

PERSONAL PROPERTY FORUM

4 November 2009

Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC)

**Hilton Garden Inn
The Regency Conference Center
400 Regency Park Drive
O'Fallon, Illinois 62269
Phone: (618) 624-4499
Fax: (618) 624-5599**

FORUM CHAIR PERSON

SDDC

Lt Col Daniel Bradley

AGENDA SUMMARY

0730 hours – 0800 hours	Doors Open
0800 hours – 0815 hours	Opening Remarks
0815 hours – 1000 hours	Topics
1000 hours – 1015 hours	Break
1015 hours – 1200 hours	Topics
1200 hours – 1300 hours	Lunch Break
1300 hours – 1415 hours	Topics
1415 hours – 1430 hours	Break
1430 hours – 1630 hours	Topics

ITEM: 09-102

PROPONENT: Atlas Van Lines (ATVL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team/Rates Team

SUBJECT: SIT Approval Process Timing

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: The revisions to the SIT approval process released by SDDC on July 1, 2009, were a significant improvement for an extremely frustrating business process. We now deal with SIT approval delays in terms of hours rather than days.

Tariff 400NG-1, Item 120 Extra Labor, Special Services and Waiting Time, Section 7 Waiting Time, paragraph a. provide for an allowance of two hours of free waiting time at destination when delivering a shipment.

Paragraph C.3. of SDDC's July 1, 2009 message concerning changes to DP3 SIT procedures states that "TSPs are responsible for contacting members during the allotted free waiting time, prior to delivery and/or any SIT request. PPSOs are required to provide a quick reply to any authorized SIT request."

Many PPSOs are under the impression that TSPs must wait two hours after arriving a shipment in DPS before SIT can be requested in DPS. These PPSOs are under the further impression that they have an additional two hours in which to respond to SIT approval requests in DPS. As a result, the total waiting time experienced by TSPs for SIT approval requests is a minimum of four hours rather than the two hours provided for in Item 120 of Tariff 400NG-1.

We have been told by some PPSOs that this timing applies even when we have already been in contact with customers (members) prior to arrival at destination and know that the customer will not be available to accept the shipment. When trying to shorten the approval process time by submitting a SIT approval request in DPS immediately after arriving a shipment in DPS, we have been reprimanded by some PPSOs for taking such action. These situations happen in spite of SDDC's guidance that "PPSOs are required to provide a quick reply to any authorized SIT request." Further, PPSOs deny waiting time requests ignoring the provisions of Tariff 400NG-1, Item 120.

RECOMMENDATION: Revise the SIT approval business process so that the proper timing for submitting SIT approval requests in DPS is immediately after arriving shipments at destination in DPS. TSPs are responsible for contacting members during the allotted free waiting time. PPSOs are required to provide a quick reply to any authorized SIT request.

The goal for the process is to have no more than two hours elapse between the time a shipment is arrived in DPS, a SIT approval request is submitted in DPS, and a PPSO approval/denial of the SIT approval request is received in DPS. If PPSOs need the two hours to respond to a SIT approval request, then the only factor affecting the two hour goal is the TSP's ability/choice for submitting the SIT approval request in DPS after arriving a shipment in DPS.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Bob Ewing, Atlas Van Lines, 800-457-3370 x 2476

RESPONSE: We agree that the PPSO should provide a timely response to a TSP's SIT request. TSPs should be arriving a shipment as soon as (but not earlier than) their driver is in the destination vicinity, and they should be in contact with the customer before requesting SIT. Otherwise, they should attempt to contact the customer for at least 2 hours before requesting SIT. If contact with the customer is made prior

to 2 hours and the customer states that they will not be available for delivery within the next 2 hours (or 3 for international) or the free time remaining, then the TSP can make the SIT request in DPS. In reference to waiting time, waiting time is a service that must be ordered by the PPSO and the TSP cannot assume that the lack of a timely response is synonymous with approval of waiting time.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-103

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: SIT / Non Responsive Bases

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: A growing number of bases aren't responding to SIT requests. Drivers are being held in limbo with other shipments to be loaded or off loaded.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that SDDC remind PPSOs that SIT approval is vital. It may make the difference as to another shipment being loaded direct. Rose Lindsey: "Go ahead and unload the driver after three hours if you can't get in touch with the base." This helps but isn't a universal fix.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: See 09-102. SDDC will send a reminder message to PPSOs.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-104

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Clearing Shipments

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Why under the DPS System is the agent supposed to notify the Carriers for an Inbound shipment? It takes days to clear the shipment with no response. Why are the agents supposed to hold shipments without getting compensated for it, and sometimes after several days we're told it's a direct delivery.

RECOMMENDATION: Fix the process of clearing shipments at destination.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Klein's Moving and Storage Inc. 718-953-1700
kmg@aol.com

RESPONSE: In DPS, the TSP is required to update a shipment arrival status in DPS. TSP is responsible to coordinate for origin and destination services. PPSOs have been informed they are to contact the TSP regarding DPS shipments. See also Item 09-106, which is similar.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-106

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team/Rates Team

SUBJECT: SIT DELIVERY OUT ON DP3 SHIPMENTS:

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: In DP3, it has been noted by some TSPs that the PPSO has made arrangements direct with the destination warehouse for delivery out of a shipment in SIT. This bypasses the TSP who has thru responsibility for the shipment and often means that the TSP does not find out about the delivery out till paperwork arrives from the agent.

RECOMMENDATION: PPSOs should be instructed to use DPS to notify a TSP that a delivery out is requested or, at a minimum, they should email or call the TSP to arrange delivery out.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Peg Wilken, Stevens Van Lines

RESPONSE: We concur that PPSOs should be using DPS and/or otherwise contacting the TSP (not their agent) to ensure that the responsible TSP handles all delivery arrangements and makes the appropriate updates in DPS. A clarifying message will be sent to PPSOs. See also item 09-104.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-107

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Destination PPSO approving and issuing SIT# without TSP making DPS SIT request

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Modify DPS where the TSP must issue the SIT request, then the PPSO approves it with the system before issuing the SIT number. Some PPSOs are operating the same way with DPS as they do today in TOPS deliveries for SIT where the hauler/driver and destination agency request the SIT number.

RECOMMENDATION: Issue a procedural notice to all PPSOs to follow the business rules until a program fix as recommended is in place. If this does not warrant a programming change to DPS, then at least issue a reminder notice that before a PPSO issues a SIT # in DPS to contact the responsible TSP. This keeps the TSP who is responsible for the movement of the household goods to be informed and perform customer service with the member.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: We concur that PPSOs should be using DPS and/or otherwise contacting the TSP (not their agent) to ensure that the responsible TSP handles all delivery arrangements and makes the appropriate updates in DPS to include requesting SIT numbers. A clarifying message will be sent to PPSOs. See also item 09-106, which is similar.

PPSO should not be issuing a SIT number without TSP requesting SIT. PPSO do not have possession of the shipment and cannot mandate in which DOD approved warehouse a shipment is placed.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-108

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Release from SIT

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: There are no written procedures for shipments being released from storage. It was our understanding that the member was required to make a request in DPS. Service members, agents, TSPs and PPSOs need to know what the procedures are for requesting delivery out of storage. Some PPSOs are telling the service member to call the local agent instead of the TSP. Some PPSOs are calling the local agent themselves instead of calling the TSP. We need to clarify procedures to ensure a prompt delivery out of storage

RECOMMENDATION: We need an advisory message sent to all participants explaining procedures and then an addition to the business rules. Additionally, the TSP should be notified via DPS email when the customer request delivery out of storage in DPS.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kevin Myers, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: See 09-106. A clarifying message from SDDC will be sent to PPSOs.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-105

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: EXTENSION OF SIT ON DP3 SHIPMENTS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: As shipments have been placed into SIT in DPS, prior to 90 days of SIT, the PPSO is supposed to be determining if SIT is to be extended. Current business rules provide that the shipment remains in SIT at government expense until the SIT is terminated through DPS. Recently, there was guidance issued that the TSP should be checking with the PPSO when 90 days is up or at the end of each SIT extension period. It should not be up to the TSP to keep track of SIT extensions.

RECOMMENDATION: PPSOs should be reminded that they have the responsibility to manage SIT and SIT extensions. The TSP should only have to monitor DPS for any termination of SIT action. SDDC should also clarify exactly how the notice will be given to the TSP if SIT is either terminated or extended.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Peg Wilken, Stevens Van Lines

RESPONSE: SDDC agrees and will send out a message reminding PPSOs of their responsibility for managing SIT. The message will remind them that when SIT is extended beyond the first 90 days, the PPSO must notify the TSP of the extension and the projected termination date. A copy of DD Form 1857, Figure U.J-9, must be provided to the PPSO for each 90-day extension period. The PPSO can view and/or print the DD Form 1857.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-118

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Payments

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: How do we get paid for our services? I have yet to be successfully paid for any services we have done. This WILL bankrupt smaller companies. We do not have the time to wait while they figure out all of their little "system glitches" and why one program does not talk to the other.

We wait for MONTHS to hear back from the DPS help desk. I have spoken extensively with DPS, Powertrack, and the bases. No one seems to understand how all of this works, how everyone and every system is connected, and what each of them needs to do in order for the TSP to get paid.

The time spent trying to track down payment is RIDICULOUS. Again, this WILL bankrupt companies...quite possibly ours, if they keep it up.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC needs to streamline the approval/payment process to enable small companies to get paid.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Aimee McDonald, Swans Moving and Storage SWNM
aimee.mcdonald@swansmoving.com

RESPONSE: SDDC host a bi-weekly TSP/PPSO invoicing call to address issues/concerns with billing and invoicing in DPS. SDDC realizes that with all new programs there are start-up challenges. As these issues are discovered, SDDC, in conjunction with the JPMO, will research and provide an interim billing solution as appropriate. There are some situations that must be submitted to Tier 2 developers to resolve before the TSPs can receive payment. In these situations where a financial burden is placed upon a TSP, SDDC will be sensitive to the urgency of addressing these matters. We highly recommend all TSPs to join our invoicing calls if you have any questions.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-125

PROPONENT: Total Military Management

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: PPSOs checking their billing queues

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: There are many bases that are not checking their billing queues in a timely manner in order for the carrier to be paid in a timely manner.

RECOMMENDATION: There needs to be consistency in the time that they are required to process.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Christiane Crown, 877-286-0512

RESPONSE: SDDC and JPMO host bi-weekly invoicing calls with the PPSOs and TSPs on a rotating basis. During these calls, SDDC and JPMO reiterate to the PPSOs the importance of timely processing of invoices. According to the electronic billing payment business rules, the PPSO is encouraged to process invoices within 3 business days, although there are some circumstances where the PPSO may be waiting for additional information from the TSP before processing the invoice. We encourage all participants in DPS to attend the invoicing calls. Any billing concerns may be addressed to: sddc.safb.billing@us.army.mil. This email box is monitored daily and the questions are discussed during the weekly invoice calls.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-121

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: CRATING SERVICES

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: On 7/28/09, Presidio of Monterey PPSO issued a letter that addressed specialized crating. The message says “Crating an item to prevent a claim under full replacement value is not a valid argument “{for authorizing the special service}. This makes no sense since that is the total reason for crating items in the first place. Just because it is the TSP who is now responsible for FRV instead of the military does not make unreasonable to request authorization for crating an item to properly protect it from damage.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should instruct PPSOs that crating should be approved when it is the appropriate method to properly protect an item from damage.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: Under the guidance provided in the DTR (e.g. Appendix P, etc) PPSOs have always had, and continue to have under FRV, the authority to approve and/or disapprove crating services. The PPSO’s disapproval does not preclude the TSP from crating at his/her own expense if that is what they believe they must do in order to ensure safe transportation. If there are specific examples that industry believes require an SDDC review or are otherwise under dispute those should be provided to the appropriate program group box sddc.safb.pops@us.army.mil. See also item 09-150.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-150

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Ops Team

SUBJECT: Crating at Origin

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: PPSOs are disapproving crating of items at origin that have been approved historically, e.g. marble and glass tabletops, fragile paintings and pictures.

RECOMMENDATION: Authorize crating or remove all TSP liability for damages sustained during transportation.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: Under the guidance provided in the DTR (e.g. Appendix P, etc) PPSOs have always had, and continue to have under FRV, the authority to approve and/or disapprove crating services. The PPSOs disapproval does not preclude the TSP from crating at his/her own expense if that is what they believe they must do in order to ensure safe transportation. If there are specific examples that industry believes require an SDDC review or are otherwise under dispute, those should be provided to the appropriate program group box (sddc.safb.pops@us.army.mil . See also item 09-121.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-135

PROPONENT: Paxton Van Lines (PAXT)

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations

SUBJECT: Payment metrics since implementation of DPS.

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: During the Phase I implementation of electronic payments, we kept good track of speed and accuracy metrics for CWA / Powertrack. What has happened to those metrics since the implementation of DPS?

