

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

COAC ACAS WG
ACAS Self Filer Model for Freight Forwarders

August 2013

- I. Overview**
 - a. The FF/Conventional Carrier Business Model
 - b. Why Freight Forwarder Participation Is Critical to the Success of a Pre-Departure Targeting Regime

- II. Policy Issues**
 - a. The Trade Act Supports a Unique ACAS Self-Filing Model for Freight Forwarders
 - b. ACAS vs. Air AMS – Key Differences
 - i. General Regulatory Assessment (Air AMS) versus Targeted Security Assessment (ACAS)
 - ii. Raw Data versus Verified Data
 - iii. Key Goal of an ACAS Self-Filing Regime is Operational Efficiency
 - iv. Duplicate Data Transmissions Should Be Minimized When Possible

- III. Overview of ACAS Freight Forwarder Self-Filing Regimes and Recommendations**
 - a. Overview of Air AMS Self-Filing today – A Starting Point For an ACAS Self-Filer Model
 - b. “ACAS-Only Self-Filer Model” and “ACAS - Air AMS Combined Self-Filer Model”
 - c. Recommendations

I. OVERVIEW

a. The Freight Forwarder / Conventional Carrier (FF/CC) Business Model

- i. Freight forwarders are the primary customers of conventional carriers. Particularly for passenger carriers, where security requirements limit their ability to accept cargo directly from most shippers, freight forwarder cargo constitutes the vast majority of a carrier’s business. A workable ACAS filing regime for this model, which is considerably more complex than the integrated carrier business model first examined by ACAS, is critical to the financial health and operational reliability of conventional carriers, and to the efficient and cost-effective functioning of the overall global supply chain.

- ii. A typical example of the FF/CC model in action would be the following:
 - 1. The FF has regular traffic between Frankfurt and New York, and makes advance daily bookings on both Air Carrier X and Air Carrier Y for 10,000kgs and 20 cubic meters. Each advance booking has a Master Air Waybill (MAWB) number assigned to it by the carrier. At the point the advance bookings are made, the FF does not know how much cargo he will actually have for Flight X and Flight Y, and may not even have any “concrete” cargo on hand that he is planning to move on either flight.
 - 2. The FF is continually making House Air Waybill (HAWB) contracts with his individual shipper customers. Approximately 6-24 hours prior to the departure of Flights X and Y, the FF begins to make his consolidation decisions and assigns one or more house bills to MAWB-X or MAWB-Y. At some point, the decisions become final, the shipments comprising Consolidation X and Consolidation Y are built onto one or more pallets/skids, and the documentation is completed. The FF may electronically transmit MAWB and HAWB data for consolidations X and Y to Air Carriers X and Y at this time, at a later time prior to or simultaneously with physical tender, or not at all.

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

3. The FF physically delivers the documents and the cargo to the air carrier warehouses – tender cutoff time for standard air cargo is usually about 4 hours prior to flight departure. If the FF has not transmitted MAWB and HAWB information electronically, this will be the air carriers’ first opportunity to collect the necessary bill information for entry into their IT systems.
4. After cargo acceptance, the air carrier completes three distinct warehouse processes;
 - a. IT Data Entry and Manipulation.
 - i. The carrier enters document data into its IT system and/or checks the details on the paper documentation against the electronic data already transmitted to the carrier system by the FF;
 - ii. The carrier adds to and manipulates this data in order to capture information on the physical build of the AWB, to manifest the AWB to a specific flight, to complete the necessary steps for customs reporting, and other functions.
 - b. Document Handling and Consolidation. The carrier handles the paper documentation as needed including checking for necessary notations, removing certain AWB pages, making copies, and consolidating the documentation for all shipments on a given flight into a flight document box.
 - c. Physical Handling
 - i. The carrier builds the pallets, skids or loose cargo delivered by the FF into aircraft Unit Load Devices (ULDs) for aircraft loading. In the physical build of cargo for loading onto aircraft with limited volume, an air carrier’s key motivation is maximum use of available capacity. Therefore, based on the 3-dimensional characteristics of the shipment for a particular flight, an air carrier may mix a FF’s individual shipment with shipments from other FFs, and a single shipment consisting of more than one piece may be divided across more than one ULD.
 - ii. The carrier pulls the ULDs to the ramp for staging and loading. Conventional carriers may begin aircraft loading 2 or more hours prior to flight departure. ULDs that are loaded first are pushed far to the interior of the aircraft hold, with later-loaded ULDs blocking access to them.

