any period they wish to review. MTMC stands by its message of 4 April 03. The intent is to count shipments in the evaluation cycle in which they are scored, not in which they are postmarked.

SUMMARY: A TA reminder will be put out to PPSOs at the end of each evaluation period thru TOPs requesting they print each carrier's summary of all shipments scored during the evaluation cycle.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 305

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PONENT: Acquisition and Services Branch

SUBJECT: Plasma TVs

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: Industry has done research on this topic and has determined that most manufacturers require very specialized preparation for shipment that would typically involve 3rd party servicing of the item. They require specialized crating and "tip and tell" indicators. Plasma TV's cannot be safely exposed to temperatures which would occur normally in the handling of a shipment in an enclosed van--exposure to temps below 32 degrees or above 100 degrees can cause permanent damage to the item, which would be an inherent vice. Movement through or use in a high altitude area over 6000 feet may seriously degrade the performance of the TV due to the sensitivity of the components in the TV. All of this will undoubtedly lead to large claims.

RECOMMENDATION: Because of the significant inherent vice associated with Plasma TVs, which are not designed for safe movement, carriers should not be responsible for damage to such TVs absent evidence of mishandling. SDDC and PPSOs should also authorize and pay for 3rd party servicing and crating of all plasma TV's to ensure their safe preparation and handling.

RESPONSE: SDDC's Acquisition and Services Branch is reviewing this item with the Military Services and the Claims Offices. A response will be provided NLT 1 Jun 2004.

SUMMARY: SDPP-PA/PO is in the process of compiling extensive research on the servicing, crating, and storage of plasma TV's. SDPP will complete their research and provide a response by 1 Jun 04.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 306

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: OperationsTeam

SUBJECT: Plastic Totes

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: Considerable discussion has taken place in an attempt to arrive at an equitable solution for the shipping and handling of plastic totes. Each option now authorized has its drawbacks. An additional option that was not previously discussed or considered is the use of plastic banding material. The tote could be banded both lengthwise and girth wise to secure its contents. The banding material in question is tightened by hand, not by a mechanical device; therefore, there would be no damage to the tote.

RECOMMENDATION: In addition to the instructions previously issued concerning the handling of plastic totes, that an amendment be added to allow the use of plastic or nylon strapping to secure the totes.

RESPONSE: SDDC will not amend its current guidance reflected in MSG DTD 191920Z DEC 03, SUBJ: PLASTIC TOTES to include additional language regarding the use of plastic or nylon strapping. The message stated, "It will be the Carrier's responsibility to ensure the Tote/Tub is adequately protected for safe movement". If the carrier feels the use of plastic or nylon strapping is necessary to adequately protect the Tote/Tub, then that decision shall be at the carrier's discretion and at no additional cost to the Government.

SUMMARY: See message on SDDC Personal Property website. Go to Personal Property/POV, Message, Domestic, Revision of Policy regarding Plastic Totes.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 307

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Digital Certificates

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: At the last M/I many questions were raised about the depth of requirements for digital certificates and the potentially extreme cost to the TP and agency families. If each and every person who even wants to send an email to a DOD entity or PPSO is required to have a person-specific digital certificate, the cost will be staggering. SDDC said they would review this issue and get back with more detailed guidance to the industry. Is there any likelihood of a further extension of the deadline from April 2004 to some future date?

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should provide an update of the status of this requirement.

RESPONSE: The deadline for digital certificates to access SDDC's ETA system stands at 30 Apr 04. DOD requirement for certificates for each person sending e-mail is also 30 Apr 04.

SUMMARY: Since the MI, the Department of Defense has put a hold on the effective date requiring the use of digital certificate for both accessing SDDC's ETA system and sending e-mail. Further information will be provided when available.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 308

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPOENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Military Service Locators

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: An old agenda item, Item 192 asked for the addresses for the locator services for each of the branches of service. We were provided that information, except for the Coast Guard. Below is the information we were provided.

ARMY: Army World Wide Locator
U.S. Army Enlisted Records & Evaluation Center
8899 East 56th Street
Indianapolis, IN 46249-5301
(703) 325-3732

NAVY: World Wide Locator
Bureau of Navy Personnel, PERS 312F
5720 Integrity Drive
Millington, TN 38055-3120
(901) 874-3388

USAF: AFPC-MSIMDL
550 C Street
Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4752
(210) 565-2660

USMC: Commandant of the Marine Corps
Headquarters, USMC
Code MMSB-10
2008 Elliot Road
Quantico, VA 22134-5030
(703) 784-3942/43

RECOMMENDATION: Update the above information for correctness and add the e-mail addresses for each location. We realize that the requests have to be sent by regular mail, however, an e-mail address would allow easier follow-up should that be necessary.

RESPONSE: E-mail addresses are only for government personnel. Coast Guard provided a telephone number (202) 493-1697.

As a result of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack, other suspected terrorist's events, on-going and potential military action, the Department of the Army has deemed it necessary to temporarily suspend its World Wide Locator service, except from military (.mil) network domains only, until further notice. We regret any inconvenience this may cause.

Non .mil requests:

Provide letter to soldier in a pre-paid envelope. Attach note providing the soldier's name, SSN, and reason for the request. EREC will mail the letter to the soldier.

**Army World Wide Locator
8899 E. 56th St
Indianapolis, IN 46249-5301**

Request by Tel/FAX: No

Retiree/Separatee

<http://www.archives.gov/welcome/index.html>

http://www.archives.gov/facilities/mo/st_louis/military_personnel_records/standard_form_180.html

**ARMY: Army World Wide Locator
U.S. Army Enlisted Records & Evaluation Center
8899 East 56th Street
Indianapolis. IN 46249-5301**

**NAVY: World Wide Locator
Bureau of Navy Personnel, PERS 312
5720 Integrity Drive
Millington, TN 38055-3120
(901) 874-3388**

**USAF: AFPC – DPDXIDL
550 C Street
Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4752
(210) 565-2660**

**USMC: Commandant of the Marine Corps
Headquarters, USMC
Code MMSB-17
2008 Elliot Road, Suite 203
Quantico, VA 22134-5030
1-800-268-3710
(703) 784-3942/43**

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard Military Worldwide Personnel Locator is as follow:

**Coast Guard Personnel Command (CGPC-adm-3)
4200 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22203-1804
Telephone: (202) 493-1666/1697
Fax: 703-493-1218
E:Mail: GOverall@Ballston.uscg.mil**

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 309

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Cross-filing of Rates

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: Item 609 of the RSD8 says "Carriers may cross file between Code 1 service and Code 2 service (or vice versa). Cross filing is identified by meeting another carrier's Code 2 service by a Code 1 service." SDDC has had some recent correspondence with the industry that would indicate a totally different interpretation and disallowing of cross filing. If SDDC disallows cross filing of a Code 1 carrier meeting a Code 2 rate, what exactly is the purpose of the language in item 609? If that is not its intended purpose then what else could the language quoted above mean or be used for? Further, the ability of a Code 1 carrier meeting a Code 2 lower rate only serves SDDC and the PPSO and will provide overall lower costs to SDDC. Request clarification of the policy and language and specific allowance of a Code 1 carrier's rate to be cross filed to a lower Code 2 rate in the me-too cycle.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should explain the rules on cross-filing of rates and provide the likelihood and rationale for any proposed changes to these rules.