RECOMMENDATION: Please provide comparative metrics for invoicing processes and payments to TSPs from before and after implementation of DPS.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Chuck White, IAM

RESPONSE: For Phase I of DPS, SDDC was providing a Payment Times Report to all the Service Representatives. This PTR recorded all PPSOs overall average payment time to process invoices. SDDC still maintains these metrics for CWA and has started maintaining the same metrics for DPS.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-101

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Black-Out Dates

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Should be limited down to PPSO level. For example Garmisch or Geilenkirchen are areas with very limited capacity in Germany. Due to cost and distance they are booked out much faster than other ones. One would not like to black out the whole country or gblock if only problems in small areas exist and as such deprive the GOVT of the TSPs with best value in ranking.

RECOMMENDATION: Add extra level to black outs till PPSO level

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: TSPs may modify blackout dates in DPS on a daily basis. This provides TSPs with the flexibility required to manage their workload. SDDC considers the current capability to blackout appropriate to ensure a pool of available TSPs is maintained in each channel for expected DOD shipments. (See Item 09-131)

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-134

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

SUBJECT: Shipment Refusals

DISCUSSION: The idea that a TSP cannot refuse a shipment causes great problems in scheduling for agents. Most agents have been approached by various TSPs on the very day of loading to pickup shipments that were "left in the street" because of overbooking due to the DP3 rule of no shipment being refused.

We are all aware that in the peak season we are all pushed to the limit and prudence with respect to equipment and driver hours of service (a federal DOT rule) dictates refusal of shipments by agents. Refusals are sometimes necessary. Allow shipment refusals; at least a certain number of them.

RESPONSE: TSPs may modify blackout dates in DPS on a daily basis. This provides TSPs with the flexibility to manage their workload. SDDC considers the current capability to blackout appropriate to ensure a pool of available TSPs is maintained in each channel for expected DOD shipments. (Same as 09-101)

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-111

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Provide a direct HOT link into DPS for members to do CSS surveys

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: As discussed in the April 2009 PPF (Item 09-021) , provide the service member a link within their CSS email reminders where the member can click on Perform Survey and it will take them directly into DPS without logging into DPS with a ID/Password. If we are achieving 15-20% return rate on surveys in the TOPS moves and only 4-5% in DPS, then access to the survey must be one of the main issues for a poor return rate.

RECOMMENDATION: This hot link exists in emails sent out of ETA for TOPS shipments. Modify this process so it accesses DPS giving the member direct access to enter their survey data.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR 0343 has been written to provide an encrypted link into DPS for Service Members to do the survey. This SCR has been costed within the JPMO.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-112

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Re-instate use of domestic median score

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: With the removal of using the MEDIAN score in computing a TSP's CSS, very few TSPs are ever statistically valid. This ratio of statistically valid TSPs will decrease as we move more members under the DP3 system (based upon the low return rate of 4 to 5%), thus leaving just the TSPs with high scores of today continuing to be rated high while the lower scored TSPs will always remain in the system with low scores. Over the course of the next 12 months as TSP's surveys from TOPS moves age off, we will see a decrease in statistically valid TSPs. Without some modification to this process there will be no way that SDDC can measure the quality of a TSP over the course of the past year since their scores will never be used due to not being statistically valid. The CSS business rule on U.H-4 states, "The measure of statistical validity built into the CSS provides statistical rigor and confidence in the CSS as a method for providing a relative ranking of TSPs based on performance." The DOD goal of "More frequently selecting TSPs that provide better service and motivating TSPs to improve service performance," cannot be obtained if very few TSPs achieve statistical validity.

Per the CSS business rules, DPS generates a list of members to be contacted telephonically to complete the survey if the TSP does not have a valid number of surveys. Is this process staffed and being used (u-H-2)?

With the DPS program officially starting in Nov. 2008, when will the following business rule apply? Over time a very high percentage of the TSPs will fall into this classification and earn a neutral score. This will cause all TSPs to be merged into the middle of the rankings with only our rates driving who is the better quality TSP, not based upon the quality of service a TSP delivers to our military members.

At the bottom of page 10 in Quality Assurance (U.Q-10) it states: TSP DID NOT MOVE SHIPMENTS: If a TSP was not offered any shipments during the evaluation period, the previous CSS carries over. Any claims completed since the previous performance period, and during the previous 12 months, result in a new CS. The new CS is combined with the carried over CSS score and the TSP receives a new PS. If a TSP carries over the same CSS score due to a lack of statistical validity for more than six performance periods (one year), SDDC assist the TSP in attaining statistical validity utilizing supplemental neutral surveys. This methodology allows TSPs to receive credit for surveys completed and ensures that TSP performance is taken into consideration and BVS methodology retained.

NOTE: TSP may continue to receive neutral scores until they achieve statistical validity.

RECOMMENDATION: Calculate a median score at the end of each CSS recalculation window (60 days prior to the performance period where the score will apply to), and include the required number of median scores to make all TSPs statistically valid and then calculate the new CSS. This will assist in achieving a quality driven program that DPS was designed to deliver.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: As outlined in the DTR, if a TSP is not statistically valid, the previous performance score carries over. Median scores will be used for qualified new entrants. The System Response Center, in partnership with SDDC, aggressively conducts telephone surveys for iCSS in an effort to achieve statistical

validity. SDDC appreciates the efforts of TSPs to facilitate and encourage members to complete the Customer Satisfaction Survey.

This subject was also discussed at the April Forum. Please see Discussion Item 09-026, which discusses the use of the median score for new entrants. See also item 09-131.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-131

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Ranking of TSPs with non-statistical valid scores

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Average scores have been added to TSPs lacking a valid statistical score at the first racking in the beginning of the program. After that at each re-rack, they carry over the same score unless they become statistically valid on their own. That means that if a TSP never becomes statistically valid, they will forever have the same score. In some cases they will never see a shipment and in other cases they will always book a large amount. That is not best value.

RECOMMENDATION: The new average score should be published before each re-rack and added to the new score that the TSP has for the new period that is being calculated.

RESPONSE The DTR states if a TSP does not achieve statistical validity, the previous performance score carries over. Median scores (what you refer to as average scores) will be used for TSPs that do not remain statistically valid over six performance periods or for qualified new entrants. The System Response Center, in partnership with SDDC, aggressively conducts telephone surveys for iCSS in an effort to achieve statistical validity. SDDC appreciates the efforts of TSPs to facilitate and encourage members to complete the Customer Satisfaction Survey.

This subject was also discussed at the April Forum (discussion item 09-026) which discusses the use of the median score for new entrants.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-113

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Review number of DPS Performance Periods

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Need to address what can be changed in DOMESTIC traffic distribution to allow TSPs in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quartile to receive shipments. Under the current process in the two busy performance periods (2nd & 6th), the amount of traffic that moved in 2007 was mapped to channels. During these performance periods only the TSPs in the 1st quartile will receive traffic offers. With 700+ TSPs filing rates in the high volume channels, that puts about 175-180 in each quartile. In all channels there is only enough traffic to create 2 or 3 passes through the 1st quartile. I cannot find a channel where DPS will ever drop into the 2nd quartile.

This is the performance period with the most traffic moved, but with a new rate filing these numbers need divided by Apr1-May 14, then May 15 to June 30.

2nd performance period of April – June (which will be split in half due to new rates on May 15)

Period	State	Channel	# Shipments
2007 2	California-South	10	797
2007 2	Virginia	12	751
2007 2	Virginia	2	742
2007 2	Texas-North	5	698
2007 2	Texas-North	12	621
2007 2	Virginia	6	604
2007 2	California-South	6	589
2007 2	Florida-North	10	531
2007 2	California-South	15	496
2007 2	Virginia	13	490
2007 2	North Carolina	10	486
2007 2	California-South	12	484
2007 2	Georgia	6	476
2007 2	Texas-North	15	476
2007 2	Virginia	9	438
2007 2	North Carolina	6	430
2007 2	Virginia	15	420
2007 2	Florida-North	6	414
2007 2	Virginia	5	414
2007 2	Texas-North	10	410
2007 2	Virginia	11	402

The 2nd busiest performance period is Oct-Dec, the 6th performance period

6th Performance Period for October through December

Period	State	Channel	# Shipments
2007 6	California-South	10	488
2007 6	Virginia	12	468
2007 6	Virginia	2	420
2007 6	California-South	6	395
2007 6	Texas-North	15	390
2007 6	Virginia	6	365
2007 6	California-South	12	333
2007 6	California-South	15	322
2007 6	Texas-North	12	321
2007 6	Georgia	6	318
2007 6	North Carolina	6	312
2007 6	Florida-North	6	277
2007 6	North Carolina	12	275
2007 6	Texas-South	15	274
2007 6	Washington	6	273
2007 6	Florida-North	10	268
2007 6	Virginia	9	251
2007 6	Washington	2	250
2007 6	North Carolina	10	248
2007 6	Virginia	13	247
2007 6	Washington	12	234
2007 6	Virginia	15	233
2007 6	Texas-South	10	229
2007 6	Florida-North	2	227
2007 6	Virginia	11	221
2007 6	California-South	9	219
2007 6	Washington	10	208
2007 6	California-North	10	207
2007 6	Georgia	12	205
2007 6	Georgia	10	202
2007 6	Texas-North	10	200
2007 6	California-South	1	199

RECOMMENDATION: During the PPF we discuss a change in the number of performance periods. Two performance periods of Jan 1 to May 14 and May 15 to-Dec 31 will increase the number of shipments to move into the 2nd and 3rd quartiles in many of the higher volume channels.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SDDC continues to review this process and appreciates the recommendation. The **current** Business Rules state that six performance periods were appropriate to ensure Best Value and maximize traffic distribution. As the program matures, we will continue reviewing our processes and consider proposed changes. The government reserves the right to determine the evaluation and performance criteria it administratively determines to be in the best interest of the government.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: Closed 6 April 2009

ITEM: 09-114

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: BVS Performance Periods & Cutoff Dates

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Items 09-019 and 09-020 from the 6 Apr PPF related to BVS cutoff dates for 2009 Performance periods and stated that there would be six performance periods annually. Because the annual rate cycle begins May 15 each year, the following cutoff dates will no longer work:

The outline of performance period cutoff for CSS is outlined below.

Performance Periods	Performance Period Cutoff Dates (12 Months Worth of Data)
1 Jan to 31 Mar	Not Applicable
1 Apr to 30 Jun	1 Feb 08 to 31 Jan 09
1 Jul to 31 Jul	1 May 08 to 31 Apr 09
1 Aug to 31 Aug	1 Jun 08 to 31 May 09
1 Sep to 30 Sep	1 Jul 08 to 30 Jun 09
1 Oct 31 Dec	1 Aug 08 to 31 Jul 09

RECOMMENDATION: A new performance period begins with each annual rate cycle date (15 May), we recommend the following modification along with removing the calendar year reference for 12-month data used for each performance period:

<u>Performance Periods</u>	<u>Performance Period Cutoff Dates (12 Months Worth of Data)</u>
1 Jan to 14 May	1 Nov to Oct 31
15 May to 30 June	1 Mar to 28(29) Feb
1 Jul to 31 Jul	1 May to 30 Apr
1 Aug to 31 Aug	1 Jun to 31 May
1 Sep to 30 Sep	1 Jul to 30 Jun
1 Oct 31 Dec	1 Aug to 31 Jul

If adjustments to the current schedule are not made, there will actually be seven performance periods due to the recalculation of BVS with the annual beginning of the rate cycle on 15 May.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Sonja Pullaro, UniGroup, Inc., 636-305-6260

RESPONSE: The current process to determine a performance score requires combining iCSS data with CSS data. This process takes approximately 60 days as CSS data needs to be combined, processed and sent to industry for review before calculating the BVS. Each BVS is run the day prior to its effective date, the first day of the performance period month. The one exception is the 1 Apr BVS which includes two TDs (1Apr-14 May and 15 May-30 Jun. We established the 60 day cut off prior to each performance period in order to ensure enough processing time and capture the most current performance data.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-116

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Agents providing origin services

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: If an agent does not have to be military approved in DP3, and does not have an approved warehouse facility, how is he allowed to perform origin services? For example, if a TSP's usual agent is not available during peak season to provide packing and other origin services and the TSP hires a packing service that is not an approved agent. The TSP plans to have the over-the-road vehicle arrive at residence to load the shipment, but there may be a mechanical issue, or the driver may have an hours of service limitation, or the driver may be unable to offload their vehicle into storage as planned. What happens to the shipment then? It could be loaded onto the unapproved agent's vehicle, or placed into an unapproved warehouse until a driver can pick it up, or left at the house. None of these are good options.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should advise how TSPs are allowed to use unapproved agents in the DP3 program.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Joel Summer, Pacific Moving & Storage, 718-345-6000

RESPONSE: In DPS, SDDC corresponds only with the responsible TSPs for movement of personal property.. The business rules allow TSPs to utilize other entities (non-approved agents/local agents) to perform services but retain overall responsibility for the end-to-end movement of any personal property shipment in their possession. Approved warehouses are still required for SIT/NTS but not if only used to provide origin/destination services. See also item 09-133.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-120

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team/JA

SUBJECT: THIRD PARTY SERVICING COMPANIES

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: On 7/28/09, Presidio of Monterey PPSO issued a letter reference SDDC guidance dated 6/20/09 regarding 3rd party companies associated with a TSP or agent. The message seems to say that if an agent or a TSP owns a 3rd party servicing company, that company can't be used to provide 3rd party billable services on DOD shipments.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should share with industry what guidance it issued on this subject. If a TSP or its agent sets up a separate company with skilled individuals who provide everything from crating to appliance servicing, they usually provide services to many other TSPs and agents as a legitimate separate company. Request that SDDC recognize this arrangement as an acceptable 3rd party serving company.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: Current SDDC guidance on third party service providers still applies. The PPSO has the authority to approve a third party service and determine if it is a legitimate request. SDDC is reviewing current policy defining what constitutes a "legal" third party service provider and we will publish those results once finalized.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-123

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Enhance Traffic Distribution List to include total number of TSPs filing rates in a channel

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: This relates to the solution given in the Atlanta PPF (Item 09-018) where the decision was to provide a total number of TSPs in a channel be made available in a report posted on the SDDC website.