b. Why Freight Forwarder Participation Is Critical to the Success of a Pre-Departure Targeting Regime

i. ACAS Pilot Development

1. Initial Concern: There was considerable industry concern when ACAS was launched that moving targeting from a post-departure to a pre-departure time frame, with the attendant risk of holds being issued in the midst of time-compressed warehouse build/load operations, would be disruptive and negatively impact air cargo operations, and would be a significant burden on the movement of legitimate commerce. Cargo targeted within a few hours of departure could result in:
 - a. Flight delays: If the ULD(s) containing the problem shipment has/have already been loaded and now must be unloaded, likely requiring the unloading (and subsequent reloading) of many additional ULDs to reach the problem ULDs, flight delays are likely. Delays are of particular concern to passenger carriers due to the potential for significant down-line disruption, as international wide-body flights may carry 200-500 passengers with connecting flights at the arrival gateway station.
 - b. Spoiled (lost) capacity: If a problem shipment is identified in the hours close to departure, requiring an already-built ULD to be pulled and broken down to retrieve it, it will be difficult to impossible for the carrier to secure replacement cargo and build replacement

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

ULDs in time, and the flight will depart with empty cargo positions – a significant revenue hit for carriers who already operate with slim profit margins today.

- c. Warehouse disruption: Warehouse flows are clearly divided into EXPORT – in which ULDs are built up for loading and departure, and IMPORT – in which ULDs are broken down for arrival or transit processing. If a problem shipment must be retrieved from an already built ULD on the EXPORT side, it means inserting an import process into the middle of the export chain. This causes significant disruption to warehouse operations and negatively impacts all other shipments currently moving through the normal export flow. Additionally, carriers have neither the physical space nor the necessary warehouse staff to be able to accomplish this as part of normal operations.
 - d. Customer dissatisfaction: Carriers will face complaints – and potential lost business – from customers whose shipments have been delayed because they had the bad luck of being built into the same ULDs as the problem shipment, and thus also miss their planned flight departures.
2. Pilot Phase 1 – Integrated Carriers
- a. One of the first lessons to emerge from the ACAS pilot - during its first phase involving integrated carriers only - was that the negative impact of pre-departure targeting could be significantly mitigated by decoupling substantive shipment data from transport data and delivering that data to ACAS as early as possible in the supply chain.
 - b. Integrated carriers, who create and therefore “own” the house bill contracts with their shipper customers, are in possession of the house bill data required for ACAS targeting from the very start of the process, and thus can transmit this data very early with little difficulty.
3. Phase 2
- a. When conventional carriers joined the pilot in late 2011, it became clear that this business model would require a new approach.
 - i. Conventional carriers do not own the house bill contract with shippers, but only the master bill contract with their freight forwarder customers.
 - ii. It is the freight forwarder who owns the house bill contract with his shipper customers.
 - b. The freight forwarder generally makes his house bill contracts with customers long before he has made a particular flight reservation, or even chosen which air carrier he will utilize for transport. The selection of routing, carrier and flight is usually made much later. The house bill information that is available very early to the FF is therefore not available to the carrier until much later in the process, in some cases not until very close to flight departure.
 - c. To produce the same successful result that the integrated carriers achieved in Phase 1 – i.e., the early delivery of data for targeting and the resulting minimal negative impacts on carrier operations – the freight forwarder was brought into the ACAS data transmission process. Because ACAS data is decoupled from transport data, the freight forwarder is able, just like the integrated carrier, to transmit the house bill information as soon as a house bill is created.
 - d. Under current ACAS pilot IT functionality the carrier, once it receives the necessary data from the FF, must “re-transmit” the house bill data to ACAS in order to receive ACAS statuses.

II. POLICY ISSUES

a. The Trade Act Supports an ACAS-Specific, Unique Self-Filing Model for Freight Forwarders

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

The Trade Act of 2002 specifically directs that regulations imposing advance data requirements on carriers must take into account differences in commercial practices, operational characteristics and technological capacity to collect and transmit information electronically (Section 343(A)(3)(D)).