RESPONSE: Carriers can cross file a rate lower than his earlier accepted filed rate from/to the same channel for the other code of service. The rate cross filed can be lower than the original established low rate during the I/F A for that channel. The rate reasonableness range remains at the same level established during the I/F.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 310

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Item 616 (Rate Filing Procedures) – 60% Differential Cap in M/T phase

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: SDDC created M/T rate restrictions in RS-D8. Industry is concerned that the capacity in certain lanes, both short and long haul may be left without valid rates after one or more L/C cycle(s). This would likely occur when a bidder files a low rate (e.g. 60%) and after seeing that his rate was not widely met, decides to cancel during an L/C cycle. If the next available I/F rate available for M/T filing was over 120%, the remaining industry capacity would not be available to service the shipments in these channels. In the past, MTMC has seen channels where VERY few bidders met a low I/F filed to a nearby state, or in a pattern of service that is difficult. It is at least possible that the carrier that submitted the low I/F will decide to cancel its low rate.

In the event there is no valid rate to a destination state from an origin GBLOC, there would be no TOPS generated TDR for the PPSO to assign an order to a carrier. As a result of this lack of M/T interest and subsequent rate cancellation by a single or small number of M/T bidders resulting in no rates to a specific channel(s), for the remaining portion of the rate volume/cycle after one or more L/C cycles, DOD would have options such as...

1. use OTO bid procurement from the DTR, or
2. use base purchase order to procure commercial service, or
3. use volume move procurement from the DTR, or
4. re-open M/T bidding with industry that excludes the canceled/ineffective rate.

Examples are:

Redstone Arsenal: MS 80; TN 60
Annapolis: PA 60
Whiteman AFB: AR 60
Seymour-Johnson AFB: TX 95
FISC Jacksonville: CA 89
Ft Detrick: VA 99
Columbus AFB: AL 60
Wright-Patterson AFB: WV 60
Aberdeen Proving Grounds: PA 60
Ft Leonardwood: OK 80
Camp LeJuene: UT 90
Red River AD: OK 80

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should require the rates of bidders to abide by the 200% cap (adjusted annually) during the I/F but rescind the 60% rate differential cap enabling a greater

portion of industry's capacity to be available to service SDDC's moves. Otherwise, SDDC is taking a risk that may result in service failures, particularly during peak season.

RESPONSE: Since we do not perceive a significant impact to the Personal Property Program concerning this issue, the 60% rate differential will remain in effect. PPSOs will utilize DPM or Code 2 service if needed. We will continue to watch this situation and re-evaluate if needed.

SUMMARY: The 60% rate differential will remain in effect. Our research has shown that the problem identified by Industry affects mainly Code 2 service. Only a few Code 1 channels were affected. We will continue to monitor and re-evaluate if needed.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 311

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Acquisition and Services Branch

SUBJECT: NTS Payment

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: Contractors have experienced several problems with this program recently. We are seeing an unusual number of invoices showing up as no record found in the DFAS system. We resubmit these invoices to the correct military installation representative and continue to have problems. We are also experiencing problems when a member separates and the NTS converts to members expense, the last known addresses are often outdated. Each base seems to do things differently rather than use one standard method.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should advise what can be done to address these problems.

RESPONSES:

NTS Payments: The long term solutions to the NTS payment problem should be rectified with the migration to PowerTrack for the Families First Program. However, in the short term you, (NTS contractor) need to work closely with the Regional Storage Management Office (RSMO) in the region that you operate for assistance. If you feel that they are not getting any assistance in getting you paid for the services that have been performed, as a last resort the issue needs to be addressed to DCSPPP, Acquisition and Services Branch.

Members address: We will draft a message with the Military Services concurrence to the PPSO's reemphasizing the importance of providing the contractor with the service member's most current address, and request added emphasis when counseling members about the importance of the providing the PPSO with any address changes.

SUMMARY: A Personal Property Advisory message concerning the final address for Separates upon conversion of Nontemporary storage was sent out to all PPSOs, DTG 292121Z Apr 04. Go to SDDC Personal Property website. Personal Property/POV, Messages, General, NTS payments.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 1 May 04

ITEM: 312

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Personal Property Systems Team

SUBJECT: Traffic Distribution

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: There seems to be some confusion regarding how TDRs are set up in TOPS and then traffic distributed.

RECOMMENDATION: Someone from TOPS should explain exactly how TDRs are set up in TOPS, including how carriers are ranked for distribution of shipments.

RESPONSE: **The process for setting up and managing TDRs in the TOPS Application mirror the requirements and guidelines defined in the DTR. The TOPS Application manages and maintains the following types of TDRs: Domestic Interstate; Domestic Intrastate; International HHG; International UB. As established by the DTR the TDRs are set up as follows:**

T. DOMESTIC TDR

1. Interstate.

- a. Separate TDRs will be established for Codes 1A and 2A shipments for each CONUS destination State and the District of Columbia. Separate TDRs will also be established for each area of operation within the AOR for each TO to each destination State. If there is more than one rate level to a destination State or the District of Columbia, like rates will be grouped from the low to high rate.**
- b. TDRs are set up with an average shipment score for each carrier and new rates published for the rate cycle. The low rate carrier (within each rate group) with the highest average shipment score will be awarded traffic first unless an authorized exception applies. All tonnage is set to zero at the beginning of each new rate cycle. Average shipment scores are based on the carrier's performance during the previous performance period. When a carrier has not been tendered any shipment or shipments have not been scored, the carrier's last score will be carried forward. New carriers are placed on the TDR with an administrative score of 90. Carrier's average shipment score will be extended to the second decimal place, e.g., 99.78, without rounding. Carriers with equal scores (within the same rate group) will be brought forward on the new cycle TDR (using previous tonnage as a factor) from low to high tonnage. When scores, tonnage, and rates are all equal, a random selection is made.**
- c. The most eligible carrier to receive the next shipment is the one with the highest**

performance score and lowest cumulative weight. When sufficient shipments are known by historical review to be available during a cycle, shipments may be allocated sequentially to give each carrier a shipment (or charge a refusal) during the initial movement through the TDR from the first to last carrier at the same rate level. Subsequent shipments in the same rate cycle will be allocated to correct an imbalance in weight allocated. If sufficient shipments are not projected to be available to permit a run through the entire TDR and to correct the resulting imbalances, sequential allocation may not be practical. When determining the projected availability of traffic for this purpose, historical data from a like cycle will be used, e.g., summer cycle data with summer cycle data from prior years. Traffic is to be managed to stay within a maximum differential of 40,000 pounds between the highest and lowest of all carriers at the rate level, to include carriers with zero weight. In a correctly maintained TDR, a carrier with a lower TQAP score will not have a higher cumulative weight than a carrier with a higher TQAP score except briefly in those situations requiring the application of sound traffic management to ensure a shipment moves in a safe and timely manner. When such situations occur, subsequent tonnage will be awarded in such a manner as to return the higher scored carriers to higher cumulative weight by the end of the rate cycle.