RECOMMENDATION: Add one data field into the Traffic Distribution Report listing the total number of TSPs that filed rates within each channel. This data would be useful to all TSPs and PPSOs when reviewing where a TSP resides within a given quartile without having to go to another data source to locate how many TSPs filed rates in a specific channel.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR #5343 is in place to provide the capability for each TSP to view its specific placement on the TDL. In the interim, the TSP per channel listing is available on SDDC's website. This information can be found by going to the SDDC internet, then selecting:

1. Personal Property
2. DPS
3. Phase II
4. TSP per channel listing

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-124

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Team

SUBJECT: Modify DPS Analytics or DPS Customer Survey process to generate summary data as is available out of ICSS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: A TSP has no report out of DPS that can verify their CSS scores between a select date range. As moves increase under DPS and in the future when all traffic is moved in DPS there is no process in place to generate a summary or detailed CSS report that can be used to validate a TSP's RAW score for the past 12 months that will be used in a performance period. The current ICSS report process provides a summary line for dHHG and iHHG and indicates number of surveys during a date range along with the average score for each question. In the analytics process when you use DPS Answers and the DPS Surveys it limits the data fields that are available. Some of the key data fields that are unavailable are the origin or destination address, and the indicator letting a TSP know if the member can be contacted.

RECOMMENDATION: Modify the DPS Analytics under DPS Answers to provide such data or build a process within the Customers Survey tab to generate this type of summary and detailed data.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR 5875 was submitted to addresses this concern. DPS Analytics, DPS Answers and DPS Surveys does provide some capability to review your CSS data to the same level as the reports previously provided in iCSS. However, several reports need to be run versus all inclusive on one report.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-126

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: ITEM 09-023 "Customer Comments on CSS" from the Atlanta forum

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Survey comments are not being sent out using the DPS E-Mail Manager but are sent to all personnel who have select DPS user roles both within the TSP and PPSO roles. The TSP role of Quality Assurance needs these survey comments.

RECOMMENDATION: The TSP role of Quality Assurance needs to be added to this distribution.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR 4330 added the TSP Master and TSP Operations role to receive CSS comments but did not include TSP QA role. If this functionality is needed, request TSPs utilize the SCR request process linked on the SDDC Personal Property website to submit this request for added functionality.
[http://www.sddc.army.mil/Public/Personal%20Property/Defense%20Personal%20Property%20Program/Defense%20Personal%20Property%20System%20\(DPS\)/Instructions%20for%20DPS%20System%20Change%20Request?summary=fullcontent](http://www.sddc.army.mil/Public/Personal%20Property/Defense%20Personal%20Property%20Program/Defense%20Personal%20Property%20System%20(DPS)/Instructions%20for%20DPS%20System%20Change%20Request?summary=fullcontent)

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-127

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance

SUBJECT: ITEM 09-051 “Email notification to TSP when Existing Claims are modified” from the Atlanta forum

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: To better assist the member, TSP, and PPSO in knowing that a claim has been submitted or modified in a timely manner, and in turn provides better service to our military members.

RECOMMENDATION: 1. Enhance the email notifications within the claims process so that when a TSP makes an offer, the member receives an email notifying them of the offer. 2. Modify the process so the TSP receives an email when the member or PPSO makes any change to an existing claim or adds an item to the claim. 3. If the claim is settled in full and at a later date the member submits another claim item on this shipment, notify the TSP with an email.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: Per the response to item 09-050 (not 09-051) at the April PPF, SDDC recommended that Industry submit an SCR on this issue. Based on summary of item 09-050 (not 051) from Atlanta forum, SDDC recommended that industry submit an SCR on this issue. SCR 5330 was submitted. This item should now be closed.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-129

PROPONENT: Atlas Van Lines International (ATVN)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: “Anonymous” Customer Satisfaction Surveys

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Service members can do something during their CSS so that their name and GBL number is marked “anonymous” when we look at the report in DPS. However, the last 4 digits of their SSN are still present, as well as the origin and destination rate areas, plus pick up and delivery dates. Therefore, surveys are not truly anonymous since there is enough information to allow a TSP to determine who the shipper actually is with a little research.

Truly anonymous surveys are worthless information unless they are specific enough in their comments to determine exactly where the problem is. (i.e. “agent “X” did a poor job packing...”) Even then, the agent would not be able to determine which of their packing crews were responsible without more details.

The foundation of any quality system is a feedback loop to allow for continuous improvement. It is unfair, and does nobody any good to find out about a problem that you can’t trace back to the source and therefore have no ability to fix. Withholding the name and GBL number merely creates more work for the carriers in tracking down and resolving problems with no apparent benefit to the member or anyone else.

Service members are being misled if they think that their comments are truly anonymous, or that checking a box to indicate anonymous will prevent later contact from the TSP. Wishing to remain anonymous and not wanting to be contacted are two completely different things. (Think of all the anonymous phone survey calls you have answered at dinner time...) Someone may wish to remain anonymous, yet be perfectly willing to discuss something in greater detail as long as their privacy is protected.

In the ICSS program, Members could indicate whether or not they wanted to be contacted regarding the comments in their survey. TSPs understand and respect this. There is nothing in this false “anonymous” status that prohibits a carrier from following up with the member after their survey.

RECOMMENDATION: If the member does not wish to be contacted by the TSP after completing the survey, then provide them with a check box to indicate such. Unmask the name and GBL# in the survey report so that TSPs can more readily match the survey results to a specific shipment.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Michael Hall, mhall@atlasintl.com, (206) 436-0106

RESPONSE: DTR U.H outlines members/employees CSS comment options. Option 2 and 3 are similar in that they indicate members/employees preference to not be contacted and/or remain anonymous. Currently, DPS does not truly allow a member/employee to remain “anonymous” as there are reports that DPS (TSPs) can generate and discover who a particular CSS belongs to. However, that does not eliminate the business rule restriction of not contacting any member/employee who selects Option 2 or 3 when completing their CSS. SDDC will research ability for DPS to allow members/employees to remain anonymous if requested.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-130

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

SUBJECT: Need a Claims Service User Role

DISCUSSION: A large percentage of TSPs have always used a claims settlement service, in the same manner that a third party billing service is utilized (like the Day Companies). However, unlike billing services, there is no user role that will allow the third party claims service to have access to all of their TSPs. It is impossible for a claims service to operate at the required level of efficiency if they must sign on and off of each of their client's SCACs all day long. Signing up for the Claims User function for every single client is not an acceptable remedy, just as it would not be an acceptable remedy for the third party billing services. It also hinders the ability to serve DOD Customers in an efficient manner.

Since many of the TSPs that use claims services are small businesses that are not large enough to sustain a full time claims person, the result is a discriminatory expense for small business.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that a Claims Service User Role be created in DPS that would allow a Claims Service access to all of their clients without having to go in and out of DPS and juggle a multitude of sign-ons.

RESPONSE: SCR 5295 is in place to expand current DPS capabilities that allow third party billing services to view claims data for multiple SCACs.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-132

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

Subject: Claims Communication between TSP and member

Initiated: 4 Nov 09

Discussion: At present the TSP cannot communicate with the member in DPS in regards to a claim that was filed. A TSP can only make an offer or deny it. Member and TSP cannot ask questions and get answers, which is almost always a must when processing a claim. All communication must be done outside DPS, yet the clock ticks even though a TSP is waiting for a response from the member, which many times takes days.

Recommendation: Add a section in the claims module where the TSP and member can communicate and stop the clock when a question was posed to the member until he answers. Having all the information in one place will also help the claims services in case a claim is reverted to them.

RESPONSE: SCR 5307 is in place to fix this issue. However, TSPs and member should be actively communicating via phone to facilitate that actions have been accomplished in DPS.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-133

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

SUBJECT: Use of Non-Military Approved Agents in DP3

DISCUSSION: Why should TSPs be allowed to use non-DOD approved agents to service shipments? This is something that seems highly implausible for overseas agents. Special requirements are necessary for an overseas agent such as heat treated boxes, flatbed equipment scales, banding equipment, etc. Most non-military agents do not have this equipment. Furthermore in speaking to QC inspectors they sometimes do not know the agent who is to service the shipment since they can come in unmarked vehicles and the member is confused since he may have several shipments to move.

RECOMMENDATION: Disallow the use of non-DOD approved agents

RESPONSE: : In DPS, SDDC corresponds only with the responsible TSPs for movement of personal property.. The business rules allow TSPs to utilize other entities (non-approved agents/local agents) to perform services but retain overall responsibility for the end-to-end movement of any personal property shipment in their possession. Approved warehouses are still required for SIT/NTS but not if only used to provide origin/destination services. See also item 09-116.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-136

PROPONENT: Paxton Van Lines (PAXT)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: CSS and ICSS Response Rates.

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: We haven't seen any really current metrics on the ICSS/CSS response rates. What are they by market? How many TSPs actually have significant scores?

RECOMMENDATION: Please provide metrics for CSS responses at the market level. Discuss ongoing efforts (and your assessment of them) to improve the response rate.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Chuck White, IAM

RESPONSE: SDDC is providing the metrics for iCSS and CSS response rates. This table is pulling data from 18 November 08 to 30 September 09:

CSS Response Rates			
Market	iCSS	DPS	Total
dHHG	29.73%	12.12%	26.97%
iHHG	18.06%	9.04%	16.96%
iUB	13.97%	9.13%	13.44%
Total	22.49%	10.76%	20.90%
*Dates from 11/18/2008 to 9/30/2009			

Percentage of Statistically Valid TSPs for October-December Performance Period
30%

SDDC continues to work with the Services and Industry to increase our return rate for the Customer Satisfaction Survey. We are working with JPMO and SRA to provide an encrypted link for direct access to the CSS within DPS and to allow for telephone survey completion for CSS within DPS. Additionally, SDDC constantly strives to provide updated information within JPMO's move.mil and on the SDDC website. SDDC encourages the use of the CSS Brochure, both by the TSP and by the PPSO, to facilitate the process and steps for CSS completion. SDDC is developing a guide for the PPSOs so they are better equipped to explain, encourage, and guide the member thru CSS completion. In addition, SDDC is continuing to encourage members/employees to complete their CSS by creating a video spot for distribution on AFRTS.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-137

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF ARRIVAL OF SHIPMENT FOR DIRECT DELIVERY

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: We have received Letters of Warning for failure to notify the PPSO of arrival/delivery on shipments that deliver direct to residence. We are unaware of any business rules requirement to provide such notice. In fact, when a DP3 shipment has a residence address at destination, the driver simply makes arrangements with the customer to deliver direct and then the TSP notes that delivery in DPS after it has occurred.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should notify PPSOs that it is not a business rule requirement to give advance notice of the arrival or delivery of a shipment at destination, other than to put the final delivery information in DPS in a timely fashion.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Peg Wilken, Stevens Van Lines

RESPONSE: There is not a business rule requirement to give advance notice on the arrival or delivery of a shipment to the destination PPSO. However, there is a requirement to notify the PPSO of arrival/delivery on shipments that deliver directly to a residence. DTR, Part IV, Appendix U, Attachment U.J., par. C3a states: "Upon shipment arrival at destination, the TSP must enter the arrival information in DPS within 72 hours" Clarifying language is being coordinated to explain "72 hours equals 3 business days.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-138

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: APPROVAL FOR INTRASTATE BUSINESS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: DPS business rules state that in order to have intrastate approval for a regulated state, the TSP must “submit electronically a copy of your state permit. . .” (2.2.7 TSP Qualifications). The State of Michigan (for example) is regulated and each carrier must have a license from the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC). Many carriers have Michigan intrastate rates on file in DP3 that do not have operating authority granted by the MPSC. The same issue applies to many if not all of the regulated states.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should enforce the regulation that requires carriers to show proof of operating authority or approval to operate within a regulated state

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: SCR 3528 is in place to allow TSPs to enter each State in which they have authority. TSPs are required to give HQ SDDC a copy of their state permit or if that state is deregulated and no permit is required, a copy of the TSP’s articles of incorporation. The state permit or articles of incorporation must apply to the state(s) in which the TSP is applying. The documents must be faxed to (618) 220-5282. Presently, this process must be done manually. SDDC is actively working to ensure no TSP is allocated a shipment within a state they do not have authority to transport HHG.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-139

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team/TCJ5/4

SUBJECT: Saturation and Quality

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: This DPS program is sacrificing the member for high quality service. It is also unfriendly between Carriers, Agents, and Transportation Offices. DPS was supposedly established for high quality service but has done exactly the opposite. TSPs are forced to take all shipments no matter if they are saturated or not. You demand professional service but there are times when our resources are stretched to the saturation point. TSPs should have the right to reject shipments when resources are exhausted. This system forces a TSP to use unapproved agents. How do you provide high quality service by condoning the use of unapproved substandard agents for origin services?