Under this standard and on all three levels – commercial, operational and technological – the specificities of the freight forwarder /conventional carrier supply chain business model and the specificities of ACAS (as opposed to Air AMS) justify a unique solution. To attempt to force freight forwarder and conventional carriers into the integrated carrier model would result in fundamental business process changes that would damage the air cargo business model, and to attempt to force ACAS self-filing into the Air AMS model would not allow it to achieve its primary purpose – the minimization of operational disruption and cost.

b. ACAS vs. Air AMS – Key Differences

A self-filing model already exists today in Air AMS that can be a starting point for the development of a Freight Forwarder ACAS Self-Filing model. But there are key differences between ACAS and Air AMS that demand a specific ACAS self-filer model.

i. General Regulatory Assessment (Air AMS) versus Targeted Security Assessment (ACAS)

First, ACAS provides a unique security benefit that is not provided by the AMS regime. Air AMS demands pre-arrival data and uses it, along with data submitted to CBP by the importer, to accomplish a wide-ranging cargo release determination, asking the question, “Is this cargo safe to allow into the United States?” In other words, the Air AMS risk assessment is of primary benefit to the security of the United States, but is of little benefit to a carrier that is already airborne when the assessment occurs, and a carrier’s primary concern regarding Air AMS self-filing failures is limited to potential exposure to liquidated damages.

ACAS, on the other hand, demands pre-departure data in order to perform a tightly-targeted security risk assessment that asks the question “Is this shipment a danger to the aircraft onto which it will be loaded?” The air carrier receives a direct benefit from ACAS that it does not receive from Air AMS, as well as being subjected to a greater risk should an ACAS self-filing failure occur, and therefore has much more of an interest in ensuring that the ACAS risk assessment has taken place for each shipment it plans to transport.

ii. Raw Data versus Verified Data

Second, at the point in time when the ACAS data set becomes available for transmission, the data is “raw” – i.e., it is freshly received from the shipper, it has not undergone a data quality check, and the ACAS transmitter, whether forwarder or carrier, has often not taken possession of the physical shipment and so has had no opportunity to visually inspect the shipment.

- It was never the intention of the government or industry stakeholders to require an “AMS standard of data” for ACAS, as it was understood by all that the earlier the transmission of data, the greater the chance for inaccuracies/imprecision, but that the benefits of the early delivery of data nonetheless outweighed the downside.
- At the same time, from the intelligence point of view, it was recognized that raw shipment data in its “unedited” form, being provided directly by the shipper or his agent (as opposed to verified/corrected/completed by a carrier for Air AMS purposes) confers a substantial benefit in terms of the effectiveness of the security risk assessment. In other words, a carrier’s “cleaning up” of the data could have a negative impact on the efficacy of the data screening.

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

iii. **Key Goal of an ACAS Self-Filing Regime is Operational Efficiency**

Finally, the participation of freight forwarders in ACAS is critical because of the operational and security benefits provided by forwarder self-filers. Forwarders are the owners of the data needed for the ACAS security risk assessment and they are in possession of this data much earlier in the supply chain than the conventional carrier. The early transmission of ACAS data by forwarders facilitates the early resolution of referrals prior to tender to the carrier, the removal of DNL shipments from the supply chain prior to their arrival at an airport, and the ability for a forwarder to identify referred cargo and deliver it to the carrier segregated from cleared shipment. In addition to being a significant security benefit for all ACAS stakeholders, this minimizes the negative consequences of warehouse disruption, unnecessary build and re-build, and customer dissatisfaction for both carriers and freight forwarders, and for carriers it limits the additional risk of flight delays and lost capacity/revenue. In Air AMS, self-filer participation is driven not by operational efficiency and security benefits – but rather by other individual business factors.

Because robust freight forwarder participation as self-filers is so critical to the success of ACAS, the self-filing regime developed for them should actively promote their participation, and the barriers to becoming a self-filer should be limited to those necessary to ensure the security of the system and accountability.

iv. **Duplicate Data Transmissions Should Be Minimized When Possible**

Despite the security, data quality and operational factors set out above that argue against an automatic conflation of ACAS and Air AMS self-filing, industry nonetheless remains a strong proponent of minimizing repetitive transmissions of identical data. In cases where a freight forwarder chooses to be both an ACAS self-filer and an Air AMS self-filer, we strongly support the ability of that party to also voluntarily choose to have its ACAS transmissions suffice as its Air AMS HAWB self-filing transmissions.

III. OVERVIEW OF ACAS FREIGHT FORWARDER SELF-FILING REGIMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. **Air AMS self-filing today**

i. **Overview:**

1. Air AMS regulations require the inbound air carrier to transmit Air AMS data for both master bills and house bills, but allow other authorized parties to transmit house bill data if those parties meet certain prerequisites.
2. Once authorized, these other parties are not mandated to transmit HAWB data for all, or for any, of their shipments. Instead, for shipments where the self-filing party has elected to transmit HAWB data, that party indicates this to the carrier by providing its CBP-issued “Agent Number”.
3. Because the inbound carrier is the regulated party mandated to submit HAWB data, the carrier can “refuse to recognize” a party as a self-filer, even if the party has been approved by CBP as such. In this case, the carrier would possess and transmit HAWB data to Air AMS, regardless of the self-filing party’s status or its provision of an agent number on a given shipment.
4. Even if the inbound carrier has recognized the self-filer, the regulations mandate that the carrier transmit HAWB data when it splits a shipment over more than one inbound flight. Because splits cannot be predicted, carriers will often have HAWB data in their systems for a self-filer’s shipments, even if it does not plan to transmit that data to Air AMS.

