When NVO boxes reach U.S. shores

Consolidators, Customs clean up nitty-gritty AMS details in manifest filing system.

BY CHRIS GILLIS

N on-vessel-operating common carriers have worked with the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection to devise what they hope will be a more efficient way to electronically manage the movement of containerized cargoes within terminal areas and to inland destinations.

In mid-April, the National Customs Brokers and Forwarders Association of America approached Customs about NVO problems with inbound cargo flows under the agency’s advance manifest rule.

Under this rule, effective Dec. 2, NVOs gained access to the Automated Manifest System, an electronic agency program previously reserved for vessel operators. The shift also required AMS-approved NVOs to take charge of their shipments after they reached the port.

“In the beginning everyone focused on the manifest requirements, but all the requirements associated with the entry processes were not properly addressed,” said Peter Herling, vice president of import development for Hoboken, N.J.-based Shipco Transport. “In hindsight, we should have seen the problems coming.”

To accommodate this aspect of the rule, many NVOs, such as Shipco, made substantial investments in their computer systems to use AMS and become customs-bonded carriers to legally manage inland cargo moves.

NVOs, however, continue to struggle with the in-bond process, causing their cargo to be held at seaports until arrangements are made to move it forward.

Albert W. Saphir, head of ABS Consulting, based in Marietta, Ga., agrees that NVOs on AMS suffer from unresolved operational issues when their cargo arrives in U.S. ports. “There’s an incredible amount of additional work for all involved, less automation than before, and just too many individual parties involved in a process that was designed only for a few participants,” he said.

Special Bill. Customs and Border Protection worked with about a dozen NVOs in a technical working group to come up with a better way to manage land-side moves, called the “special bill” proposal.

The original proposed special bill called for vessel operators to manage arrivals of NVO cargoes and in-transit procedures. NVOs that had invested in their AMS systems and actively used them protested the proposal.

A second special bill proposal was then presented to the agency that would give the NVOs the option to conduct the inland portion of the clearance process or hand it off to the vessel operators. The agency and industry viewed this as workable.

A third “revised special bill,” developed by Shipco and NACA Logistics Group was proposed by the NCBFAA NVOCC committee chairperson Maurine Cecil, who is also regional vice president of American Shipping Co., in consultation with other NVOs to Customs.

This revised special bill, which appears to be acceptable to Customs, enables NVOs to manage their in-bond cargoes through the Paperless Master In-Bond program. Vessel operators will provide arrival information to Customs. Otherwise, the vessel operator can handle the cargo to destination.

The revised special bill also covers NVO inbound movements of full containers (back to back and merchant’s haulage) and less-than-container-loads (groupage and co-loads).

“We are pleased that we could come together with the NVOs and the carriers, said Brian Goebel, Customs’ counsel and senior policy advisor, during an April 4 meeting of the Treasury Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations, which kicked off the recent AMS-related work between the agency, the NVOs and ocean carriers.

But more impressive was the ability of the NVO firms and representatives of several industry-related groups, such as the NCBFAA and NVOCC-Government Affairs Conference, to leave any philosophical differences outside the meeting room.

“I have never seen so much active communication between Customs and all the parties involved,” said Saphir, who followed the progress of the special bill meetings. “The same also applies to communication between NVOCCs and VOCCs.”

“We are pleased that the NVO community, along with Customs, has produced a collective solution to these issues,” said Norm Schenck, vice president of brokerage services for UPS Supply Chain Solutions. UPS was an active participant in the technical working group. “We look forward to working with Customs and the ocean industry throughout the remainder of this process and into the future,” Schenck said.

Customs Support. While the technical groundwork for the special bill is finished, Customs’ implementation has yet to be done. The agency made it clear in a May 29 response to the industry that it “does not support the creation of a master NVOCC bill type.” Customs will support a previous method of requiring co-loading NVOs to indicate the master NVO’s SCAC (Standard Carrier Alpha Code) code in the secondary-notify party field of the electronic manifest.

“It should be noted here that since all arrival and post arrival actions will be against the master VOCC (vessel-operating common carrier) bill, the master NVOCC will not receive any of these status notifica-
possible to jump even further ahead,” Saphir

participating. “AMS will provide a more

perts say, is far more beneficial than not

may back-solicit to their customers.

many NVOs that fear cargo hungry carriers

operators to process and file. It’s a big risk for

able customer information, to the vessel op-

their manifest details, which include valu-

NVOs, but it should be optional,” Foley said.

makes the in-bond process easier for some

provider.

vices, the largest third party AMS systems

we quickly incorporated it,” said Robert

AMS systems have spent $4,000 to $6,000.