RECOMMENDATION:

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Klein's Moving and Storage Inc. 718-953-1700
kmvg@aol.com

RESPONSE: In DPS, SDDC corresponds only with the responsible TSPs for movement of personal property.. The business rules allow TSPs to utilize other entities (non-approved agents/local agents) to perform services but TSPs retain overall responsibility for the end-to-end movement of any personal property shipment in their possession. TSPs may modify blackout dates in DPS on a daily basis. This provides TSPs with the flexibility required to manage their workload..

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-140

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: DPS LETTERS OF WARNING

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: In DPS, a Letter of Warning is generated by the system even if the PPSO is just entering notes about the services rendered.

RECOMMENDATION: Change DPS so that the option to issue a Letter of Warning is an explicit action that needs to be taken by the PPSO selecting that action.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael, smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: From the Shipment Management tab, the QA inspector can enter the QA Management function to enter remarks in the "Inspector Remarks" box. If the PPSO does NOT check/select one of the 25 Tender of Service Violations listed on the screen that give reasons for a LOW, but selects the "Enter Inspection" button instead, the screen shows a block for comments/notes. The QA Inspector must then select the "save and continue" button. No LOW will be sent out, but the notes will be saved.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-141

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team/Military Services Headquarters

SUBJECT: Vehicle Certification

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When shipping vehicles in containers, such as a motorcycle, scooter, watercraft, or similar items, the TSP is supposed to certify that the vehicle has been completely drained of fuel and run until stalled. Batteries must be disconnected and taped back to prevent ignition. However, the member is responsible for preparing these items for shipment, not the TSP. In many cases, the TSP will not have the key, so they will have no way to confirm that the tank is empty and the ignition won't work, especially if the battery has been disconnected.

RECOMMENDATION: The service member should be responsible for signing this certification, not the TSP, because the member knows whether that has been performed as required.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Joel Summer, Pacific Moving & Storage, 718-345-6000

RESPONSE: This Service Member's requirement to service gas powered equipment is on the counseling check list. The TSP has overall responsibility for validating these requirements are met before accepting any item for shipment. TSPs are encouraged to reiterate this responsibility during any premove survey when such equipment is identified for movement to prevent any delays during packing/pick up. If an issue arises that cannot be resolved between the TSP and member/employee, TSPs should call the local PPSO/PPPO for assistance.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-142

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: DPS process to allow a TSP to request GBL corrections

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Today when a TSP enters data fields that should trigger a GBL correction it causes problems for the PPSO to review and issue the correction. JPPSO-SA has found it much easier for the TSP to just call the PPSO with the necessary changes or data additions and they can enter the data and then issue the correction. If the TSP enters the data change, then the PPSO must back out the entries and re-enter them under their PPSO login and then issue the correction.

The workaround documented in the Smart Book where the TSP calls the PPSO and they make a modification of some data field works, but is time consuming. Also some PPSOs are unfamiliar with the process causing delays in a TSP obtaining corrections.

RECOMMENDATION: Enhance the system to allow a TSP to make data changes such as date changes, address changes, etc. to trigger a GBL correction, and email a notification to the PPSO of the changes so they can review and issue the GBL correction.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR 5510 and 5514 address this issue.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-143

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Allow TSP and PPSO to make modifications to data fields after shipment is shown as delivered

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When a TSP or possibly a PPSO makes a mistake entering data, once the shipment is marked as delivered we must make a request of the helpdesk/SRA to get data errors corrected. This functionality will eliminate the helpdesk and SRA from having to be involved in data corrections.

RECOMMENDATION: Allow select fields to be modified after a shipment is marked as delivered. Require the change to be documented as to why and allow the PPSO to accept or validate the change. A set list of updatable fields could be drafted with TSP and PPSO input. Our suggested data fields would be at a minimum the weights, delivery address, delivery dates, phone numbers, and email address.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR 5510 and 5514 address this issue.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-144

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team

SUBJECT: Traffic Distribution after a shipment is cancelled/pulled back

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: In the July performance period we had two shipments cancelled with no additional offer in those channels. In the May 15-June 30 performance period we had 4 terminations with no additional offers in those channels. In the April 1 to the May 15 performance period (everything gets reset with new rates causing a new performance period from an offering standpoint) we had 9 terminations with no additional offers in those channels.

RECOMMENDATION: Provide a few examples of where a TSP had a shipment cancelled and received another offer in the same channel and performance period.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: There are instances where a shipment is cancelled/pulled back and there may not be another offer for the TSP who was awarded the shipment. Orders can be cancelled and no other shipment is needed. Orders can be changed where the member/employee is no longer moving to the same location and therefore no additional shipment offered in that particular channel. SDDC has received several inquiries on this particular concern and each time we researched, DPS was functioning according to the business rules.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-145

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: JPMO

SUBJECT: Automated SIT approvals on destination shipment OCONUS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When TSP puts shipment in SIT at destination in OCONUS DPS, sit number is automatically issued and three items are automatically generated and approved in the accessorial item list, however two of them are incorrect, this happens with EVERY shipment in OCONUS and has to be manually adjusted: 3 items are CONUS first sit day and warehouse handling / CONUS sit additional days / OCONUS sit additional days

RECOMMENDATION: Obviously only the following two items should be generated and automatically be approved: OCONUS first sit day and warehouse handling + OCONUS sit additional days

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Test Problem Report TPR 5857 was created to allow for this Item to be fixed.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-109

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Need a guide for carton/debris removal to support the proposed changes to the 'Loss or Damage AT Delivery' form

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: With the current forms it's confusing to the TSP and Member as to how the form was to be marked. Removal of all such wording leaves it very open as to what a TSP may be requested to remove at time of delivery to the residence.

RECOMMENDATION: Develop some type of document clarifying the entire delivery and carton/debris removal that all members, TSPs, and PPSOs have for reference. Our personal recommendation is to keep a separate section on the AT Delivery form where member can check one of the following:

- Partial unpack and removal of partial unpacked materials
- TSP or designee will return for unpack materials
- Full unpack and removal of all unpack materials
- Waive unpack & removal of materials by TSP
- Requested unpacking was not performed

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Elmer Storck 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: The Loss and Damage Forms were revised and posted to the DTR Part IV App U.Q on 14 Oct 2009 as a result of industry association feedback. Guidance on how/when debris removal can be requested and/or utilized will be located in the 400NG tariff .

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-110

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Debris Removal

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Next day debris removals should be authorized when a customer makes the request. There are service members that prefer to unpack themselves, but it is difficult for them to dispose of the debris. Many places no longer accept curbside disposal and many places require a fee for disposal of cardboard. Denying the requested debris removal after the driver has departed and the customer has been told that the TSP will return is unfair to the customer and the TSP. Additionally, being threatened with a suspension unless the TSP agrees to return to provide a service that is in the tariff is not conducive to a positive business relationship. If next day debris removals continue to be denied, remove them from the tariff and increase the amount of compensation for unpacking.

RECOMMENDATION: Change the business rules to grant authorization based on the members request.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: The 400NG states that debris removal will be authorized by “PPSO request” not by the customer request. Each PPSO has the authority to approve or disapprove this request. The 400NG already compensates TSPs for full pack/unpack on all shipments. Debris removal and compensation for unpacking are two independent and unrelated items.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-115

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Personal Property Branch

SUBJECT: Destination Addresses

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: PPSOs are placing invalid destination addresses in DPS, e.g. "TYBD", "Ft Hood", "SIT". This causes extra work on the destination transportation office and prevents expedited delivery or placement into storage.

RECOMMENDATION: If the customer has no delivery address, leave the field blank. This allows the system to function as designed and creates less work for PPSOs and TSP.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kevin Myers, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: Unless there is a valid direct delivery address, PPSO's should leave the delivery street address field in shipment management blank as well as answer "No" to the "Is this a direct delivery" question in counseling. A clarifying message from SDDC to the PPSOs is being coordinated.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-117

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Rate Rejections in DP3

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Under DP3, rates are accepted or rejected based on "rate reasonableness." This means that rates can be judged either to be too high or too low. It is unclear how some rates are judged to be too high. I assume an economic study was performed of high cost areas especially New York City with high taxes, insurance, tolls, traffic congestion, licensing fees, labor and material costs. There also needs to be criteria for rates being too low. Were any rates rejected for being too low?

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should explain how it determined that rates were too high, especially in high cost areas like New York. SDDC should also consider sending a rate explanation after a rate is rejected.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Joel Summer, Pacific Moving & Storage, 718-345-6000

RESPONSE: Rate rejection explanation codes are provided by DPS for each and every channel-code of service rate rejection that occurs. In the spirit of competitive bidding, the concepts of rate transparency and public limits have been eliminated in the DP3 program. This encourages competitive bidding by all interested participants. TSPs currently have an additional round or opportunities to file rates should their initial rates be outside the non published rate reasonableness parameters.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-119

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Multiple pricing options for code D shipments moving to and from Alaska.

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: In the 400NG, there are three pricing options for a code D shipment moving to and from Alaska. The 400NG tariff is a **zip** code to **zip** code architecture and having three pricing option is not justified or appropriate. No where else in the tariff is there multiple pricing options from one zip code to another. Also, the difficulty of having SRA program multiple routes to Alaska and the complexity of having the industry invoice multiple routes is overwhelming.

RECOMMENDATION: Remove the multiple pricing options on code D shipments moving to and from Alaska.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Paul Morley, Hi-Line Transfer & Storage, 800-755-7580

RESPONSE: There are currently three transit methods available for transportation service providers (TSPs) to choose from when transporting shipments to and from Alaska. These alternative routing options were carried over to the Defense Personal Property System (DPS) from our previous domestic solicitation. We are currently reviewing this process in order to better standardize the associated transportation costs for these shipments.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-146

PROPONENT: IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Make DP3 rates public

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Make rates filed public record after rates are filed and accepted so independent audit can be done of BVS and rate scores. It is impossible for TSPs to determine if their BVS scores are correct. A number of mistakes have been identified in this process since program inception. A number of those problems have cause BVS scores to be re-run so that are corrected. How can we be assured that a TSPs scores are valid if we have no way to validate them?

RECOMMENDATION: Make rates public after they have been filed.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: In the spirit of competitive bidding, the concept of rate transparency and publicly available rates has been eliminated in the DP3 program which encourages competitive bidding by all interested participants. This is supported by multiple GAO studies and SDDC legal. In DP3, filed rates are procurement sensitive and therefore exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-147

PROPONENT: The Pasha Group, General Agents in Italy

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Motorcycles to Italy

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: The Italian government and each base currently follow different regulations for clearing inbound motorcycles most of which result in considerable delays and extra costs to the TSPs and their agents which are not recoverable from DOD at this time. Here is further information:

Numerous meetings with Italian Customs, US Customs, and TIE Port Management have been held over the last 16 months. However, the different area customs officials are not in agreement with a standard process resulting in delays in excess costs.

Aviano - accepts that we forward to our destination pack agent the motorcycle together with the T1. The T1 is given to the US Government customs officer, who will at their expense and care clear the T1 and release the motorcycle. This happens only when the service member is physically available. In the meantime the motorcycle can be stored at the pack agent's warehouse. If the service member is not available and the T1 expires (its validity is approximately 5/6 days), TIE/Pasha has to reinstate the T1 validity at its expense.

Vicenza - TIE must advise as soon as possible that a motorcycle is arriving into the base of Vicenza, and forwards a copy of the GBL and US registration to the US Customs office so they can see if the member is available. If the member is in Vicenza the T1 must be taken immediately upon arrival to the US Customs Office and they clear it; but, if the member has not yet arrived, US Customs position is that the port agent keeps the motorcycle in their warehouse until the service member is available. Upon the closure of the T1, a customs broker must process the T1 closure and this is at additional TIE/Pasha expense. If by chance a T1 should arrive at the Italian customs in Vicenza and it has already expired, TIE/Pasha has to reinstate the T1 validity at its expense.

Livorno - the same procedure as Aviano and Vicenza applies.

Naples - TIE is instructed to keep the motorcycle in our warehouse and deliver the T1 to the local TO so that the Service member can register the motorcycle. After the motorcycle is registered the T1 is closed, and only then the destination agent can deliver the motorcycle to the Service member. To close the T1 we have to hire a customs broker and close it at our expense. If the service member is not available and the T1 expires, TIE/Pasha must reinstate it at our expense.

Sigonella - the destination agents are instructed to deliver the motorcycle to the member before he can register it and before we can close the T1. Only when the motorcycle is registered are we allowed to close the T1. To close the T1 we have to hire a customs broker and close it at our expense.

