GNOSIS FREIGHT

**VIA REGULATIONS.GOV — DOCKET FMC-2026-0067**

March 26, 2026

**Federal Maritime Commission**

Office of the Secretary

800 North Capitol Street, NW

Washington, DC 20573

**RE:** Comments on Proposed Revision to OMB Control Number 3072-0074 — Containerized Freight Statistics Collection

## Introduction

Gnosis Freight submits these comments on the Commission's proposed revision to OMB Control Number 3072-0074, published January 26, 2026. The comment period closes March 27, 2026.

Gnosis operates the AI Global Freight Operating System built on AI-native logistics data infrastructure, providing real-time container-level visibility, execution, and data services to commercial shippers, carriers, and logistics service providers. Our commercial clients include Maersk, Hapag-Lloyd, GE Vernova, Continental Tire, and Rooms to Go. We are an Automated Broker Interface (ABI) vendor with a direct electronic connection to CBP's Automated Commercial Environment for hold status and ISF data, and we maintain active data connections with container shipping lines, container terminals, Class I rail carriers, trucking networks, and AIS satellite providers across U.S. port operations. Our Container Payment Portal is the first and only OSRA 2022-compliant demurrage and detention management system in commercial operation, a development Gnosis presented to the FMC's National Shipper Advisory Committee in June 2025.

We're not a carrier subject to these reporting requirements — we're the company that has built the logistics data infrastructure this collection is attempting to access, and we operate it at commercial scale today.

The central argument across all five recommendations is the same: the commercial logistics technology sector has already built the data infrastructure needed to validate

and expand the Commission's containerized freight statistics. The FMC does not need to construct new interagency arrangements, build internal verification systems, or negotiate voluntary agreements with terminal operators. That work is done. What the Commission needs to do is simple: add two fields to the 3072-0074 reporting schema, and procure commercial data validation services from a provider with the connections already in place.

## I. The Validation Gap — and the Two Fields That Close It

The Commission's current practice is to publish 3072-0074 data as "raw, self-reported data with minimal processing" that the FMC "does not independently validate or verify." For a dataset that now informs quarterly public reporting under 46 U.S.C. § 41110, that is a structural problem — and the Commission's own MTDS report documented that some carriers are "not willing to fully embrace the need to provide public information." The current framework gives the FMC no way to check.

The fix requires two additional mandatory fields in the 3072-0074 submission schema: master bill of lading (MBL) numbers and container numbers. That is the only change to the collection itself that the Commission needs to make.

With those identifiers, a commercial validation provider can query ocean carrier systems, terminal operators, and — for containers with inland rail transit — rail carriers, cross-checking each reported container against actual event records. This capability exists and operates at commercial scale today. It does not require the FMC to build new infrastructure, establish new technology relationships, or issue new guidance to terminal operators.

Container type and weight data — available from carrier data feeds for each container number — provides an additional validation layer for the TEU counts and tonnage figures at the core of the 3072-0074 collection. Where a carrier's aggregate reported tonnage diverges from the sum of individual container weights on file, or where reported TEU counts don't match the container type breakdown in carrier records, those discrepancies surface through the same query process. This moves the collection from self-reported totals to figures that can be verified at the individual container level.

For completeness verification — detecting whether a carrier omitted MBLs from its submission — CBP vessel manifests provide the independent baseline. Every container that legally enters a U.S. port must appear on a vessel manifest filed with CBP, and those manifests become publicly available within days of vessel arrival. Cross-referencing a carrier's FMC submission against the manifest for the same vessel calls surfaces omissions directly. Where shippers have requested confidential treatment

under 19 C.F.R. § 103.31, shipper and consignee identity is suppressed, but container numbers remain part of the public record — the completeness check is not affected. The few-day lag in manifest availability is well within the Commission's monthly reporting and quarterly publication cycle.

The Commission does not need a formal interagency arrangement with CBP to access this data. It is publicly available. A commercial validation provider with ABI vendor status can access hold status through an existing direct CBP connection, and manifest data through standard public channels. No new government-to-government agreements are required.

> ***Recommendation:*** *Add master bill of lading numbers and container numbers as mandatory fields in the 3072-0074 reporting schema. Procure commercial data validation services from a provider with existing carrier API integrations, terminal query capability, and ABI vendor status. The validation infrastructure does not need to be built — it exists today.*

## II. Event-Based Reporting — Enabled by the Same Identifiers

The current collection captures TEU counts and tonnage per vessel at port level — a volume snapshot that tells the Commission what arrived, not what happened to it. The MTDS recommendations identified harmonized container status (Available, Unavailable, On Hold, Cargo Handling) and real-time ETA data as priorities. These require event-based reporting, not aggregate counts.

The MBL and container number fields recommended in Section I are the prerequisite. Once those identifiers are in the submission schema, the same commercial provider performing accuracy validation can query carrier, terminal, and rail carrier systems for each container's actual milestone history: port discharge, gate-out, availability confirmation, inland transfer. The FMC gets event-level data without adding burden to its own infrastructure. The query capability — reaching carriers, terminals, and rail operators — already exists in commercial systems serving major U.S. importers today.

A vessel arriving with 2,400 TEUs is materially different from one arriving with 2,400 TEUs of which 600 are under CBP hold — the current collection captures neither the distinction nor its economic significance. Event-based reporting, built on container-level identifiers, closes that gap.

> ***Recommendation:*** *Expand the reporting schema to include container-level status events at port discharge, gate-out, and availability confirmation, aligned with the MTDS harmonized container status taxonomy. Phase implementation starting with*

> *the highest-value events. The MBL and container number fields from Section I are the enabling prerequisite.*

## III. Inland Visibility

Current collection scope ends at the marine terminal gate. For containers moving by rail to inland destinations — a significant share of import volume at major load centers — the Commission has no visibility past the port.