2. Intrastate.

- a. Separate TDRs will be established for Codes 1B and 2B shipments from the origin Bill of Lading Office Code (BLOC) to each destination BLOC within the State of the origin BLOC.**
- b. The primary carrier (rate setter), who is otherwise qualified and has a TQAP score of at least 90, will receive 50 percent of the traffic. Other qualified carriers meeting the low rate will share equally in the remaining tonnage.**
- c. If two carriers establish an identical low rate, each carrier will receive 33-1/3 percent of the tonnage. The remaining 33-1/3 percent will be awarded to the carriers meeting the low rate.**
- d. If three or more carriers establish an identical low rate, each carrier will receive an equal percentage with the remaining carriers receiving the same percentage. Example: Three carriers submit the identical low rate with six carriers meeting the low rate. The three rate setters would each receive 25 percent of the tonnage. The other six carriers would divide the remaining 25 percent. At no time will the carriers meeting the low rate receive more tonnage than the rate setters. The TO will adjust percentages according to the volume of carriers involved.**
- e. TOs in those States where carriers have limited operating authority will award tonnage as follows:**
 - 1) Separate TDRs will be established for the State and for each destination**

AOR where rates are filed and accepted by HQ MTMC.

2) TDRs will be established based on:

- a) The carrier establishing the low rate will be placed on the TDR first. This low rate carrier will meet the TQAP criteria established by HQ MTMC. Those meeting the low rate will be placed on the TDR IAW their TQAP score. Carriers with equal TQAP scores will be placed on the TDR IAW low to high tonnage from the past rate cycle.**
- b) All carriers will begin the cycle with zero tonnage.**
- c) Carrier establishing the low rate will receive 50 percent of the tonnage from its AOR within its operating authority only. Example: Carrier AAAA establishes the low rate for the AOR. However, the carrier can pick up only in counties A and B of the origin AOR. Carrier AAAA will receive every other shipment from counties A and B. Carriers meeting the low rate will share in the remaining tonnage. In the event no one meets the low rate, carrier AAAA will be offered all traffic before an offer is made to a higher cost carrier. In all other areas covered by this low rate, but not a part of the low rate carrier's operating authority, tonnage will be divided equally among the carriers meeting the low rate to the extent of their operating authorities.**

- 3. Shipment Refusals. Shipments refused by carriers/agents will be considered traffic offerings and added to the carrier's cumulative weight. The refusal is annotated with "RR". Short notice shipments refused by a carrier are annotated with "AZ" and are not added to the carrier's cumulative weight. A carrier/agent may notify the TO in writing to identify a period of time when they will not be accepting shipments due to peak season saturation. During this time, the carrier will automatically be charged with a refusal if they become the most eligible carrier identified for traffic on the TDR. The refusal weight is added to the carrier's cumulative weight.**
- 4. Pullback/Turnback. If a shipment is pulled back or turned back, the TO will enter the code "PB" or "TB" and the weight is charged as follows:**
 - a. Shipments pulled back/turned back with seven or less days notice of the pickup date are considered short notice shipments when reallocating to the new carrier. The new carrier is not charged tonnage on the TDR and the TDR will be annotated with a "PG" or "TC". Shipments pulled back/turned back cannot be re-booked with the same carrier.**
 - b. If a shipment is pulled back after the pickup date, or if the carrier failed to pickup on the pickup date, tonnage is added to the carrier's cumulative weight.**

- c. A shipment turned back before or after the pickup date is charged to the carrier's cumulative weight.

U. INTERNATIONAL TDR

1. **General.** Carriers submit rates every six months for rate channels and codes of service for international traffic.
2. **TDRs.**
 - a. **Separate TDRs will be established for each TO's AOR for each ITGBL code of service for each traffic channel based on the carrier's rate and average shipment score. Shipments will be distributed exclusively to carriers on the lowest rate level unless the volume of traffic exceeds the capability of the low rate carriers. When this occurs, the remaining traffic will be offered to carriers on the next and succeeding rate levels. However, shipments will always be offered first to the carriers on the lowest rate level before higher rate level carriers are considered unless the primary carrier is suspended, cancels its rates, is placed in nonuse, or refuses the traffic. The TDRs will be arranged in three sections: Sections I, II, and III record all traffic offered to the primary carriers, equalization carriers, and all other participating carriers, respectively.**
 - 1) **Section I.** TOs will ensure that the primary carriers are offered their designated share of traffic. Periodic weight checks will be made to minimize deviations from the designated shares due to unequal weight of shipments. Example: If weight checks indicate that the "running" total of estimated tonnage for the traffic route is 240,000 pounds, a single primary carrier with a 50 percent share will have been offered approximately 120,000 pounds.
 - 2) **Section II.** If the primary carrier's share for a given traffic channel is 50 percent, every second shipment (subject to a consideration of weight factors) will be offered on a rotational basis to equalization carriers. Equalization carriers are those carriers with exactly the same rates as the primary carrier. Each equalization carrier is obligated to accept residual shipments in an amount equal to one half the primary percentage. If equalization carrier capability is insufficient and there is no primary carrier or the primary carrier cannot accept additional traffic, shipments will be offered to other participating carriers. If there is no primary carrier because of rate cancellations, nonuse, traffic will be awarded equitably among the equalization carriers.
 - 3) **Section III.** Other participating carriers will be offered any traffic that cannot be handled by primary and equalization carriers. Traffic will be offered first to other participating carriers at the lowest rate level and highest TQAP score. TOs will not penalize other participating carriers for failure to accept traffic beyond the established requirement.

Note: Estimated weights may be used in posting shipments to the TDR.