At this point and time, TIE ports are working on a case to case base doing as best possible, and working in coordination with both the concerned US and Italian Customs officers for each individual area in order to ensure the motorcycles move along smoothly, unnecessary costs are avoided and all is performed within the laws and regulations set forth.

Further complications include the importation of motorcycles under 50 cc (motorcycles/moped), dirt bikes, off road vehicles like a 4 wheel quad. The bases seem to have different requirements/interpretations for their declaration/registration and whether a T1 is or is not necessary to be opened. However if these vehicles are declared on shipping documents we are obliged to open a T1 that we are then obliged to close legally and the only way to close it is if the MVRO registers the vehicle.

Failure to close T1 for any reason such as: the Service member is not available, the vehicle cannot be registered even if declared on shipping documents, lack of a valid title or registration especially for off road vehicles/quad, no title at all, or also when the Service member refuses to go to the MVRO and register the bike because they do not want to use it or pay insurance and license fees for it and so on, will result in Italian Customs fines, requests for duties and taxes to be paid by us on each vehicle for which the T1 is not closed, and also in the prohibition for our Customs broker and for us to open any further T1s.

RECOMMENDATION: We request that SDDC facilitate a meeting with all US Customs Coordinators to develop uniform policies, in agreement with Italian Customs representatives, and publish these in the consignment guide so that TSPS and their port agents have a standardized process to follow in order to properly evaluate costs during rate filing.

The only valid solution is that we discontinue opening T1s and that each US Customs officer issues and provides an AE302 form for each motorcycle or vehicle that is coming into Italy. This document should be given to TIE Ports which in turn deliver it to the customs brokers at the POE. By using this document the motorcycle/vehicle can be easily imported and the document closed on base by the US Customs.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Christine Kinkel, The Pasha Group AG or 41 79 439 3631 or Chuck White at IAM

RESPONSE: SDDC contacted HQ EUCOM ECJ4 and local US Customs coordinators. USAREUR Reg 55-355, states the AE 302 must be issued for motorcycles that are shipped with the HHGs. US Customs Coordinator state they require use of the T1 instead of the AE 302. We asked HQ EUCOM to contact the US Customs Clearance Supervisor at Vicenza and the Italian Customs Coordinator in Naples to resolve this issue. A meeting is being coordinated between SDDC, US Customs and Italian Customs to clarify the clearance procedures for motorcycles.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-148

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Packing Inspection for Shipments Loading from Non-Temp Storage

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: During recent DP3 invoicing calls, SDDC advised TSPs that there will be no compensation paid to a TSP when they inspect and/or repack pack cartons when a shipment loads from Non-Temp Storage (NTS). The TSP picking up the shipment from NTS is the GBL TSP and is expected to assume liability for Full Replacement Value (FRV), including items in packed cartons that were packed, more often than not, by the NTS contractors or another TSP. In 2003 and 2004, the Rates BPWG discussed packing and unpacking; to include shipment loading from NTS. Several of the discussions centered around compensation for inspecting packed cartons when a shipment picks up from NTS and the relationship to SDDC and the services position to reduce the full-unpack compensation component because not all service members requested full-unpack. Part of the concession between industry, SDDC and the services was that industry would be paid for a full-pack and full-unpack (at a reduced rate subject to the TSP's discount) on every shipment. While this charge would apply to a shipment originating from NTS when actual packing wasn't performed, it would compensate the TSP for any packing inspection and/or required repacking while also providing revenue for any unpacking requested by the service member. This eliminated the need to charge a separate NTS inspection fee and also eliminated the need to request pre-approval for extra labor for hourly unpacking. This agreement allowed the process and procedures to be streamlined, thus eliminating counting, tracking, requesting, pre-approvals, approvals, etc. and compensated the TSP.

RECOMMENDATION: Follow the process discussed and agreed to in 2004 between industry, SDDC and the services. A full-pack and full-unpack will be paid to a TSP on every DOD shipment and that compensation covers containers, packing, packing materials, repacking, packing inspections and unpacking.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Sonja Pullaro, UniGroup, Inc., 636-305-6260

RESPONSE The DPS Smartbook directs PPSOs and TSPs to use TOPS for "All NTS shipments including NTS releases" and so these shipment types should not be moving in DPS. However, payment for full pack/unpack is currently authorized in the 400NG tariff. The 2010 400NG tariff will be updated to limit compensation for reinspection of shipments released from NTS.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-149

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Third Party Service (Origin and Destination)

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: There are some items that require third party service in order to safely prepare the item for transportation. Third party services are performed by technicians who have been trained to handle items such as disconnecting/reconnecting gas lines for dryers and/or ranges; disconnecting/reconnecting ice maker water lines; disconnecting/reconnecting electronics associated with home theater systems; stabilizing/destabilizing front load washers; to name a few. What we're experiencing is that while the servicing of an item may be approved for third party at origin, some bases are not approving the de-servicing at destination. While we can appreciate that the physical requirement to de-service might be "just removing a bolt or two," if the person removing the bolt has not been trained in how to remove a bolt and what impact removing it incorrectly might have to the item, then damage can possibly occur. The standard commercial industry practice is that if an item required third party service at origin to safely prepare it for transportation, then the item should be serviced by a third party at destination to safely prepare it for use at the destination residence. Van operators and/or delivery crewmembers are often being asked to de-service front load washers (or other items), and they are not experienced appliance technicians. If a van operator or delivery crewmember de-services a front load washer and then the washer doesn't work properly, improper de-servicing may be the issue – not unsafe transportation.

RECOMMENDATION: If third party service at origin is authorized to prepare an item for safe transportation, then third party at destination should be authorized to de-service the item for safe use in the residence.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Sonja Pullaro, UniGroup, Inc., 636-305-6260

RESPONSE: The decision to authorize or deny third party service is handled at the PPSO level. There are circumstances in which third party service may have been approved at one location but are not needed at another (e.g. disassembly of a German Schrank in OCONUS), as well as situations in which a PPSO may not agree that third party service is required. We support the PPSOs authority to make such decisions based on the guidance provided in our regulations and their proximity to the services being provided. If industry wishes to discuss any specific items, they can forward any questions to the appropriate international/domestic program group box (sddc.safb.ppintl@us.army.mil or sddc.safb.ppratesdom@us.army.mil)

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-151

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team/TCJ5/4

SUBJECT: Uncrating at Destination

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Destination PPSOs are disapproving uncrating of items at destination because the shipment hasn't arrived at destination at time of request.

RECOMMENDATION: Authorize uncrating at the time crating is approved at origin. This will speed up response time for agents and drivers. Alternatively, uncrating could be combined with crating charge, if it does not involve a third party. This would alleviate additionally pre-approval request and burden placed on PPSOs and TSPs. If uncrating is approved at the time crating is approved, the driver and agents can already know the service is approved upon arrival at destination and the service member does not have to wait until another day to have items uncrated.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kevin Myers, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: The TOPS domestic solicitation (D-17) states that crating services include "packing and unpacking of crates..." In the 400NG, there are separate charges/item codes for crating and uncrating. TSPs should request pre approval of Item 105E at destination in DPS as soon as possible following preapproval of Item 105B at origin. A clarifying message will be sent to PPSOs.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-152

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Rate Rejections

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: As a Carrier and an Agent, I want to know why when we filed our initial rates, they were rejected without a reason. Under the DPS system, I'm having trouble finding a warehouse to take our shipments. A lot of warehouses are refusing to take them because they are DPS shipments and they are not compensatory to the SIT warehouse.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should explain why rates were rejected.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Klein's Moving and Storage Inc. 718-953-1700
kmg@aol.com

RESPONSE: DPS does provide a rate rejection code that explains the reason for rejection following both rounds of rate filing. Regarding SIT warehouses not taking shipments, this is an internal agency process to resolve between the TSP and the agent that is unrelated to the DPS system or DP3.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-153

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team/SDDC/JA

SUBJECT: FOIA Rates

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Why can't we get Freedom of Information Act for the rates filed by Carriers?

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should allow agents to see the rates filed by carriers.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Klein's Moving and Storage Inc. 718-953-1700
kmvg@aol.com

RESPONSE: Same answer as 09-146.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-154

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: SIT Percentage

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: On the GBL in Block 31, could we not only show the line haul percentage but also the SIT percentage? This would help the warehouse since in many cases warehouses are asked to take shipments for carriers who have no local agents. Many warehouses will not take shipments if the SIT rates are discounted too low. I must also add that the hauling driver does not in most cases know the SIT discount. This means that a driver has to wait sometimes three hours for a West Coast van line to open up if he is on the East Coast. This (especially on small shipments) ruins the driver's productive hours for that day.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should modify the GBL to also show the SIT percentage discount.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Joel Summer, Pacific Moving & Storage, 718-345-6000

RESPONSE: TSPs and their representatives, not the DOD or DP3, are responsible for interagency agreements. Rate information in Block 31 of the GBL is no longer needed for billing (electronic billing) or to authorize movement. Due to these reasons, rate information in block 31 is both unnecessary and counter to DP3 practices of not making rates public or visible. We are currently reviewing the option to remove all rate information from the GBL Block 31.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-155

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team/Military Services

SUBJECT: Cost Estimate on Pre-Approvals

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: PPSOs are requesting the cost on pre-approvals that are part of the tariff. I understand providing a cost on third party services, but on tariff items the cost is automatic based on the 400NG. This request places an additional burden on the TSP and delays the approval process when pre-approvals are denied for not providing a cost.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve based on the tariff cost in the 400NG.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: PPSOs should be approving services and not costs. However, there are cases in which a PPSO may wish to know the cost of a service in order to assist them in their decision to approve/deny. As PPSOs become more familiar with the 400NG and the DP3 program we anticipate these delays will decrease.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-156

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Percentage Bids on DP3 Domestic vs. International

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Since warehouse handling, storage, and delivery charges are not subject to the percentage bid in the overseas portion of DP3, why should the same services be subject to percentage factors on domestic shipments? Why would a warehouse store shipments for domestic carriers when each carrier has different rates for performing the same services and in some cases the same carrier could have different rates depending on the origin (channel) of the shipment? Companies who perform domestic SIT should enjoy the same rates as the overseas SIT schedule for performing the same services. The same labor and insurance premium costs exist no matter what type of shipment it is. What will eventually happen is that when a warehouse is getting saturated, the warehouse owner will have to make a choice based on available limited space and as a prudent businessman, reject the domestic SIT in favor of the overseas SIT. How can a TSP in another state know what the costs for warehouse operation are in every locale in the country? By imposing artificial rates based on line haul discount, an artificial unrealistic rate can occur.

RECOMMENDATION: The rates for SIT as found in the DPS for overseas shipments should also be used for domestic shipments as well.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Joel Summer, Pacific Moving & Storage, 718-345-6000

RESPONSE: The International and Domestic programs in DP3 are entirely unique programs and compensation for SIT is different in the two programs by design. The International tender derives from the IPPRS and the 400NG derived from the commercial 400N meaning that the actual rate structure of the two programs differs greatly. Because of these differences, there is little basis for comparison of the SIT rates in the two programs. Note that TSPs, and not the DOD or DPS, are responsible for negotiating interagency agreements with their representatives which may or may not differ from compensation provided to TSPs by the DOD as per the International Tender and 400NG tariff.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-157

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Zones

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Who made up the zoning system? How could you combine New York State together with New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont and Maine? New York City alone is a zone by itself with its complications, for example – Hi-rise buildings, service entrances, service elevators, changing elevators from basement to ground floor, excessive long walks, time limitations, no standing zones which means not even loading and unloading, insurance certificates up to five million dollars and over which we have to pay for and end up fighting with either the carrier or base for compensation. I have had trucks ticketed and towed in the middle of a moving job with no consideration of the security of the load and end up with damaged goods. Doing a job in the city of New York requires a man to stay with the truck to try to avoid all these complications in which the base will not give a control number for extra labor. Also the legal limit of trucks in New York City is 55' bumper to bumper, therefore all jobs in New York City have to be an automatic shuttle.

RECOMMENDATION: New York City should be a separate zone.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Klein's Moving and Storage Inc. 718-953-1700
kmvg@aol.com

RESPONSE: The Region structure in the 400NG was derived from business process working groups held with Industry Associations and DOD representatives. The agreement reached through these working groups was to ensure coverage and capacity to all locations in CONUS for the DOD, to minimize selective refusals, and maximize participation by TSPs in the DOD program. In reference to shuttle services in New York City, those decisions must be made by the responsible PPSO and are not an automatically approved service. Delivery from SIT facilities to New York City, for example, should not require shuttle service in most cases as such deliveries often occur in a truck 55' or less (not normally assigned line haul equipment). Shuttles should usually be requested only on direct deliveries only where a TSP is unable to access the delivery point with normally assigned line haul equipment. In those cases, TSPs request preapproval of a shuttle during the arrival process in DPS. As far as filing rates for a channel comprising multiple states (e.g. Region 9), TSPs must make their own internal decisions as to how to file their rates.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-158

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Front Load Washer Service

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Some PPSOs are disapproving the servicing of front load washers at origin and destination. The TSP cannot safely transport these items without the locking bolts and TSPs are not qualified to remove the locking bolts at destination. This falls under the same category as disconnecting and reconnecting appliances at origin and destination.