The cost of changes now and in the future

for AMS has yet to be determined.

Overseas NVOs have already made large

investments to acquire the proper customs

bonds in order to file their manifests through

third-party AMS systems. The average in-

vestment for overseas NVOs ranges from

about $12,000 to $15,000, whereas most
domestic NVOs using similar third-party

AMS systems have spent $4,000 to $6,000.

Third-party AMS systems providers will

make changes to their networks to accom-

modate the special bill.

“When we rolled out our Import2000 prod-

uct, we did not have the in-bond module, but

we quickly incorporated it,” said Robert
Foley, president of Flagship Customs Ser-

tices, the largest third party AMS systems

provider.

“We support the special bill in that it

makes the in-bond process easier for some

NVOs, but it should be optional,” Foley said.

NVOs that don’t use AMS must hand over

their manifest details, which include valu-

able customer information, to the vessel op-

erators to process and file. It’s a big risk for

many NVOs that fear cargo hungry carriers

may back-solicit to their customers.

AMS implementation in the long run, ex-

perts say, is far more beneficial than not

participating. “AMS will provide a more

level playing field, and some such as UPS

and NACA are actually doing everything

possible to jump even further ahead,” Saphir

said.

One issue that the AMS system will not

solve is the current lack of insufficient

agency-approved container freight stations

in the major inbound seaports. In the port of

Los Angeles, for instance, Customs has one

container freight station to conduct physi-

cal cargo exams. NVO executives say there

should be three or four in the port.

“Because of these setbacks what we’re

seeing is the shift in logistics from a just in

time to just in case,” Herling said. “Unpre-
dictable delays force companies to increase

inventory.”

Meanwhile Customs has shifted to the

next phase of enforcement of its advance

manifest-filing rule, worrying many NVOs

that are just getting used to AMS.

When the rule was implemented, Customs

held off on issuing fines for manifest filing

errors until Feb. 2. The agency then focused

on significant violations of the cargo descrip-
tion requirement and the use of vague cargo
terms, such as “freight all kinds,” “said to
contain,” “consolidated cargo,” and “general
department store merchandise.” Container-
ized cargo with these descriptions was issued
a “do not load” message while it was in an
overseas port. If the cargo has already been
loaded, the agency would deny it a permit to
unload in the United States.

Between Feb. 2 and April 29, Customs
reviewed more than 2.4 million bills of
lading, of which about 260 containers had
inadequate cargo descriptions. The agency
said most violations were resolved in time
to make their original booked voyages.

“We are taking the next step in our com-

pliance strategy to see that all of the rule’s
requirements are complied with,” said Cus-
toms Commissioner Robert C. Bonner. “Our
goal is to achieve full compliance quickly
and efficiently while still maintaining a
high rate of trade compliance.

On May 4, the agency started to issue “do

not load” messages for containerized cargo

that has an invalid or incomplete cargo
description. Customs also began issuing
monetary penalties for late submissions of
cargo declarations.

On May 15, the agency commenced with

“do not load” messages for “clear violations”
of the consignee name and address require-
ments. The former practice of using “to or-
der” or “to order of shipper” without

responding information in the consignee

field and notify party field, or a consignee

with no address, are not acceptable.

At the same time, the agency started

issuing monetary penalties for freight re-
maining on board (FROB) that has an in-

valid cargo description, and has been loaded

onboard a vessel without providing Cus-
toms a 24-hour timeframe for targeting.

The fines are stiff. NVOs may be as-

sessed liquidated damages of $5,000, and

$5,000 for every subsequent violation.

“We as an industry are deeply concerned

that Customs and Border Protection is en-
tering a fining state of mind when there’s

still too many uncertainties in this environ-
ment,” Herling said.

Some NVOs are afraid to activate AMS

if there’s a chance that they will be penal-
ized for infractions or have their cargo held
up in ports for inspection.

“There’s a legitimate concern that some

NVOs could be fined out of business,”

Herling said. “We’re sticking it out. To be

a responsible player in the market, we have
to do this.”