- b. The carriers' rates, LOIs on file, Carrier Approval listing, and average semiannual shipment score will be used to establish all TDRs. The share of traffic to be offered to primary carriers during the traffic distribution period is distributed with the rate solicitation each rate cycle. Other participating carriers will appear in ascending order based on lowest rate and highest TQAP score.**
- c. Selective refusal of traffic by a carrier is prohibited. If a pattern is observed, action to suspend and/or request disqualification will be taken.**

3. Percentage of Traffic.

- a. Class 1 Rates. Carriers setting the low rate in a Class 1 traffic channel will be offered 100 percent of the traffic moved within that channel. If two carriers establish an identical low rate, both carriers will be offered one half of the total tonnage or 50 percent each.**
- b. Class 2 Rates. Carriers setting the low rate in a Class 2 traffic channel are offered a prescribed percentage of tonnage within each individual traffic channel.**

- 1) The primary carrier will be offered and is responsible for accepting actual tonnage equal to the primary percentage indicated. For example, if the primary percentage of the traffic channel is 20 percent, the primary carrier will be awarded 20 percent of the tonnage. The other 80 percent of the tonnage will be considered residual and will be shared equally between the primary and equalization carriers. Tonnage refused by the primary and equalization carriers will then be offered to the participating carriers. Example is as follows:**

1 primary carrier = 20 percent*
7 equalization carriers plus the primary carrier = 10 percent each
totaling 80 percent)* participating carriers = *

***The residual 80 percent of the tonnage will be offered equitably to the equalization (with the highest scored carriers first) and primary carriers. Any remaining traffic will then be offered to the participating carriers within the same rate groups with the highest scored carrier first.**

- 2) If two carriers establish an identical low rate, each carrier will be offered the prescribed tonnage for that traffic channel. For example, if two carriers establish the low rate on a 50 percent channel, each carrier will be offered 50 percent. If two or more carriers have filed identical rates and have equal average shipment scores, the random number table contained in Item 1706 of**

the International Personal Property Rate Solicitation will be used to determine the standing on the TDR.

3) Equalization carriers may not be offered a larger share of the volume on a particular channel than the carrier establishing the low rate unless the low rate carrier is suspended or cancels its rates.

4) All participating carriers will accept tonnage, if offered, as follows:

50 percent channel 12 percent

30 percent channel 7 percent

20 percent channel 5 percent

10 percent channel 2 percent

c. Class 3 Rates. Carriers will be placed on the TDR based on their average shipment score and will share equitably in traffic distribution.

SUMMARY: Air Force will provide a response to this issue directly to the carrier Industry.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 313

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services (USAF)

SUBJECT: JPPSO-COS Traffic Distribution

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: The TDR's for JPPSO COS and JPPSO San Antonio and others are distributing tonnage unevenly. The TDR is allocating a large percentage of the tonnage to carriers whose SCAC's start with the letters "A", "B", or "C" and whose rates and TQAP scores are identical to the carriers with SCAC's starting with letters further down the alphabet.

RECOMMENDATION: We would like to see the TDR reworked, especially in the large JPPSO's so it will allot the tonnage equitably to all participating carriers in accordance with current TDR rules.

RESPONSE: Air Force will provide a response to this issue directly to the carrier Industry.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 314

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance

SUBJECT: Agent Representation

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: App. 0, page IV-0-9 para 6c. states that if a carrier lets an entire shipment cycle go by without agency representation, they are not entitled to any previous earned scores. But, if you put an agent in mid-cycle, you pick up a 90 and then you can get the previously earned scores during the next semi-annual. TOs have 18 months to score a shipment, so carriers should also be given some time to replace an agent without losing the score. This argument actually applies whether the earned score is good or bad. If a carrier earned a bad score, DOD should want them to be stuck with that score.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should revert back to the old rules that ensured that carriers were rated based on an earned score, rather than an administrative score of 90.

RESPONSE: When the agent notifies TO that they no longer represent the carrier, they have 45 days to find new representation. Carriers that let an entire performance cycle go by without agency representation are not entitled to a free score while other carriers comply with the requirements as identified in the DTR. The traffic denial time frame will and should apply regardless of the LOI procedures for those carriers that will have gone into traffic denial. We non-concur to a change to the present regulation.

SUMMARY: A message DTG 192246Z APR 04 was sent to all PPSO's reminding them that all shipments will continue to be scored, regardless of a carrier's standing at an installation, i.e., nonuse, suspension, loss of LOI, disqualification. See message on the SDDC Personal Property Website. Go to Personal Property/POV, Messages, Vehicles/POV, Return of carriers to the TDR after Invalidation/Return of LOI.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 315

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Carrier Removals

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: Many agents and carriers make an effort to ensure that they are only dealing with reputable, approved carriers for military shipments. Now, the only way to know if a carrier is approved by SDDC is to refer to the list on the SDDC website. It would assist carriers in assuring that they are only interlining with approved DOD carriers, without having to refer back to the website all the time, if SDDC would make a specific announcement whenever carriers are removed from DOD approval. Currently, it appears that approved carriers can just disappear from the list with no explanation.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should advise the industry by way of a message that a carrier has been removed from DOD approval, regardless of reason.

RESPONSE: There is an approved carriers list on the SDDC website, which is updated as carriers are removed. In addition, SDDC makes specific announcements when carriers are removed from the approved list by posting messages on our web page identifying which carriers are being removed and when they are being removed. We believe this is a satisfactory method that provides all carriers the same information.

SUMMARY: Carrier Revoked Approvals are on SDDC website. This list will be updated as necessary. Go to the SDDC Personal Property website. Personal Property/POV, Carrier Qualification/Performance, Revoked Approvals.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 316

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: New Carrier Approvals

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: SDDC now permits new applications only once per year.

RECOMMENDATION: When will the next open window for new TP entry take place?

RESPONSE: The moratorium will be lifted 1 May 04.

SUMMARY: The moratorium that was suppose to be lifted 1 May 04 was postponed until 10 May 2004.

On May 10, 2004, the moratorium was lifted until 10 Aug 04. See the notice on the Personal Property Website. Go to Personal Property/POV, Carrier Qualification/Performance, Open Season Notice: Lifting of Carrier Qualification Moratorium.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 317

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Carrier Approvals

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: The carrier approvals listing on the SDDC website used to include data on the TP listing to show what companies a TP is in CFAC with, but when the qualification process was redone in the last 2 years, that data was removed from the file. It seems that this info would be very helpful to both the PPSO and other TP's.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should restore this information.

RESPONSE: CFAC information was at one time part of the approved carrier list. It was removed when developing the automated PPQWEB system as being information to be used only internally by SDDC. PPSO's deals mainly with carriers/agents and have no need of the details of CFAC affiliations.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 318

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services (USAF and DA)

SUBJECT: Tours of Duty

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: The Army has announced its plans to extend tours of duty to as much as seven years in one location before moving soldiers to a new duty station.

RECOMMENDATION: Army should brief us on the anticipated timing and impact of their announced extension of tours of duty and resulting slowdown in PCS moves. Also request all the other Services to advise if they are considering similar policy changes.

RESPONSE: HQDA suggests reviewing the article on Internet at <https://www.stabilization.army.mil/> to current events-recent articles then scroll to the 9 Feb article "Army Announces Force Stabilization Initiative".

SUMMARY: Unit Manning is a part of Task Force Stabilization. Information can be found on https://www.unitmanning.army.mil/Research_items/manning_only.htm

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 319

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Program

SUBJECT: Signing of non-government forms

INITIATED: February 13, 2003

DISCUSSION: We believe that it is in the government's interest to allow carriers to provide some forms for customers to sign. We know they've had some problems with carrier generated forms trying to waive responsibility for pressboard furniture, etc. However, forms such as the customer service survey and a pre-move survey will only serve to provide better service. Carriers/agents that try to get customers to waive rights that are protected by the regulations or try to circumvent the regulations should be handled on a case-by-case basis and those violators should be held to the punitive actions provided for in the regulations.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC and the services should agree that carrier/agent generated customer service surveys and pre-move survey forms can be used. They should provide official support for these forms as they will provide improvements in service.

RESPONSE: Since SDDC's customer satisfaction survey will be in use very soon, carriers/agents should not be using their own customer service surveys. Carriers/agents may use other forms such as pre-move survey, bingo card/check-off sheets as internal company documents. However, these forms are not to be signed by service members/employees and are not to be used in place of DOD officially approved forms such as DD Forms 1840/1840R. Basic guidance on use of carrier forms is on SDDC's web page by message dated 19 Nov 03 (Personal Property; Messages; Domestic).

After the briefing on the Interim Customer Satisfaction Surveys (ICSS), industry questioned the level of data that would be provided on completed government surveys. The Quality Assurance Business Process Working Group (QA BPWG), which is made up of members from the Moving Industry, Industry Associations, the Services and SDDC personnel, met on 13 April regarding ICSS. The group agreed, and SDDC has concurred, that the following data will be available to Transportation Providers:

- TPs will be provided metrics to all their surveys but not all survey data elements
- TPs will not be provided metrics on other TPs surveys
- SDDC will make available the following data to individual TPs:
 - By shipment market (dHHG, iHHG, or iUB)
 - By code of service (as applicable)
 - The Origin and Destination: City, State, and/or Country.
 - The responses to the 6 TP questions from each survey
 - BOL/GBL number for the shipment

Note: Customer information such as address, phone number, email address will not be provided to the TP.

Additionally, the group came to consensus on the following:

- **During their regular contact with the customers the TPs can encourage customers to complete the survey.**
- **Customers must respond (Y/N) to the following question, prior to the survey results being submitted:**

May the Transportation Provider contact you regarding your survey responses?

- **A Response to this question will be required and will be either a “Yes” or “No”**
- **If the customer selects “No” then the TP cannot contact the customer regarding their survey responses**
 - **Business rules regarding punitive action for TPs that violate this rules are yet to be determined.**
- **If the customer selected “Yes” then the TP may contact the customer regarding their survey responses**
 - **In this situation the TP may consult the customer to determine how improvements can be made on future shipments (e.g., what in particular did the customer not like about the service received - - problems experienced with packing crew, loading crew, delivery, etc.)**

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Close 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 320

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Long deliveries out of SIT

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: Most linehaul rates are now well over 100%, but SIT delivery rates are capped at 100% of the base rates. This becomes more of a problem when shipments are ordered out of SIT for a long delivery that really is a diversion to an entirely new destination. For example, a move from Washington to Virginia is later ordered out of SIT for delivery up to New York. Obviously the service member has been given a new assignment, necessitating a second move. But instead the shipment is ordered as a delivery out of SIT at 100%, rather than whatever rate would apply from Virginia to New York.

RECOMMENDATION: SIT deliveries greater than 100 miles should be either declared as a new move or rated using the original linehaul percentage or the current rate on file from the SIT location to the ultimate destination.

RESPONSE: SDDC will take this item under review to determine if long delivery out of SIT should be based on the carrier's rate percentage. A response will be provided NLT 1 Jun 04.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 321

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Clearing Containerized Shipments

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: It has come to our attention that the provision of the DTR regarding clearing of containerized shipments is inconsistent with the provisions contained in I-14 and there are no specific clearing procedures in D-8 for clearing domestic containerized shipments upon their arrival at destination. As a result, TOs are applying the wording of D-8, Item 406, Note 1 to clear all domestic shipments.

Two problems result from these situations. There is inconsistent guidance for clearing containerized shipments and TOs are applying items that have no application to the specific situation.

DTR Page IV-B-11, Paragraph 6

6. I agree to notify the destination TO of the arrival of containerized shipments within one workday after arrival at my agent's facilities. In addition, I will affect delivery-out services as follows:

- a. For shipments which arrive before the RDD, I agree to deliver to the member/employee or member's/employee's agent within five working days from the date of notification by the PPSO, if agreed upon by the member/employee or member's/employee's agent. If the RDD falls within five working days, I agree to deliver no later than the RDD.
- b. For those shipments which arrive after the RDD, I agree to deliver IAW the TO's instructions.

I-14, Item 435 **Tender of Delivery of Containerized Shipments - HHG**

- a. Carrier must notify PPSO of arrival of containerized shipment and provide first available delivery date within one workday after arrival at agent's facility.
- b. If notification is before 12 noon, the PPSO will furnish delivery instruction or SIT control number by 5 p.m. on date of notification. Delivery must be on the day of notification or following workday, otherwise SIT number must be provided.
- c. If notification is after 12 noon, the PPSO will furnish delivery instructions or SIT control number by 12 noon the following workday. Delivery must be within 2 workdays

following notification of delivery, otherwise SIT number will be provided.

- (1) The PPSO will provide SIT control number or delivery instruction within 24 hours of time of notification.
- (2) The SIT control number will be based on carrier's available delivery date, not the date of notification.

d. Waiting time will commence upon expiration of the time limits above.

D-8, Item 406. [WTG]

WAITING TIME

NOTE 1: Unless otherwise provided by agreement, loading and unloading of all equipment shall be performed between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and waiting time charge shall be applicable only between these hours, subject to the following allowable waiting time included in the line haul transportation rates:

- When distance between point of pickup and point of delivery is less than 200 miles, one hour free waiting time shall be allowed only at destination. (See Note 2.)
- When distance between point of pickup and point of delivery is 200 miles or more, two hours free waiting time shall be allowed only at destination. (See Note 2.)

Logistically, there is little difference between a Code 2 and a Code 4 shipment. Both are containerized, both have final movement to the destination by motor freight, and the destination agent rarely knows specifically when the shipment will arrive. It is not economically practical for an agent to maintain a crew for a shipment that may or may not materialize. The clearing of a Code 2 shipment for delivery should be the same as a Code 4 shipment.

RECOMMENDATION: In view of the fact that the logistical/operational functions of the carrier/agent at destination are identical for the processing of a Code 2 & 4 shipment, and that there is either inconsistent or no guidance for clearing containerized shipments, the clearing procedure should also be the same for all containerized shipments.

1. Revise I-14, Item 435 to make the provisions consistent with those contained in the DTR Page IV-B-11, Paragraph 6.
2. Add a new Item 405 (now unused) to D-8, and reissues thereof, to mirror the requirements of Item 435 of I-14, and DTR Page IV-B-11, Paragraph 6.

RESPONSE: AMSA will provide clarification or withdraw item.

SUMMARY: AMSA tabled this Item.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 322

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Policy and Business Process Team

SUBJECT: Current/Active TMA's not listed on SDDC's website

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: The listing of currently effective TMA's on the SDDC website is not entirely accurate. Some TMA's are listed while others can be found only by knowing the TMA number and using the search function. Yet others like TMA DTG 121701Z cannot be found at all. That message was in response to Item 289 of the S03 M/I, although as of February 11, 2004, cannot be found on the SDDC website.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry requests that SDDC confirm that the message contained on its website are the only ones that currently apply. If that is not true, Industry requests guidance on how to retrieve and review the currently effective TMA's.

RESPONSE: Our PPP Web Manager will be going through entire PPP website and put all messages into the Messages tab provided on the main page of the PPP Web. The message tab will serve as the main focal point for all message viewing. This should eliminate the problem with viewing messages.

SUMMARY: The PPP Web Manager went through the entire PPP website and made sure all messages were put into the messages tabs.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 323

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services (USAF)

SUBJECT: Air Force JPPSO GBL/BL Production Failures

INITIATED: February 13, 2004

DISCUSSION: We are experiencing continuing problems with JPPSO-COS, JPPSO-NE and to a smaller extent, JPPSO-SAT, in their failure to produce GBLs/BLs in a timely manner. Clearly, published procedures for where these documents are being mailed are not being followed. They do not arrive at either the agent or the carrier's facilities.

While personnel at these JPPSOs are for the most part very helpful in getting copies of the documents sent, when requested. The exception of having to request copies of these documents is becoming the normally required process.

Discussions with personnel at these JPPSOs also produce the standard response of, 'If the agent didn't get the GBL/BL it was sent to the carrier.' Unfortunately, the documents do not arrive at either location

The consistency of this problem is clear evidence that the failure cannot be a part of the mail system or the agents' or carriers' processing of these documents. Too many different parties over too long a period are involved. The problem lies at the source of these documents.

The problem is creating another growing problem whereby agents are more and more unwilling to service shipments at these JPPSOs due to the continuing frustration and financial harm this is causing. Maximum agent resources must be available to handle the upcoming peak season traffic. Diminished agent resources will only mean more work for overtaxed JPPSO staff resources, more service failures and greater relocating member dissatisfaction.

RECOMMENDATION: More resources must be devoted to these JPPSOs to handle the workload they are facing. Management clearly underestimated the resources required to maintain a quality operation that meets the expectations that were related to Industry and relocating members.

RESPONSE: BOL/GBL is routinely provided to the TP or designated agent. Need specific examples in order to respond.

SUMMARY: Working on developing software so Industry will have the capability to download from the Internet. There is no time frame yet.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 324

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: DTR -(Page IV-A-2, para n.(2)) - Letters of Intent (LOI)

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: The DTR reads: For International, any LOI received after the 30-day time frame will be “considered for the following rate cycle.” For Domestic, any LOIs received after the 30-day time frame will be “effective for the next rate cycle.”

RECOMMENDATION: Industry wish to be provided with clarification on the difference between “considered and effective,” as well as “next versus following.”

Further, we assume that this rule deals strictly with New LOIs, but request confirmation that a ‘Replacement LOI,’ once received and accepted by the TO, will be effective immediately and the carrier can perform service.

RESPONSE: **DTR change for the International program will reflect the following change. (Once a new LOI is received and accepted by the TO, the LOI will be effective for the next rate cycle.)**

SUMMARY: A Traffic Management Advisory message 02-04, DTR changes effective immediately, DTG 101756Z May 04. See message on SDDC, Personal Property Website. Go to the Personal Property/POV, Message, Traffic Management Advisory Message 02-04 DTR Changes.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 325

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: DTR - (Page IV-B-15) Manner of Packing (Crating)

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: The DTR provides that crating authorization is not required for international shipments since packing and crating services are included in the SFR. If external and internal crates are no longer to be authorized under any circumstance for international shipments then the industry will need to pursue action that personal water craft (PWC) and motorcycles over a certain horsepower or cubic centimeter be reclassified and shipped as POV or as OTOs.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry would like to be provided clarification on the issue of crating authorization.

RESPONSE: External and internal crating is authorized. The above item is in reference to normal packing procedures. Any item that requires additional crating/containerizing for safe transport may be authorized if the PPSO determines that request is warranted. Carriers must obtain approval prior to the construction of crates/containers from the PPSO.

SUMMARY: A message was sent to all PPSO's DTG 061101Z Apr 04. See SDDC Personal Property Website. Go to Personal Property/POV, Message, International, Crates/Special Containers for ITGBL Shipment.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 326

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services/Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: DTR - (Page IV-B-7) - Inconvenience Claims

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: There have been numerous instances where carriers believe items have been claimed and charged to the carrier in an inconvenience claim, where those items were not originally tendered and did not actually exist in the shipment.

RECOMMENDATION: When filing an inconvenience claim a claimant in addition to providing an itemized list of charges and accompanying receipts should, if requested by the carrier, be required to provide proof or evidence that the shipment actually contained the items needing to have been replaced or supplied until the shipment was delivered.

RESPONSE: SDDC is sending out a worldwide message on the subject of submitting inconvenience claims. Part of the message requests transportation offices to review members claims to ensure they are valid and to screen claims for items purchased that may not qualify for reimbursement. Regarding the need for evidence a shipment actually contained items needing to have been replaced, if the inventory is the only item the member has to show tender, how does the member prove there were dishes in the "kitchenware box"? It may be acceptable for a TP that has a list of items it paid for in an inconvenience claim, to request the member to identify these items at the time of delivery of the shipment.

SUMMARY: A message was sent out on Inconvenience Claims, DTG Message 031237Z Mar 04. Go to the SDDC Personal Property website. Personal Property/POV, Message, General, Inconvenience Claims.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 327

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: DTR (Page IV-B-10) - Pickup and Delivery Dates (Direct Delivery)

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: We recognize this section of the DTR has been temporarily waived. However, the rule as written provides that if the member requests direct delivery and furnishes a delivery address which is annotated on the GBL the carrier, by acceptance of the shipment, agrees to deliver it on or before the RDD and is not eligible for storage charges should the shipment arrive at destination early and the member is not ready to accept delivery.

It seems unreasonable to penalize a carrier for getting the shipment to destination early.