RECOMMENDATION: Authorize third party services or remove TSP liability for damages related to the washer drum or for damages related to not servicing the front load washers.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael, smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: SDDC will provide effective with the D-18 a front load washer servicing fee of \$75 which is provided to compensate the TSP for ensuring the safe transport of a front load washer (obtaining and installing necessary hardware and all associated costs). Effective with the D-18 third party service will not be authorized for front load washers. If a TSP utilizes third party service, the compensation will not exceed the \$75 amount.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-159

PROPONENT: Total Military Management

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Third Party Service Items

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: There are several PPSOs that will not approve the destination third party services that were approved at origin – i.e. third party service was approved at origin for a washing machine but it will not be approved at destination because the destination base wants the destination agent/carrier to perform the service (without using a third party company). Many PPSOs have discussed that they are not approving the items at the request of SDDC.

RECOMMENDATION: The specialized third party service is needed in many cases because they are specially trained to perform the service, whereas, the driver is not trained to de-service the items.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Christiane Crown, 877-286-0512

RESPONSE: See items 09-149 and 09-158 above.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-173

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: SIT deliveries beyond 50 miles (Long Deliveries Out of SIT)

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: There are no procedures for shipments being released from storage with a delivery further than 50 miles. The tariff outlines payment, but nothing is mentioned about how the destination GBLOC changes - or does the original destination transportation office approve all accessorial requests? How do we ensure the billing will be correct? Will we be paid for delivery to destination and then for doing a long delivery out of storage?

RECOMMENDATION: PPSOs should have the capability to change destination GBLOCs and regions with a GBL correction. It should not take Tier II support and weeks/months of waiting for the change.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kevin Myers, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: We agree the PPSO should have the ability to order delivery out of SIT past 50 miles. SPR 5796 was submitted by SDDC to correct this issue. (Title: Need ability to edit delivery location with no Region constraints).

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-194

PROPONENT: IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: TCJ5/4

SUBJECT: IT'S YOUR MOVE PAMPHLET - CLAIMS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: In the 'It's Your Move' pamphlet there is a red arrow in the section for filing a claim that states "Within 9 months after delivery, file your claim with the TSP for FRV protection." This is misleading as it gives the member false expectations of filing with the TSP only to have the TSP direct them to the DPS system which requires a user id and password.

RECOMMENDATION: Change the wording to direct the member to go online with their user id and password and file their claim within the DPS.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Subject paragraph is correct as written. You must read the entire paragraph three (3) when consulting "It's Your Move" for FRV information. In addition, changing the requested verbiage to include claim filing via DPS (with login and password) would essentially imply that a TSP would not be liable for FRV if a claim is not filed via DPS...and that is not correct.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-195

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: TCJ5/4 / Personal Property Information and Business Integration Branch and
Personal Property Branch

SUBJECT: CHANGES TO BUSINESS RULES

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: On 6/23/09, a member of industry noticed that there was a new Tender of Service dated 6/3/09 on TRANSCOM's website; however there was no notification to industry that the document was modified and it never appeared in the "What's New" section on the SDDC website. This has been an ongoing problem for years.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should work again with TRANSCOM to assure that industry is notified of changes when they are made to business rules that govern how we are to perform services for DOD, and that substantive changes are coordinated with rate filings and increases to the rate caps to give TSPs the opportunity to adjust rates to account for any increased cost to industry.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: USTRANSCOM will ensure that SDDC and the Military Services are notified in advance of any changes. SDDC will in turn notify Industry Associations (electronically and/or via SDDC website) of these changes. USTRANSCOM and SDDC will work together to promote advance notification, to include major changes being completed in connection with a new rate filing.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-187

PROPONENT: Arpin Group, Inc

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: TIER 2 DATA FIXES

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: I am a little confused on the time frame to complete a Tier 2 Data Fix. If we enter information incorrectly and it requires a Tier 2 Data Fix, that fix takes up to 3 weeks to complete. In a particular case, we had a shipment that was 20,000 lbs and was on two trucks. We mistakenly entered the shipment as a “whole shipment arrival” instead of a “partial.” Because of this mistake, the base TMO would not issue the SIT control number for the whole shipment when only part of it had actually arrived. It was explained that there should be two SIT Control Numbers, one for each part of the shipment. We called the help desk to see if we could get the “arrival” information either reversed or corrected. The help desk explained that this would be a Tier 2 Data Fix and they would need written consent from the TMO to change the information. The TMO gave the written consent via email. The help desk then explained that with this type of fix the programmers would have to go into the program and essentially rewrite a portion of the program to make this fix. And it will take 2 or 3 weeks to complete. The other half of this shipment arrived about a week later. We still don’t have an SIT number for either portion of the shipment.

RECOMMENDATION: My recommendation for this is that there should be an easier, more effective, way to make these types of changes. These types of changes should not have a three week time frame but should be shortened to a maximum of a couple of days. If the programmers need to go in and essentially rewrite the program to make these changes, they should add an “edit” function for them to use to reduce the amount of time it takes to make a correction.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Jamie Goeden (800) 343-3500 x 425

RESPONSE: We recognize that the validation between the Tier 2 and the Help Desk is slow and we are working on a process by which PPSO, JPMO, and SDDC can make changes.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-175

PROPONENT: Atlas Van Lines (ATVL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team/G6

SUBJECT: DPS Issued Automatic Suspensions for Shipment Offer Refusal/Failure to Respond to Shipment Offer

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: We have received several email notifications from shipmentmanager@dpsmail.csd.disa.mil regarding suspensions for “Refusal of awarded shipment or no response to award within 24 hours.” The email notifications only contain information regarding the origin GBLOC for which the suspension was issued. When PPSOs were forwarding the suspension notifications in a timely manner, TSPs had some sense of when the DPS supposedly had sent the offer to determine whether or not the suspension was valid and send an appeal if it was not. As the volume of notifications grew and PPSOs were no longer forwarding the suspension notifications in a timely manner, TSPs lost all capability to determine which offer the suspension applied to and to determine whether or not the suspension was valid or send an appeal. Further, PPSOs, the DPS Help Desk, and SDDC cannot determine which shipment offer caused the suspension notification.

DPS does not have the capability to produce DD Forms 1814 for these suspension notifications. As a result, there are no details for the suspension notifications available from any source.

When we had the capability to determine whether or not the suspension was valid, we found that some suspensions were valid, but that many notifications were not. Award notifications had actually been responded to within the 24 hour time period allowed and DPS had issued BL numbers. In those situations we were able to get the suspensions reversed by going through the DPS Help Desk.

We now find that PPSOs are providing no assistance at all in trying to determine the validity of the suspension notices due to lack of information and are simply letting the suspensions stand just because DPS issued the suspension. As a result, TSPs are likely receiving suspensions for invalid reasons without any capability to appeal.

RECOMMENDATION: Until DPS has the capability to provide the appropriate details about the shipment offer notification related to the suspension notifications, such as time of shipment offer, origin and destination locations, SDDC should revise the business rules to consider these suspensions invalid, and the DPS Help Desk should have the automatic authority to reverse the suspension information in DPS without further communication from either the PPSOs or SDDC.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Bob Ewing, Atlas Van Lines, 800-457-3370 x 2476

RESPONSE: TSPs are not automatically suspended for refusing a shipment. The TSP is placed in the Pending Suspensions queue at which time the PPSO reviews/validates the reason for suspension to ensure the non-response was not due to a system issue.

SCR 3259 and 5299 have been submitted to allow DPS to produce the DD Form 1814. SDDC will send a message to PPSOs reminding them of the current work around for notifying TSPs of a suspension and to ensure the DD1814 is forwarded to the affected TSP.

SUMMARY:

ITEM: 09-190

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Navy Claims

SUBJECT: SETOFFS ON NAVY CLAIMS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When an impasse has been reached on a claims settlement, Navy Claims is now sending the claim both to DFAS for setoff and directly to the TSP's insurance carrier for payment. This totally bypasses the normal process of settlement of a claim. The insurance carrier is not the proper place to pursue payment of a personal property claim unless the TSP has gone out of business or has no revenue stream available against which to offset funds. Furthermore, by sending the claim both to DFAS for offset and to the insurance carrier, the Navy will recover twice on the same claim and make it more complicated than necessary for recovery of those funds.

RECOMMENDATION: Navy Claims should stop sending claims to the insurance carrier and should continue to use DFAS offset of funds if an impasse is reached.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Peg Wilken, Stevens Van Lines

RESPONSE: Currently, the Navy does not have the ability to offset using Power Track. Manual offset actions attempted through DFAS eventually proved unsuccessful because the funds were no longer available. Therefore, in November 2008, the Navy made a decision to file claims directly against the TSP's cargo insurance in cases where the TSP could not or would not pay. The Navy will use the new offset procedures in Power Track once the system is working.

With regard to sending the claims to both DFAS for offset and to the insurance carrier, this was an error and we have pulled back all offset requests in cases where we have sent to cargo insurance carriers. Due to the fact that there are no manual offsets being taken by DFAS for the Navy, we do not expect that any double payments will occur and we are monitoring to ensure none are received. The Navy will continue to make every effort to negotiate settlement with the TSP's. However, in cases where the TSP does not respond to demands, negotiations reach an impasse or the TSP is no longer in business, the Navy will continue to request payment from cargo insurance until setoff action through Power Track is available to the Navy.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-162

PROPONENT: IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Interface Software

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Many TSPs have made an investment in hardware and software to accomplish an interface with DPS. Industry is forced into this mode as DPS doesn't provide that capability. What assurances does Industry have that these applications won't be cut off or limited?

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that SDDC provide reasonable assurance that Industry won't be cut off or limited in the future.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: JPMO and SDDC cannot give assurance for any external interfaces that any TSP procured since these external interfaces are not mandated nor endorsed by the JPMO or SDDC.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-150

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Rates Team

SUBJECT: Crating at Origin

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: PPSOs are disapproving crating of items at origin that have been approved historically, e.g. marble and glass tabletops, fragile paintings and pictures.

RECOMMENDATION: Authorize crating or remove all TSP liability for damages sustained during transportation.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: Under the guidance provided in the DTR (e.g. Appendix P, etc) PPSOs have always had, and continue to have under FRV, the authority to approve and/or disapprove crating services. The PPSOs disapproval does not preclude the TSP from crating at his/her own expense if that is what they believe they must do in order to ensure safe transportation. If there are specific examples that industry believes require an SDDC review or are otherwise under dispute, those should be provided to the appropriate program group box (sddc.safb.ppintl@us.army.mil or sddc.safb.ppratesdom@us.army.mil). See also item 09-121.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-160

PROPONENT: IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Monitoring of systems 24/7

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: SDDC/Transcom needs to monitor DPS, CWA, etc. 24 hours a day. It seems that anytime one of these systems goes down unexpectedly it is up to the industry to communicate to the responsible entity that their system is down. Many times it seems that that the DOD responsible entity is not aware of the disruption in service.

RECOMMENDATION: Monitor systems 24/7

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: DPS is monitored 24/7 by DISA for any servers disruption. USTRANSCOM Global Command, Control, Communications and Computer Systems (C4S) Coordination Center will be monitoring certain DPS modules to ensure availability.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-161

PROPONENT: IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office/G6

SUBJECT: CAPTCHA VERIFICATION

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: This new verification was initiated to halt ping. Has it been verified that there was an impact on DPS?

RECOMMENDATION: If the addition of CAPTCHAs has had no impact on DPS, they should be removed.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: The ETA CAPTCHA is part of DPS overall solution set. This functionality cannot be removed from DPS in any immediate future releases.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-163

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Acquisition and Services Branch

SUBJECT: Mold & mildew – refrigerators released from NTS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When shipments have been in NTS and mold has grown, it's a health issue. The warehouse is not qualified to verify that mold has been eliminated. This creates potential health risks for customers and a liability for the TSP if the mold reappears.

RECOMMENDATION: Appliances with mold should be left at the warehouse until removed by a certified mold inspector and then shipped as DPM.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: SDDC does not concur that refrigerators be left at a NTS warehouse for the following reasons:

1. NTS rates do not currently include costs of inspections fees. This will require modifications to NTS TOS and an increase of rates.
2. If refrigerator is left at the NTS TSP warehouse, NTS charges will accrue on refrigerator at 500 lb minimum. Cost will transfer to customer when storage authorization expires.
3. Not all locations support DPM. If a refrigerator is sent Code 1 or by DPS/DP3 it would be subject to a 500 or 1000 lb minimum line haul rate. This 2nd shipment may be passed to the customer as excess cost if only one shipment is authorized.

RECOMMENDED POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:

1. DPS self counseling and the PPSO/JPPSO offices counsel customers/service members on the importance of drying and prepping refrigerator prior to shipment.
2. Recommend NTS TOS be modified to reflect that TSP's include odor control and moisture control desiccant packets in each refrigerator/freezer prior to pickup.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-164

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: G6

SUBJECT: Help Desk Hold Message

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Several times in the recent past I have been on hold in excess of 20 minutes on the SDDC help line only to be told the problem I am having is a known issue that is being worked on.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should employ the same practice the utility companies use when they have a known issue and place an announcement on their hold message that they are working on the issue so people experiencing the issue hang up and don't clog the call center. It should include an estimated finish time.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Anne Dooley, Ramar Moving Systems, Inc
adooley@ramarmoving.com (301) 694-3366 EXT 117 (941) 629-1494 FAX

RESPONSE: Response: The SRC DPS helpdesk manpower was increased in July. Average call wait time is averaging between 1-4 minutes verses 20 minutes previously.

