



***EID CONOPS Working  
Group***

***19 November 2009***



**UNCLASSIFIED**

# Meeting Objectives

- EDDOC meeting EID CONOPS requirement to facilitate regularly scheduled performance review meetings with theater distribution agencies
- Assist with resolving any issues inhibiting execution of the CONOPS
- Provide opportunity for open discussion
- Provide theater distribution partners with information on upcoming initiatives
- Discuss means of solving issues



# Current Items

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>OPR/OCR</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Next Action</b>
1	<b>PBA being refined by USAREUR</b>  Date of Issue: 25 June 09	OPR: USAREUR G4	• PBA showing difference in standards and needs updating	• On hold pending outcome of TDD Standards review and guidance received from this initiative



# Current Items

	Issue	OPR/OCR	Status	Next Action
2	<p><b>How to Ship MICAPS that can't go WWX</b></p> <p>Date of Issue: 25 June 09</p>	<p>OPR: EUCOM EDDOC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HAZMAT, classified shipments, etc that can't be shipped commercial express (WWX) must move via mil transport or some other means.</li> <li>• How can we better ship these in a timely manner to meet MICAP RDD requirements?</li> <li>• Analysis indicates a full C-130 a week to MHZ and half that to AVB are currently being airlifted.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 80% of the cargo could move by truck</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICTB needs projected volumes and frequency data over the respective channels.</li> <li>• Tenders are doable but very difficult to find a carrier willing to hire an American with the proper security clearance unless there is regular , profitable work</li> <li>• Savings of 12-24 hours in transit times if TCSP is circumvented</li> <li>• What are the business rules?</li> <li>• Who will fund this?</li> </ul>



# Current Items

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>OPR/OCR</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Next Action</b>
4	<p>Back-haul optimization</p> <p>Date of Issue: 25 June 09</p>	<p>OPR: EUCOM DLA LNO</p> <p>OCR: EUCOM EDDOC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sigonella/DDSI has agreed to utilize back-haul trucks from TCSP for all cargo categories to include high priority air when faster than waiting for AMC channel air</li> <li>• Implementation &amp; funding reimbursement to DLA piece to be worked out.</li> <li>• TRANSCOM J5/J4 re-writing par 7 of CONOPS to reflect new agreed upon procedures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No centralized visibility of movements in theater               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is not possible to coordinate and consolidate movements in a joint manner</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will IAX base entry for contracted drivers be a problem?</li> <li>• Need to re-write pars 3.6 and 3.5 (Southern Region) once procedures updated</li> </ul>

# Current Items


	Issue	OPR/OCR	Status	Next Action
5	<p>Proposed changes to EID CONOPS</p> <p>Date of Issue: 25 June 09</p>	<p>OPR: EUCOM EDDOC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northern Region. Par 2.2 rewritten for clarity on personal property shipments and contractor shipments.</li> <li>• Par 3.2.2.3.1 &amp; .2 rewritten to include Baumholder and Pirmasens.</li> <li>• Par 4.2.2 subparagraphs rewritten--times changed for N. Italy and UK and S. Italy times added.</li> <li>• Par 5.5.5.1 deleted. Southern Region.</li> <li>• Par 4.1 subparagraphs re-numbered for clarity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TRANSCOM rewriting both par 7s to include TWCF reimbursement procedures to DLA.</li> <li>• ICTB tenders do not require drivers to have access to bases so backhaul from DDSI to Ramstein issues need to be addressed with the carriers and Ramstein sponsors directly for the time being.</li> <li>• DDSI backhaul processing times to the Northern Region locations included in Chp 4.</li> <li>• Southern Region par 3.2.2.3.2 rewrite inputs from DDDE need to be vetted with DDSI before including in CONOPS.</li> <li>• Southern Region par 3.7.1.1 Aviano CONOPS needs to be looked at since the TMO there is having problems complying due to funding issues</li> </ul>



# Current Items

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>OPR/OCR</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Next Action</b>
7	<p>USAFE / 3AF identified issues and TCSP and Ramstein APS processing of UK origin and destined cargo</p> <p>Date of Issue: 22 Oct 09</p>	<p>OPR: TCSP/DDDE Reps</p> <p>OPR: Ramstein APS</p> <p>OCR: USAFE/3AF</p> <p>OCR: EUCOM EDDOC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Origin cargo when processed by TCSP changes modes, TACs and other shipment data-- Why?</li> <li>• When changes are from surface to air, shipper is charged more than desired.</li> <li>• Data changes also create problems with UK customs officials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramstein APS holding truck eligible cargo for airlift when truck would have been faster--or they could trigger airlift sooner or work consolidation issues with 727 AMS</li> </ul>

# Closed Items

	Issue	OPR/OCR	Status	Next Action
 <p data-bbox="144 1071 627 1178">Date of Issue: 25 June 09</p>	<p data-bbox="144 335 656 549">MICAPS and other high priority cargo are not meeting their RDD timelines</p>	<p data-bbox="695 335 994 435">OPR: USAFE A4RTT</p> <p data-bbox="695 506 879 664">OPR: EUCOM EDDOC</p> <p data-bbox="695 735 908 835">OCR: 721 APS</p>	<ul data-bbox="1033 335 1439 1285" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These shipments are not meeting their timelines, but WHY?</li> <li>• One possible reason is that AMC labels their MICAPS differently and they get priority treatment.</li> <li>• Labeling AMC MICAPS differently may cause confusion with handlers and other MICAPS may not then get the priority attention they need</li> </ul>	<ul data-bbox="1477 335 1864 1335" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>USAFE discovered most of the identified MICAPS in question were delayed munitions shipments that had in-transit storage /clearance problems and were delayed for these reasons.</b></li> <li>• <b>Recommended that this item be closed unless there is a need to re-write par 2.2 (MICAP Processing instructions for AMC/USAFE) that we deleted previously</b></li> </ul>

# Closed Items

	Issue	OPR/OCR	Status	Next Action
	<p>Develop a reference list of what DLA/TCSP/DDDE handles and processes per CONOPS</p> <p>Date of Issue: 30 Jul 09</p>	<p>OPR: DLA LNO</p> <p>OPR: TCSP/DDDE Reps</p> <p>OCR: EUCOM EDDOC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is cargo identified in par 2.2 the only cargo that TCSP does not handle?</li> <li>• All else is OK?</li> <li>• What about contractor OWNED cargo vs US owned cargo being shipped to a contractor?</li> <li>• What are the rules on that?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open for further discussion and a way ahead</li> <li>• <b>Para 2.2 was rewritten to encompass all excluded cargo—any cargo not otherwise excluded is acceptable.</b></li> </ul>