



**IAM Technology and Communications Committee  
Report to the Active Members  
October 13, 2009  
Gordon Keene - Chairman  
Orlando, Florida**

Technology and Communication Committee Members

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Mr. Chuck Bailey     | 6. Mr. Brandon Day   |
| 2. Mr. Richard Corona   | 7. Mr. Kourtney Kono |
| 3. Mr. Craig Crawford   | 8. Mr. Leo Pakala    |
| 4. Ms. Christiane Crown | 9. Mr. Keith Simmons |
| 5. Mr. C. J. Dabo       | 10. Ms. Fran Vollaro |

American National Standards Institute Consensus Committee

- |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Mr. Joe Bippen     | 7. Mr. Lynn Peterson  |
| 2. Ms. Linda Bauer    | 8. Mr. Boris Populoh  |
| 3. Mr. David Hope     | 9. Mr. Don Robinson   |
| 4. Mr. Maxim Kreyenin | 10. Mr. George Sikora |
| 5. Mr. John Levi      | 11. Ms. Ellen Troska  |
| 6. Mr. Michael Scott  | 12. Ms. Fran Vollaro  |

I want to thank the Technology and Communications Committee members for their commitment to our membership through their efforts on this Committee. In addition I want to thank the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) consensus body members who have contributed a great deal of time to the ANSI electronic inventory standards that we expect will be submitted after the annual meeting.

I also want to thank the staff of the International Association of Movers (IAM) for their assistance and guidance.

The Technology and Communications Committee was formed to assist our membership in identifying and addressing the needs of our members as we move forward with new systems and technologies. This Committee is also involved in the IAM initiative as an accredited standards developer. My report will summarize the actions of our Committee during the past year.

Items that were addressed by our Committee during this past year:

1. One area where a significant amount of time was expended by the committee was the ANSI numerical standards codification assignments and the electronic exchange format

for those codes. This project was significantly more complex than it appeared initially, due to the discussions and recognition of numerous operational issues by our committee members and the ANSI consensus body. The committee and consensus body was able to work through a significant number of questions and options to arrive at a standard that is comprehensive and has the ability to evolve as new items and technologies are created. In addition, the exchange methodology (XML) provides this same evolutionary capability/flexibility.

2. We investigated and confirmed that TSPs were not making up Storage In Transit (SIT) numbers in DPS. This was necessary as the military was under the impression that TSPs were exploiting the DPS system and creating their own SIT numbers. We were able to systematically test the DPS system and identify that the design of functionality within DPS allowed for placing shipments directly into SIT by the TSPs, if the destination address field was blank. This design was based on previous business rules. The result was the only option given by DPS when the TSP “arrived the shipment” with a blank address field was to place the shipment into SIT. If the destination address field was populated, then the TSP user would be taken to the “Request SIT” menu and a request was then sent to the PPSO for approval.
3. Claims Database – The Technology and Communications Committee reviewed and suggested the data fields which should be captured and possible transmission methods. This information was presented to the Claims Committee for consideration. We also agreed to work with the Claims Committee once they determine
  - a. If this proposal should go forward based on legal considerations.
  - b. The method for collection and administration of the data within the association office has been identified.
4. The DPS electronic billings being sent through PowerTrack and then into DPS were in numerous cases being rejected. The users were unable to determine the reason for the rejections as the DPS Billing Module was not providing the required level of detail. We notified the military of the deficiency. They first fixed the reports so they actually provided the detail necessary to ascertain the reasons for the rejections. At that time it was determined that many of the rejections were due to location identifiers. DPS was expecting one type of location identifier while the PowerTrack specifications required a different location qualifier. We reviewed this issue and found the PowerTrack EDI specifications were requiring the location codes of CC for conus locations while the DPS system was expecting the location code of RA (rate area). This issue was presented to the PowerTrack and the military for review. A decision was made to use the location value of RA for all locations. To date, PowerTrack has not updated the EDI 859 specifications to reflect this change; however, a message was sent to all TSPs advising of the revision.
5. The Technology and Communications Committee requested that the Report for Channel Rankings, to include TSPs Ranking within quartile as well as total number within the four quartiles, should be contained within a DPS report so users can download rather than requesting a portion of the data via email. This report provides critical information to the TSPs and as such should be available within DPS. A formal request was made by Mr. White to have this report created and made available within DPS. The military responded by providing two report locations within DPS for parts of the pertinent data and the SDDC website for another portion of the data. One report within DPS, the Best

Value Score Report, lists the TSPs different score components (rate score, survey score and claim score) while the other report, the Traffic Distribution Report, lists the TSPs quartile rank and the band. The TSPs are then required to go to the SDDC website and download the TSPs per channel report which lists the total number of TSPs in each channel type and code of service combination. This report is important as it allows the TSP to determine how many TSPs are in the four bands so they can then understand where their position within their respective band is located. While we appreciate the effort of the military to eliminate the email request for a portion of this data, we believe the military should be able to combine this data into one report, in one location, preferably within DPS, so the data pertaining to a specific TSP can be viewed and/or downloaded by that TSP. Our Committee will provide a summary report proposal and present to Chuck White so he can submit to the military for consideration.