Customer Self-Service website (<https://www.sddc-srchelpme.com/>) was created in June for customers to create, check status of their service request and to review the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's). The FAQ's may provide answer to question verses submitting a service request or contacting the customer service center.

Current voice message also advises customers they can leave a voice message or they can create or check status of a service request via the Customer Self-Service website (<https://www.sddc-srchelpme.com/>)

Early FY10 implementation of announcement listing average hold time for next available customer service representative will be available. Call center will send callers to open customer service representatives to create service requests and take messages followed by return calls.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-165

PROPONENT: IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: RA or CC for billing

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: RA or CC for billing. What is the proper code? Power Track specifications which we are supposed to follow reflect use RA for Overseas locations however, DPS will not accept unless coded as CC. Why can't someone make a decision and the other party fix their specifications (PT) or the system (DPS)? See my July 30, 2009 email to Shelia Woodson which has never been responded that you were CC'ed on. Also see my June 30, 2009 email to Cheryl Garcia which you were CC'ed on. Finally, my email to you dated June 29, 2009 which included all the supporting documents such as screen shots from DPS, specifications from Power track 859 document, and the actual 859 transmit structure.

RECOMMENDATION: Put out description of the proper EDI formatting for billing

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

Response: JPMO met with USBank, SRA and Industry partners to confirm the DPS location validations as there has been some confusion concerning the N4 requirements, depending upon whether the shipment involved CONUS or OCONUS locations. The DPS requirements are dependent upon the applicable tariff and system being used.

US Bank (Cheryl Garcia, Vice President, Government Services) has the action to update the EDI-859 specifications they own; they have to manage that specific EDI. They will provide that update to the JPMO once it has been accomplished.

PowerTrack will update the EDI 859 specification to reflect the DPS information and publish to industry as soon as it is complete. In the interim, TSPs should use the attached spreadsheet to assist in updating your EDI content to comply with DPS requirements. This spreadsheet was posted to the SDDC website on 10/8/09 and can be found at: Personal Property -> Defense Personal Property Program -> Phase 2 Business Rule Attachments -> EDI 859 Specifications.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

	<u>Country Code</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Rate Area</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Notes</u>
<u>Domestic D10 (CWA Costing)</u>							
CONUS addresses	X	X	X		X	X	
Alaska addresses	X	X	X		X	X	
<u>International I16 (CWA Costing)</u>							
CONUS addresses	X	X	X		X	X	
OCONUS Addresses	X			X		X	
Alaska addresses	X	X	X		X	X	
Hawaii	X	X	X	X		X	
<u>Domestic 400NG</u>							
CONUS addresses	X	X	X				
Alaska addresses	X	X	X				Note: need port name in some field on both addresses TBD
<u>International Tender</u>							
CONUS addresses	X	X	X	X			
OCONUS Addresses	X			X			
Alaska addresses	X	X	X	X			
Hawaii	X	X	X	X			

***X=validated

***Note city, county validation is required under the old tariff(s) because of costing specifics for additional transportation charges

ITEM: 09-166

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

Subject: Inventory numbers in DPS claims

Initiated: 4 Nov 09

Discussion: Members are filing claims without typing in the inventory numbers. In some cases TSP has to spend time going thru pages of inventories to find the item.

Recommendation: Set up the system so that the member cannot go on to the next item or screen without filling out the item number.

RESPONSE: System Change Request (SCR) 5789 was submitted to allow for this functionality.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-167

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: DPS Billing Representative Role

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: As an independent management billing company, we invoice for several different SCACs and use the services of an outside firm for our EDI translations to Powertrack, but do all billings “in-house.” Since the outside firm does not do our billing, they are not responsible for tracking our invoices. We have attempted to access our invoices as a Billing Representative, but because we do not have our own ISA sender number, we cannot view our invoices or any shipment information. DPS does not recognize our company as the responsible party for our invoices because we use the outside translator’s ISA number. The only way we can view our invoices is to use the TP Master role, but that is not an optimal solution because we don’t necessarily need access to all of the areas of DPS that the TP Master role allows.

RECOMMENDATION: DPS needs to provide a solution so that the Billing Representative Role can actually work in the manner that it was originally intended.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Chuck White of IAM

RESPONSE: System Change Request (SCR) 5861 was created to allow for this functionality

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-168

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: PRINT GBL COPY

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When an agent is in dire need of a GBL, it takes ages to get it. A TSP must first imitate a request to print one, then PPSO must approve it; only then can it be printed. Both the PPSO and TSP get so busy, it sometimes takes weeks before the agent gets his copy.

RECOMMENDATION: Understand this procedure for CERTIFIED copies of a GBL. Regular GBLs should be possible to be printed at anytime, right away like it was in Jolt. You could print original ones, copy as many you needed. This option needs to be open to all roles in the system

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Providing the GBL copy to the agent is a business process between the TSP and agent. However, TPR 5303 will allow the TSP to print a non-original/non-certified copy of the GBL. TSPs requesting a certified copy of the GBL is initiated through DPS queue to the PPSO queue and approved in matter of minutes. TSP and PPSO must status their queues daily for any type of approval. This is Business Rules process.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-169

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Customer name sort

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Whenever you look for a shipper under his name, it is quite confusing as some members names are entered in capitals others in small characters and some mixed. Problem is that they are being sorted separately, so you first have a whole listing with small letters in alphabetical order and then the ones in capitals.

RECOMMENDATION: Only allow one format to be used in the System and if that is not possible at least let the alphabetical order override the font size.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: System Change Request (SCR) 5790 was created to allow for this functionality.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-170

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Shipment booked twice with different SCAC but same GBL number!

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Shipment booked twice with different SCAC but same GBL number!

RECOMMENDATION: It should not happen; if booked twice with different SCAC, it could only happen under different GBL number. As in TOPS (although it also happened sometimes there with system breakdown, data got lost and same numbers reused again).

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Shipment WKFS0000953 was Routed and Awarded to the TSP (BINL). In DPS production, this shipment was not booked twice. The RDD is 15 Oct 09. The origin agent is the Pasha Group. The Destination agent is Ortlieb Moving & Storage.

If such a problem were to arise, the TSP or their representative should call the Help Desk.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-171

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: DROPDOWN OF SIT FACILITIES

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: With a diversion from a warehouse or delivery from sit from one CPPSO to another. For example WKFS to WKAS: the dropdown with sit facilities is not adjusted. Sit stops at first agent, transported to agent for new AOR under new CPPSO, needs to be put in sit at second location

RECOMMENDATION: Diversion to new location should trigger update of dropdown for sit facilities

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: A shipment should not be transported from one SIT warehouse to another warehouse. A shipment should only be released from SIT when the member is available to take delivery. However, if unforeseen circumstances pose a need for the shipment to go back into SIT at the new destination, SDDC will address these situations on a case by case basis.

Note: SCR 5796 will change DPS so that if SIT is requested at the new responsible GBLOC, then the available SIT warehouses should be those associated new responsible GBLOC.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-172

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Edit weights

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When shipping agents advise they have an additional box or additional weight it is possible to adjust the weights but not the cubic foot or pieces.

RECOMMENDATION: Important to be able to update cubic foot and pieces as well by shipping agent role

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: If a change to the number of pieces is required, the TSP should submit a Help Desk Ticket. An SCR for this functionality was submitted by the JPMO, SCR 5866.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-174

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Anticipated Worldwide Rollout of DPS and Shutdown of TOPS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: A variety of timelines have been provided over the years for DP3.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should give an update as to the timeline on worldwide implementation of DP3 and when TOPS will be shut down. Update should include information on when other shipment types will be added into DP3.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: This is unknown at this time (TBD). All updates will be posted on www.move.mil and in the Smart Book as well as SDDC website. While working on Phase II we are also working on the implementation of Phase III.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-175

PROPONENT: Atlas Van Lines (ATVL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Quality Assurance Team/G6

SUBJECT: DPS Issued Automatic Suspensions for Shipment Offer Refusal/Failure to Respond to Shipment Offer

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: We have received several email notifications from shipmentmanager@dpsmail.csd.disa.mil regarding suspensions for “Refusal of awarded shipment or no response to award within 24 hours.” The email notifications only contain information regarding the origin GBLOC for which the suspension was issued. When PPSOs were forwarding the suspension notifications in a timely manner, TSPs had some sense of when the DPS supposedly had sent the offer to determine whether or not the suspension was valid and send an appeal if it was not. As the volume of notifications grew and PPSOs were no longer forwarding the suspension notifications in a timely manner, TSPs lost all capability to determine which offer the suspension applied to and to determine whether or not the suspension was valid or send an appeal. Further, PPSOs, the DPS Help Desk, and SDDC cannot determine which shipment offer caused the suspension notification. DPS does not have the capability to produce DD Forms 1814 for these suspension notifications. As a result, there are no details for the suspension notifications available from any source.

When we had the capability to determine whether or not the suspension was valid, we found that some suspensions were valid, but that many notifications were not. Award notifications had actually been responded to within the 24 hour time period allowed and DPS had issued BL numbers. In those situations we were able to get the suspensions reversed by going through the DPS Help Desk.

We now find that PPSOs are providing no assistance at all in trying to determine the validity of the suspension notices due to lack of information and are simply letting the suspensions stand just because DPS issued the suspension. As a result, TSPs are likely receiving suspensions for invalid reasons without any capability to appeal.

RECOMMENDATION: Until DPS has the capability to provide the appropriate details about the shipment offer notification related to the suspension notifications, such as time of shipment offer, origin and destination locations, SDDC should revise the business rules to consider these suspensions invalid, and the DPS Help Desk should have the automatic authority to reverse the suspension information in DPS without further communication from either the PPSOs or SDDC.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Bob Ewing, Atlas Van Lines, 800-457-3370 x 2476

RESPONSE: TSPs are not automatically suspended for refusing a shipment. The TSP is placed in the Pending Suspensions queue at which time the PPSO reviews/validates the reason for suspension to ensure the non-response was not due to a system issue.

SCR 3259 and 5299 have been submitted to allow DPS to produce the DD Form 1814. SDDC will send a message to PPSOs reminding them of the current work around for notifying TSPs of a suspension and to ensure the DD1814 is forwarded to the affected TSP.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-176

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Email Notification

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: TSPs should be notified via email when a customer or PPSO has a request in DPS. It is nearly impossible to monitor these requests and an email notification would be useful. This would be most useful for deliveries out of storage and reweighs. PPSOs should likewise be notified via email when the customer or TSP has a request.

RECOMMENDATION: Change DPS to incorporate an email notification for request.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kevin Myers, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: Same as items 09-180 and 09-183. Under Shipment Management there is an Inbound Queue that must be maintained daily by the TSP and the PPSOs. SCR 3563 has been written requesting proactive email notifications to the Member notifying him of the change with who, what, and when he change was made for the following areas:

Pickup Address	In-transit Address	Delivery Address	Phone Numbers
Email Address	Designated Agents	Date (i.e., Pickup, RDD, Delivery)	

This SCR also requests that DPS send proactive email notifications to the applicable parties as identified in the individual item description. Proactive email notifications are to be sent in the following circumstances:

Booking Confirmation	Pack Pickup Reminder	SIT Expiration Notice	Notice of Actual Weights
Pre-move Survey	Notice of Re-weigh	Delivery Confirmation Notice	
Inbound arrival notice into SIT		Notification to PPSO of aging invoices at 3 & 7 days	
Notification to Member that PPM documentation has been verified and is ready to print			
Claims Suspense Notification			

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-177

PROPONENT: American Moving & Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Definition of Short Fuse Shipment

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Currently DPS looks at the load date to establish whether a shipment is short fuse or not. While the short fuse functionality is currently not in use, there were problems when it was running based on this issue. Many PPSOs or members were setting pack dates well within the parameters of the definition of short fuse, but then putting the load date out 7 days or more so that it did not qualify as short fuse.

RECOMMENDATION: SDDC should change DPS so that it measures short fuse as a function of the first day of service on the shipment (pack date), rather than load date.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Scott Michael smichael@moving.org

RESPONSE: For a Short Fuse shipment, DPS works according to the Business Rules, which are determined by the Pick-Up Date, i.e., shipments requiring a pickup within five business days or less.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-178

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office/Military Claims Office

SUBJECT: DPS Claims Entering Amount

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: The customers have told our claims representative that once the customer enters their claim form in DPS, they cannot go back and add the amount claimed if it has been submitted.

RECOMMENDATION: Allow for editing of that field or require the customer to input the amount claimed at the time of submission, as a required field.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kathy Kendall, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: See also item 09-179. System Change Request SCR 5693 was created to allow for this functionality.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-179

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office/Military Claims Office

SUBJECT: Member can submit a claim with no claimed amount

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Members can submit their claims with no claimed amount. This means we must contact the member and request they go back into DPS and update their claim and add the amount claimed. This has caused numerous problems as some members are not able to update their claim for various reasons. Some get an error message and some do not have the update button or are simply locked out.