The query capability described in Section II extends to rail carriers for containers with inland transit. With container numbers as the linking identifier, a commercial validation provider can track milestone events through the rail leg and report on inland delivery status. This doesn't require the Commission to expand its statutory scope or build new data relationships. It follows directly from having container numbers in the submission schema.

> ***Recommendation:*** *Require that any commercial validation contract include active Class I rail carrier data connections, extending the Commission's visibility past the port gate without additional collection burden on carriers. Container number submission is the enabling identifier; the rail carrier query capability does the rest.*

## IV. Enhanced Verification for Controlled Carriers

The Commission and Congress are both revisiting the regulatory framework for state-owned or state-influenced carriers. The FMC Reauthorization Act, which passed the House in December 2025 and is pending in the Senate, expands the controlled carrier definition and adds oversight of the Shanghai Shipping Exchange. The direction is clear: data from carriers with government ownership or influence warrants independent verification, not just self-reporting. A sovereign data model means U.S. import and export freight data is verified through U.S.-operated infrastructure, independent of foreign carrier self-reporting. The revised 3072-0074 collection, paired with commercial validation services, would establish that model.

Under the current 3072-0074 framework, carriers meeting the controlled carrier definition submit data under the same standard as private carriers. The MBL cross-reference mechanism described in Section I is particularly significant here. For a state-owned enterprise, comparing FMC-submitted figures against CBP vessel manifest data provides an independent check that does not rely on the carrier's own reporting. If a controlled carrier's submission diverges from its manifest, that discrepancy surfaces

through the same commercial validation process — no additional FMC infrastructure required.

For carriers meeting or likely to meet the expanded controlled carrier definition, the Commission should require a formal attestation from a named corporate officer certifying the submission's accuracy and completeness — the same accountability structure used in federal financial reporting. The named officer carries personal legal exposure if that certification is knowingly false. Combined with commercial cross-validation, this creates a documented chain: the officer has certified the data is accurate, and an independent system has either confirmed or contradicted it. When those two don't align, the Commission has both a signed certification and independent evidence of inaccuracy — a far cleaner predicate for enforcement action than a data discrepancy alone. For state-owned enterprises in particular, requiring a named individual at a government-affiliated carrier to personally certify accuracy to a U.S. regulatory agency is a meaningful structural change from the current framework.

> ***Recommendation:*** *Establish tiered verification requirements keyed to carrier classification. For carriers meeting the controlled carrier definition, require corporate officer attestation and mandate cross-validation against CBP manifest data prior to incorporation in public quarterly reports. The commercial validation infrastructure described in Section I supports this without additional FMC build.*

## V. What the FMC Should Do

The four recommendations above share a common implementation path. The Commission does not need to build new data collection infrastructure, pursue new interagency arrangements, or negotiate voluntary agreements with terminal operators or rail carriers. The commercial logistics data infrastructure that supports all four recommendations already exists, is already connected to the relevant carrier, terminal, and government data sources, and is already operating at scale.

What the Commission needs is two things. First, revise the 3072-0074 reporting schema to add MBL numbers and container numbers as required fields. This is a regulatory change to a data collection form — it does not require new statutory authority. Second, issue a data services contract to a commercial provider with ABI vendor status, active data connections with ocean carriers, terminals, and rail carriers serving U.S. ports. That provider must be able to deliver 95% or greater accuracy and completeness across carrier, terminal, and rail carrier records for each submitted container, and through CBP public manifest cross-reference.

Any solicitation for data validation services should specify a technical requirement that's easy to overlook: source data normalization. Container shipping lines, terminal operators, rail carriers, CBP, and AIS satellite providers each use different data formats, identifier schemas, and event taxonomies — a provider that can't normalize across those sources will produce false discrepancies from format differences rather than genuine data quality issues. The provider specification should require active data connections across all relevant source types, a translation layer that maps source-specific identifiers to a common container reference standard, and an AI-native architecture capable of resolving conflicts between source records in real time. Data completeness and data accuracy both depend on this underlying data model. These capabilities are what separate a purpose-built logistics data infrastructure from a data aggregation service.

On carrier participation incentives: the Commission should consider a safe harbor provision for carriers who submit data that passes validation — for example, a streamlined review process in enforcement proceedings for carriers with a documented record of accurate, validated submissions. Positive incentives for accurate reporting complement the compliance mandate and are likely to produce better data quality outcomes than mandate alone.

The MTDS recommendations, OSRA 2022, and the FMC Reauthorization Act together create a clear legislative mandate for improved data quality. The AI-native logistics data infrastructure needed to deliver on that mandate exists today, operating at commercial scale. The procurement path is a data services contract, not an infrastructure program.

> ***Recommendation:*** *Issue a data services contract to a commercial logistics data provider with the carrier, terminal, and government data connections described above. Pair with the schema changes in Sections I and II. The Commission's implementation burden is limited to those two actions.*

## Conclusion

The proposed revision to 3072-0074 does not require the Commission to build new data infrastructure or establish new interagency relationships. The commercial logistics technology sector has already built what is needed. The FMC adds two fields to the reporting schema and issues a data services contract to a provider with the connections already in place. The Commission gets validated, event-level, container-specific data — including completeness verification and controlled carrier cross-checks — without constructing anything new.

Gnosis Freight is prepared to brief Commission staff on our validation architecture, integration approach, and milestone taxonomy in connection with the revised collection design and any related procurement planning.

Respectfully submitted,

**Adam Baker**
Vice President
Gnosis Companies, Inc. (Gnosis Freight)
adam@gnosiscompanies.com
253-905-3933