Pending Committee items:

1. As many of you are aware, the design of the roles that can be assigned within DPS has resulted in limitations which have affected efficiency within the application for many users including Agents as well as General agents. We have also been advised by one PPSO that they are required to use two different roles when processing the delivery of a shipment. The original JSAT testers, several overseas general agents and other interested parties have discussed this issue at length and made several suggestions. I discussed this matter with Chuck and recommended the Technology and Communications Committee review this process in an effort to offer Chuck additional information which he can present to SDDC and Transcom for consideration. I am hopeful we will find a consensus and process that can be communicated to the military which benefits all stakeholders. We must keep in mind that if the cost is excessive, the military may be unable to move forward with any role modification proposal.
2. We need to continue to put pressure on the SDDC and Transcom to provide a structure for a more efficient method to contact the PPSO personnel at each installation. With DPS, it is quite burdensome for every TSP to individually determine the correct telephone numbers or email addresses at each installation when problems arise or contact is necessary. The time spent on rerouting calls to the proper individual by the PPSO is also a factor. A central email address or addresses at each installation for DPS-related questions should be maintained and listed within the Personal Property Consignment Guide for each installation.
3. JSAT telephone conference calls are being held generally twice each month. These meetings include many of the original DPS testers, association staff and other interested parties. Items are discussed and then, if appropriate, the issues are communicated to the appropriate parties within the military for action or consideration.
4. The revision in the TSP Queue in DPS has resulted in removal of the summary count of shipment(s) in each functional area. This was done when the short fuse shipment process was found to be affecting DPS system performance. This removal of the summary count has resulted in the requirement that the TSP drill down within each menu item to review pending shipments, for each available movement category. The Committee believes the TPS labor resources required to drill down within each

movement category is not nearly as efficient and actually requires additional resources from the DPS server(s) as the users are requesting data displays that the original design did not in many cases require. A request should be made that the original functionality should be restored when the short fuse process is implemented.

5. Reports from the military such as rejected rates (sent via email in text format), and within DPS for Best Value Scores (PDF format) and TSP placement within quality bands (PDF format) should be distributed to TSPs in standard format such as text and/or Excel. A standard format will allow all TSPs to decipher data without the necessity of creating additional systems to merge or group critical data. A request should be made to the military to review specific reports which can be provided by this Committee, so standard formats can be created.
6. Submission of the proposed ANSI standards to the ANSI Body for worldwide comment. This action will be taken after the annual meeting following the ANSI BSR-8 proposal guidelines. The proposal is then announced in the ANSI Standards Action for public review and comment period (normally 45 days). If comments are received and those comments do not result in significant changes, then documentation of consensus is submitted to ANSI for approval. If changes to the proposal are required based on comments received, appropriate action is taken to respond to comments and attain consensus. The revised proposal is then resubmitted to ANSI for adoption.
7. The T & C Committee discussed the need for an arbitrator within the military to address DPS issues and communication of the resolution to the stakeholders. Historically SDDC has served as the arbitrator when the TSP, Transportation Offices and/or SDDC had an issue. As the issue was resolved, depending on the nature of the issue, the resolution was addressed in the Rate Solicitation, DOD 4500, SDDC website or an email to all stakeholders. In some cases SDDC would notify a Transportation Office and/or TSP to let them know they were misinterpreting the regulations or rules which had been established. Under the new structure at Transcom and SDDC, it appears this function either has not been fully developed or Transcom is content to let the services decide how they want to address an issue. For example, shipments moving within DPS that have been delivered to SIT were getting different interpretations of the business rules as to when SIT applied. In addition, some TSPs have reported receiving warnings when not warranted within the business rules. Also, as DPS evolves, issues are being identified that require communication to all stakeholders so consistent rules are established and followed by all parties. We can not operate or file realistic rates if every service or installation has a different interpretation of the same issue. While the business rules form a part of the foundation, many of the rules are vague and leave room for different interpretations. Chuck has advised that the military already believes this process is in place through their Traffic Management Advisories. Rosia Lindsey seemed to be the person responsible for these types of information updates. Chuck did indicate that if DPS help desk issues and questions to the services or Transcom/SDDC were not being responded to in a manner where the committee or membership believed it was being received by all stakeholders, to let him know and he would bring it to the attention of Transcom/SDDC

That concludes my report.

It is my pleasure and honor to serve on the Executive Committee.

Please feel free to contact me or any of the other Technology and Communications Committee members if you have any questions or concerns so that we may address them.

Gordon Keene  
Chairman of the Technology and Communications Committee