RECOMMENDATION: If the government is not willing to authorize and pay for SIT prior to an RDD whenever a direct delivery address is shown on the GBL, then the government should allow the carrier to accept the shipment using a reasonable "spread date" for delivery. Further, should the government authorized SIT, but the GBL showed a direct delivery address, the Industry would like assurance that GSA in its audits will not off-set the SIT charges.

RESPONSE: Previous DTR change actually said "on the RDD" vice "on or before the RDD". That said, there is current discussion whether this language will be reinstated in the previous form or will be rewritten or remain rescinded. If direct delivery language is reinstated, the policy will be released to coincide with a solicitation so industry can adjust rates to account for new process.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 328

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services

SUBJECT: M/I (9/23/03) Agenda #294 - SIT Extensions

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: We believe this item is fatally flawed and raises the question of a carrier's ability to bill for SIT in certain circumstances. Particularly, where the SIT authorization shown on the GBL, as extended by the order of the TO, has expired since that is the precise situation attempted to be dealt within this M/I Item and in the DTR. The question is not one of liability, since it is clear that so long as the carrier is providing SIT under the terms of the contract it has carrier liability. The question is can the carrier properly perform and bill for services which have not been authorized by contract. The provision of the DTR that the carrier's liability as an SIT performing carrier continues until it receives notice from the TO that "the entitlement has ended" is not, in Industry's opinion, 'contract authorization' for the carrier to perform SIT services beyond the amount stated on the original contract (GBL). Further, we believe contract authorization is required for the carrier to be able to bill the government and satisfy the post-payment reviews by the GSA auditors. Tying the carrier's performance to the "entitlement" is acceptable and is only a matter between the service and the military service member, particularly since entitlement can vary. Looking forward, tying the performance of SIT to an indefinite entitlement period, rather than to contract authorization, may cause problems and become a major cost drive in the future Families First program when FRV is applied.

RECOMMENDATION: A possible solution to this problem is to provide that the SIT expires on the date of the contract-authorized period or the date the notice is received from the TO, which ever occurs first.

RESPONSE: Recommend the number of days SIT authorized no longer be indicated in Block 25, remarks section of the GBL and replaced with language that simply states "SIT Authorized". When a shipment is ordered into SIT, the shipment shall remain in SIT until the TP has been provided written notification by the PPSO that storage is no longer authorized. The PPSO shall continue to counsel members internally on storage entitlements.

SUMMARY: After coordinating with GSA, TOPS, and Personal property Systems it has been determined that the number of days for sit will be removed from the GBL and the shipment will remain government in nature until the Transportation Office sends the Carrier notification that the shipment will be converted. The only exception will be civilian shipments where the GBL will state maximum of 180 days of sit authorized. This will not circumvent the present rulings by service of requesting the appropriate extension for SIT conversion.

See Item 294

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 17 May 04

ITEM: 329

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: DTR (Appendix N) - Transit Times Guide

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: Industry recognizes that the Transit Times Guide (DTR Appendix N) has been deleted /removed from the DTR and will be maintained and published by SDDC to allow for flexibility in responding to changing conditions. Further, SDDC and Industry reached a temporary agreement on the application of the new (60 Day) Transit Times for the IS-04 Rate Cycle. The proposed Transit Times in Appendix N were not developed in coordination with Industry and are not based on actual transportation experience, capabilities and schedules as the transit times historically in use had been developed. Appendix N Transit Times reflect a force fed “60 Day Maximum” dictated by a former SDDC Commander. Indeed, Industry and SDDC have worked out a procedure that carriers, who failed to meet one of the new reduced transit times, would receive relief from punitive action upon showing that the 60-day Transit could not be met in that specific channel. Further, in the agreement, it was established that this 60-day limitation could not reasonably apply to Inter-theater shipments.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry requests that SDDC provide status of any on-going activity concerning International Transit Time Guides. What guidelines will be presented to Industry for use in the IW-04 rate filing?

RESPONSE: SDDC is reviewing current transit times. Transit times will remain as is until the review is complete. Any changes will be coordinated with the military services and industry prior to becoming effective and implemented in conjunction with the applicable rate cycle.

SUMMARY: The Transit Times Task Force (TTTF) has been established. The task force is made up of SDDC and Industry personnel who will review the current transit time for Intra-theater Transit Time Tables. There is a meeting scheduled for 19 May 04.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 330

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command/Operations Team

SUBJECT: DTR (Page IV B 10-12, para V.9) - Pre-Notice Pick-up/Delivery Times

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: The new DTR provides that when a shipment is scheduled for pick up at residence or delivery from SIT, the carrier agrees to provide information on the afternoon preceding the service date as to the time of the service, either AM or PM. The information will be provided upon telephone request of the TO or the member/employee. A TOS requirement is a serious matter and violations can lead to suspensions and disqualifications for the carrier. A telephone call from either a TO or service member is an undocumented communication/agreement and can be disputed without definitive conclusion or proof.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should develop a documented process through the TO office that verifies any agreement or commitment to pick-up/delivery times prior to service. Without such documentation the carrier should be exempt from a tender of service violation.

RESPONSE: Carrier should document time and name of person contacted. Do not believe the situation warrants the establishment of a paper trail for all shipments. If a carrier is having a problem with a specific TO they should contact SDDC for resolution.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 331

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Quality and Performance Team

SUBJECT: DTR (Page IV O, para c) Quality Assurance (Invalidated LOIs)

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: In the new DTR carriers cannot resubmit an LOI with the same agent that was listed on their invalidated LOI if the invalidation of the LOI was due to the loss of agent. Industry is at loss as to why this restriction is extended to the international program. We see no purpose served to restrict agent representation in an arbitrary manner. Other questions remain. Is there a specific time period for the restrictions or is the restriction unlimited. The international agency world is very different from domestic. Oversea agency requirements for rate filing apply to the rate channel not just individual bases. Agent availability can be very restrictive overseas with as few as one or two in some areas.

RECOMMENDATION: The International program should be exempt from this restriction unless some relevance can be identified. In the alternative, TRANSCOM/SDDC should develop a policy that stipulates the length of restriction and provides for waivers in situations where agent service (availability) is limited.

RESPONSE: In the past when agents notified TO that they would no longer represent a carrier, the carrier was given the 45 days period to provide a new agency representation. Within days of the carrier notifying the TO, the agent would send a second letter stating they no longer represent the carrier. This happened with domestic and international carriers and in many cases this has to do with non-payment of debts. We acknowledge that not all carriers fail to pay their just debts, but for FY 2003 SDDC responded to request for assistance that totaled \$430,857. We non-concur to a change to the present DTR.