RECOMMENDATION: Make it mandatory for the amount claimed section to be filled in before the member can submit their claim.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Dianne Hovatter 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: See also item 09-178. System Change Request SCR 5693 was created to allow for this functionality.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-180

PROPONENT: Total Military Management/IAM

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: DPS Email Generation of Customer/PPSO Request in DPS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: There is currently not an automation of an email to the carrier when a Customer/PPSO enters a request to the carrier in DPS

RECOMMENDATION: Create an email to go to the Operations Manager Email address

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Same as items 09-176 and 09-183. Under Shipment Management there is an Inbound Queue that must be maintained daily by the TSP and the PPSOs. SCR 3563 has been written requesting proactive email notifications to the Member notifying him of the change with who, what, and when he change was made for the following areas:

Pickup Address	In-transit Address	Delivery Address	Phone Numbers
Email Address	Designated Agents	Date (i.e., Pickup, RDD, Delivery)	

This SCR also requests that DPS send proactive email notifications to the applicable parties as identified in the individual item description. Proactive email notifications are to be sent in the following circumstances:

Booking Confirmation	Pack Pickup Reminder	SIT Expiration Notice	Notice of Actual Weights
Pre-move Survey	Notice of Re-weigh	Delivery Confirmation Notice	
Inbound arrival notice into SIT		Notification to PPSO of aging invoices at 3 & 7 days	
Notification to Member that PPM documentation has been verified and is ready to print			
Claims Suspense Notification			

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-181

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team/Rates Team

SUBJECT: 1200 attempted pickup

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When items have been applied for to approve attempted pickup, one must enter a separate request to the PPSO to cut a 1200 to show that this shipment was an attempted pickup only

RECOMMENDATION: If possible, make the 1200 already available by the system upon approval of the items

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC:

RESPONSE: An SF 1200 is not required for attempted pick-ups in DPS. Within the International Tender, TSP will use the appropriate item code to bill for the service. Attempted pick-ups do not apply to the 400NG since this is not a commercial practice.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-182

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Refresh item list pre-approvals

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When you need to indicate several items that require pre-approval you can only select one. Then the screen needs to refresh first before you can add a second one, or third, etc.

RECOMMENDATION: Some shipments require approval of several items. It would make sense one has the time to just checkmark the boxes for all you need in one time and then can submit to avoid time loss. It was setup like that in the test environment I believe.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: This is the current system design. If additional functionality is desired, a TSP may submit an SCR.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-183

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Email notification to shipping agent

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When service members change pickup/delivery dates or pick/delivery addresses, shipping agents are not aware of these changes. This is causing missed pickups and/or attempted pickups, which is affecting the capacity perhaps urgently required for other moves.

RECOMMENDATION: The respective shipping agent should be notified when entered in the system, not only the TSP to avoid hardship with agent/member. This should be done preferably by email

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Same as items 09-176 and 09-180. Under Shipment Management there is an Inbound Queue that must be maintained daily by the TSP and the PPSOs. SCR 3563 has been written requesting proactive email notifications to the Member notifying him of the change with who, what, and when he change was made for the following areas:

Pickup Address	In-transit Address	Delivery Address	Phone Numbers
Email Address	Designated Agents	Date (i.e., Pickup, RDD, Delivery)	

This SCR also requests that DPS send proactive email notifications to the applicable parties as identified in the individual item description. Proactive email notifications are to be sent in the following circumstances:

Booking Confirmation	Pack Pickup Reminder	SIT Expiration Notice	Notice of Actual Weights
Pre-move Survey	Notice of Re-weigh	Delivery Confirmation Notice	
Inbound arrival notice into SIT		Notification to PPSO of aging invoices at 3 & 7 days	
Notification to Member that PPM documentation has been verified and is ready to print			
Claims Suspense Notification			

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-184

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Delivered shipments disappear for the shipping agent from DPS

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Following shipment QEFL 0000200, CASTILLO was in SIT from the 7th of August till 10th of August. We received a SIT number in DPS, 092190096. When the shipment was delivered to the member on 10TH of August, we could not view the shipment in DPS. Therefore we could not put the delivery address in DPS. This happens with all Spangdahlem shipments. Someone is putting the delivery info in DPS.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not happening with WKFS/WKAS shipments where the shipping agent or TSP is completing the delivery address. This is only an example but in many occasions TSPs have very different SOPs on handling the DPS shipments. Should this SOP not be the same for all?

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: Even though it is a TSP responsibility, the PPSO/Member/TSP could all have input the Member address. Once the shipment is delivered the shipment drops out of the Inbound Queue. All Transportation Offices of every Branch of Service are using the Business Rules, DTR. DPS has Learning Modules (LMS) (User Guides) that's under the training tab of DPS. Visit www.move.mil

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-185

PROPONENT: Government Logistics NV (GOVG)

STAFF PROPONENT: Joint Program Management Office

SUBJECT: Sort function on GBL number or other criteria such as name, social, etc.

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: This function doesn't exist for shipping agents

RECOMMENDATION: It does exist for TSP Master Role or Operations Manager. Also make it available for Shipping Agent

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: IAM

RESPONSE: The TPS does have sort capability under the current system design for these user roles. TSPs are responsible to authorize users (Agent) access to their information.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-188

PROPONENT: International Association of Movers

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Office

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

SUBJECT: Claims Module Problems will add to DP3 Program Cost

DISCUSSION: The difficulties associated with the DPS Claims Module are so numerous that in time, TSP's will have to pass the cost onto the government. The following list, while not a short one, still represents but a few of the problems/inefficiencies:

- Lack of two way interface means duplicate data entry
- A lot of time spent trying to assist customer with the process from their end
- We have never been given documentation to show us what the customer's process (screens) look like
- You can only see one item at a time on the DPS Claims Screens, and there is no total
- You can't print a claim form, and even doing a print screen is unwieldy, since data is cut off and items are duplicated when you "page down"
- There is no way to see which items you have "saved"
- There is no place to see if you have "submitted" a settlement
- There is no email to the TSP when the member accepts the offer
- There is no apparent reason or purpose to the step of the process where the TSP goes back in, after member accepts the offer, and enters the dollar amounts in the "Amount paid to DOD customer" field. (these amounts are already in there under amount offered, and customer has already accepted – the status is "settled" even before the amount paid info is entered)
- The customer name is not shown on the screen when you click the Claims tab to review your claims – you have to look at the GBL# field and compare to the one you are looking for

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that claims be allowed to be settled outside of DPS by the TSP, as they have been under FRV (non-DP3) current program, until these problems are fixed.

RESPONSE: We cannot support this. If a move is scheduled through DPS, then the claim needs to be handled through DPS. These issues do make life more convenient, but the DPS claims module does work. We can always find ways to make software better, but that is no reason to not use a working system.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-189

Proponent: International Association of Movers

Staff Proponent: Military Claims Office

Initiated: 4 Nov 09

Subject: Claims Metrics Invalid, Not Feasible

Discussion: Industry has consistently opposed the use of the claims metrics as written. We realize that SDDC has also been consistent in promising that before the metrics are incorporated into the BVS, that another look will be taken to ensure that they are in fact measuring what they were meant to measure, and doing so in an accurate fashion. It is industry's position however, that there is sufficient evidence currently for formally make the determination not to use claims metrics in the BVS.

TSP's are getting blamed for the perceived shortcomings of the DPS Claims Module. The following is just one example of what industry sees as an overall trend of the service member not being able or willing to separate their perceptions of the DPS Claims Module from their assessments of the TSP. (this is particularly damaging when answering the open-ended question regarding their overall satisfaction of the claims process, which has the most points associated with it of any metric). Our conversations with customers have consistently shown a tendency to blame the TSP for their problems gaining access to DPS, learning to use the claims module, or other functional problems with DPS, despite any counseling from DPS or industry claims personnel that DPS should not be considered when rating the TSP. The following email is not an isolated incident therefore, but is provided here as a graphic illustration – this is a real email, and is included here word for word as it appeared.

Email from TSP to Customer:

I just received a note from my secretary that you are having difficulty filing your claim thru DPS. I just wanted to make sure you received the voice message she left you with the phone number for the DPS help desk? The Help Desk should be able to resolve issues with obtaining access to the website.

Reply from Customer (a LT COL)

Thank you for your note. I already received a customer satisfaction survey and must report what I plan to say.

The bottom line is this: I'm finding the DPS claims website process to be the most convoluted system I have seen in some time, designed, I suppose, to discourage people from filing claims with the carriers. No one at the Transportation OR local Claims office knows how the online claim is filed. It is a customer service disaster. I plan to write a scathing critique of the program AFTER I have filed my claim, and submit it to the Army Claims Service. I do plan to call the help line and thank you for your interest.

Here is a second example, but this time, it came from the military claims office representative at the destination base. The following is a memo for file, written by the TSP's claims adjustor to document her conversation with the MCO. The name of the MCO representative and the customer have been removed.

MCO called me on 7/30/09 on behalf of customer. She did not understand why we couldn't just pay the shipper as a "quick claim" because the claimed amount is only \$295.00. I explained that a quick claim must be completed within 5 days of the shipper's delivery date and the customer delivered on 7/1/09. The MCO said "Why are you penalizing her for a system that doesn't work?" I said that DPS is the government's system and that our company could be penalized for not

settling a claim through their system. MCO said, “Who is going to penalize you?? I certainly am not.”

Here are a few of the problems that claimants have experienced with DPS:

- Trouble gaining access to DPS
- Cannot find their shipment in DPS
- Their computer locks up
- The Pull Items from L/D Report button does not work
- It is generally non intuitive (user-friendly)

Industry has already listed other concerns with plans to implement the claims metrics, including the inability to appeal, and the subjective nature of the ratings combined with the fact that just one claim would serve as the TSP’s entire claims score, no matter how many shipments they moved. There are also grave concerns with the programming of DPS, and whether they will accurately incorporate the mathematics.

RECOMMENDATION: The bottom line is that there is no reason to wait any longer to make the determination that the metrics are just not feasible as written, and would result in a disastrous skewing of the TSP’s Best Value Score in many cases – something that will not help SDDC, the member, or the industry. It is time to make the decision – the metrics cannot be used.

RESPONSE: As long as the industry has a monopoly of paying FRV claim for HHG moves, we will never allow the claims metrics to go away. To the extent that the metrics are “unfair” they are evenly unfair to everyone. Since TSPs are graded against one another and not against an absolute standard, their argument has little merit. If the industry wants alternative metrics, it needs to propose them to us, and we’ll evaluate them.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-191

PROPONENT: Wheaton World Wide Moving

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Office

SUBJECT: DPS Claims Print Function

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Since DPS does not interface with our systems it is necessary for us to print the claim that is filed in DPS and enter it into our claim system. There is no way to create a PDF file that would include the entire claim and the claim heading, which includes the customer's information.

RECOMMENDATION: Create a method to print the information the same way the After Form allows for a printable view.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Kathy Kendall, Wheaton World Wide Moving

RESPONSE: SCR 3518 was created to add this capability and is categorized as a Priority 1 with a release date in FY2010. At present, the use of screen prints is a suggested work-around. See also item 09-058 from the April PP Forum.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-192

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Office

SUBJECT: Unable to use the Claims Comment section

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: Currently, TSP's are not able to use the comments section under the demand/offer field in claims to communicate with the member. This field is for members only and we must communicate with the member via phone or email according to the DPS Helpdesk. Members can submit their claim without having to enter a good contact number or email address.

RECOMMENDATION: Either make the comments section usable for the TSP's so they can communicate with the member or make it mandatory that the member must enter his email and good contact phone number before said claim can be submitted.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Dianne Hovatter 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: System Change Request (SCR) 3062 (Category 2) was created to allow for this functionality. This SCR was reviewed by the Functional Requirements Board (FRB) and went for costing; it is awaiting CCB review. See also item 09-193.

We agree on the need for a comments section. Currently the work around is by e-mail or phone for the TSP comment. Throughout DPS screens and on the Service Member paper work, an e-mail address and phone number is given; the delivery address is also known to the TSP. In the interim until a system change can be implemented, use e-mail, call the Service Member, and/or send a certified letter on why the type of action "Demand Offer" was taken by the TSP.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE:

ITEM: 09-193

PROPONENT: Carlyle Van Lines (CLYL)

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Office

SUBJECT: Need Comments field in Claims module

INITIATED: 4 Nov 09

DISCUSSION: When we deny an item, there is no place for us to add comments as to why we are denying said item.

RECOMMENDATION: When we hit the “deny” button, we get a pop up comments screen so we can add our comments. This will also help the Military Claims Office if it is sent to them so they know why the item was denied.

DISCUSSION ITEM INDUSTRY POC: Dianne Hovatter 800-356-4194

RESPONSE: SCR 3062 has been created for this additional functionality. We concur on the need for a comments section, and have asked for one in an SCR. See also item 09-192.

SUMMARY:

ESTIMATED CLOSURE: