

Proposed Container Guidance



The Problem to Solve

- Container detention costs huge, OIF/OEF
- Sub-optimizations along stovepipe lines
- Problem:
 - Detention;
 - Buyouts;
 - Transload paradigm created
- Solution:
 - Sought USTC and JIWG comments
 - Sought guidance on detention payments; OSD-C
 - Nothing so far precludes/discourages this from reoccurring during the next Contingency Operation

Container Payment Policy

- Provides revised budgeting and transportation policy for payment of and responsibility for container detention cost during contingency operations.
- Army is designated the DoD Component for payment of detention charges in the USCENTCOM OEF and OIF AOR through FY 08....Commercial Venders are responsible for paying their own detention.
- Beginning in FY09, all container detention charges for contingency operations will be assessed against the lead Military Service, as specified by the Supported COCOM.
 - Commercial Venders are responsible for paying their own detention.
 - Under an existing executive agency the Army pays detention for containers consigned to AAFES.
- For non-contingency operations, detention continues to be paid by the responsible party IAW DTR, Part II

The Policy Memo (to be incorporated in DoDI 4500.57)

- Assigns Responsibilities to DLE, Services, COCOMS, Agencies
- Container priority of use:
 - Government owned, then Leased, then USC
 - Reverse order priority for return of containers
- Avoid transload operations.
- Maintains Supported COCOM's flexibility (can violate)
- Supported COCOM designates the lead Military Service by country to pay detention.
- Services POM for boxes, as assessed above; DLA buys centrally
- Services buy and maintain, but reports data to AIDPMO, as required by USTC assessment