SUMMARY: Please refer to the TMA message DTG 021200Z FEB 04. Go to Personal Property/POV, Message, Carrier Qualification Performance, and TMA 01-04-LOI. TMA discusses the time period for restrictions. SDDC provided clarification regarding time period. Also, SDDC is preparing a DTR change to address the issue of resubmitting an LOI listing the same agent.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Open

ITEM: 332

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: DTR (Page IV B 5, para J) - In-transit Visibility

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: The new DTR deleted the requirement to respond to international shipment tracers with 120 hours. Leaving only 24 hours as the requirement for both Domestic and International shipments. Twenty-four (24) hours is insufficient time to obtain tracing information from foreign locations.

RECOMMENDATION: Clarify by message that response time for tracers on International shipments remains at 120 hours.

RESPONSE: SDDC will prepare a message providing clarification that carriers have 72 hours to respond to tracers.

SUMMARY: A Traffic Management Advisory message 02-04, was sent out changing DTR effective immediately Appendix A, Para A2N, DTG 101756Z May 04. See message on SDDC, Personal Property Website. Go to the Personal Property/POV, Message, Traffic Management Advisory Message 02-04 DTR Changes.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 333

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: DTR - (Page IV 0 12-13, para 3c) - Shipment Evaluation

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: The new DTR deleted the carrier's opportunity to recover the lost TQAP points for a missing 1840. The deleted procedure was a compromise arrived between Industry and MTMC in a joint effort to develop a more efficient method of getting the 1840 back to the origin TO. Initially this was the destination TO's responsibility, however, Origin TO's complained about not receiving the form promptly or at all. MTMC could not develop a workable internal system, so they placed this responsibility on the carriers. Unfortunately, MTMC could not resolve the issue of how to document receipt of the 1840 from the carrier. In the final analysis it was determined there was no practical method of proving if a carrier had failed to send in the 1840 or if the TO had misplaced or lost it. The compromise was to allow the carrier the opportunity to provide the 1840 after receiving the 1780 and recover the lost points. With the DTR change we are back to the same question we faced several years ago: How can this transaction be verified in a practical manageable way?

RECOMMENDATION: Reinstate by message the previous procedure that returns the lost points due to no 1840 at time of scoring if the carrier resubmits the 1840 within 45 days of receipt of the TQAP score.

RESPONSE: **Timely submission of the DD 1840 is the responsibility of the carrier. Carriers that can document timely submission of the DD form 1840 can use the appeal process to prove they are entitled to an adjusted TQAP score. SDDC will not reinstate previous procedure.**

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 334

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services

SUBJECT: Signed Delivery Receipts/Inventories as Proof of Delivery

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: Claims are being filed for missing items after the member has signed for receipt of items per delivery inventory. There have been several DOHA decisions related to service members filing claims for missing items after they have been signed for on delivery Inventories. In each decision the item was either packed within a carton that was received or one of several items listed on one line of the inventory i.e. "5 rugs" was the inventory description and the member later claimed one as missing. The Navy Claims MOU states that the member has "70 days to unpack, discover and report loss and damage that is not obvious at delivery". Our issue is that when an inventory line item describes a single item that is not a packed item, i.e. a carton, and that single item is signed for at the time of delivery, then the delivery receipt should stand as proof that the carrier delivered the item. It would seem that if the item were missing it would clearly fit the MOU as being "obvious at delivery".

RECOMMENDATION: Delivery receipts/inventories which are signed by the member should be allowed as proof of delivery when the inventory line item describes a single unit.

RESPONSES:

Navy Claims:

Navy, as well as other Services, continue to disagree with it is recommendation. There are often circumstances that lead to the failure to note a missing item in the delivery. In the example provided on the 5 rugs, for instance, a delivery agent could pick up the bundle, walk off the trailer and yell to the member, "Number 256, RUGS!" Member checks off #256 and later, while unbundling, notes that one of the rugs is not in the bundle and reports on the 1840R as they can under the current system. Services will continue to look to the totality of the circumstance and ask member to provide information on why item not listed as missing on 1840 and make a reasonableness determination based on the information.

Army Claims:

This item is almost identical to Item 239 submitted for the February 2002 M/I symposium. The military Services did not agree then, and will still disagree now. If the member actually initialed next to a specific item to show it was delivered, then that could be used as evidence to rebut the presumption created by the DD Form 1840R notice that it was missing. But merely signing an inventory at the bottom of a page does not indicate that the member carefully reviewed and checked each line item. In the Army, if a large item that

should have been noticed as missing on the day of delivery (e.g. piano, bed, dining room table) is not noted on the 1840, we ask the member to explain why it was not noted on day of delivery. All too often, the answer is that they did note it, but the delivery agent told them to put all of their items on the 1840R.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 335

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services

SUBJECT: Shuttle Transfers - Safety and Liability Concerns

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: Several local agents have experienced difficulty in obtaining approval from TMOs to initiate Shuttle Transfers from the agent's facility. The basis of the request is to avoid liability and safety concern when parking the over-the-road van on other people's private property without obtaining a waiver of liability from the property owner (commercial or residential). In today's litigious society, it would only take one small incident to the local agent out of business.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry recommends that TMOs be instructed to authorized the local agents warehouse as the initiation point for shuttle transfers when liability and safety concerns are involved and appropriately identified.

RESPONSE: Shuttle services must be coordinated with the responsible PPSO on a case-by-case basis. As part of the pre-pickup or delivery process the PPSO and the transportation provider have a responsibility to query the member to determine if there are any "special" requirements to include access to their quarters.

SUMMARY: AMSA Tabled this Item.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04

ITEM: 336

PROPONENT: HOUSEHOLD GOODS FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION

STAFF PROPONENT: Acquisition and Services Branch

SUBJECT: DPM Contracts that have carrier liability of sixty cents per pound per article.

INITIATED: February 14, 2004

DISCUSSION: A mover having a DPM contract with Kirtland AFB has had trouble with the base not limiting their liability to sixty cents per pound per article as specified in the contract. Instead, Kirtland has refused to accept carrier's payments based on the sixty cent liability, claiming that a 'negligence clause' in their contract which allows for depreciated value liability (\$1.25 per pound), and the base feels this should be automatically invoked on every DPM shipment. AFLSA/JACC has indicated that it does not have authority over Kirtland on a local contract like a DPM.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry would like SDDC to issue a written statement that the negligence clause in a DPM contract is not to be invoked without the existence of direct evidence of negligence on the part of the DPM contractor. We also call upon Air Force to advise which of their offices have authority over Kirtland AFB in these matters, and to have them assist by informing Kirtland of the correct policy and procedure relating to the application of the terms and conditions of the contract.

RESPONSE: The FAR clauses that are included in the solicitation for DPM services by a contracting office are not an ITO/TMO issue. The ITOs/TMOs have no say in this matter. Industry should address their concerns to the contracting officer awarding the contract.

SUMMARY: Industry will discuss with SDDC JA.

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 3 Mar 04