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

ii. **If the freight forwarder is recognized as an Air AMS self-filer (for house bills) by both CBP and the transporting carrier, self-filing works in the following manner:**

1. The FF will transmit his HAWB data to Air AMS. The HAWB transmissions must include the MAWB number to which the house is linked as a mandatory data element.
2. The FF will include his self-filer agent number on the paper MAWB and/or in his electronic messaging to the carrier.
3. The carrier will capture this agent number in its IT system. The carrier will transmit the MAWB to Air AMS, and include this agent number as a data element of the MAWB message. Depending on its IT system, the carrier may or may not transmit HAWBs associated to this MAWB to Air AMS.
4. Both the carrier and the forwarder will receive HAWB-level status messages back from Air AMS.

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

b. Overview of recommended “ACAS-Only” and “ACAS-Air AMS” Self-Filing Models For Freight Forwarders

	ACAS-only Self-Filer Model	ACAS - Air AMS Combined Self-Filer Model
Pre-requisites to file	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less stringent than those for Air AMS self-filing, and 2. Narrowly tailored to meet CBP’s interest in ensuring both the security of the ACAS system and its ability to effectively address fraud or grossly negligent behavior on the part of the self-filer. <p>Rationale: Because the air carrier will be maintaining regulatory responsibility for submitting or verifying ACAS transmissions, and because the success of the conventional carrier / freight forwarder ACAS model is dependent upon the robust self-filing participation of forwarders, these criteria should not be overly burdensome so as to promote freight forwarder participation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eligible to submit Air AMS filings under the current self-filer provision of the regulations (19CFR122.48a(c)) 2. Notification to CBP that it also wants to participate in ACAS as a self-filer. <p>Rationale: A freight forwarder who qualifies as an Air AMS filer already meets strict CBP-defined requirements, thus additional criteria are not required. At the same time, an Air AMS self-filer should not be required to file ACAS, therefore an “opt-in” notification to CBP of the Air AMS self-filer’s desire to also participate in ACAS is necessary.</p>
Set-up	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After approval, CBP provides the self-filer forwarder with an ACAS-only agent number 2. Self-filer forwarder secures connection to ACAS directly or via service provider 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After approval, CBP provides the self-filer forwarder with an ACAS-Air AMS agent number (this must distinguish the ACAS-Air AMS self-filer from parties who are Air-AMS ONLY and ACAS ONLY self-filers). 2. Self-filer forwarder utilizes existing connection to Air AMS, or secures an additional connection to ACAS directly or via service provider.
Self-filer messaging and response protocols	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self-filer forwarder transmits house-level data to ACAS, with or without a MAWB link 2. ACAS responses returned to self-filer per “ACAS Data Submission Formats” document 3. Self-filer forwarder receives ACAS responses and may choose to action selectee screening or selectee data referrals as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No action. b. Resolution of data referrals. Selectee data referrals will be resolved per the “ACAS SOP” and “ACAS Data Submission Formats” documents. c. Segregation of screening referrals before tender to carrier. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Physical segregation only before tender to carrier. ii. Physical and MAWB segregation before tender to carrier d. Resolution of screening referrals per the “ACAS SOP” and “ACAS Data Submission Formats” (if permitted by TSA security program). 4. The self-filer will be responsible to action “Do not load” holds as set required in the “ACAS SOP” and “ACAS Data Submission Formats” documents. 	

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

	ACAS-only Self-Filer Model	ACAS - Air AMS Combined Self-Filer Model
Carrier Processing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the self-filer tenders cargo to the carrier, the MAWB document and/or electronic message should include the ACAS self-filer agent number in the appropriate field (to be determined). 2. Upon accepting a shipment from an ACAS self-filer, the carrier may choose to “recognize” the forwarder’s self-filing status as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It may refuse to recognize the ACAS self-filer. The carrier will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Transmit individual FHL messages to ACAS and perform verification per company protocol that there are no unresolved data or resolved/unresolved screening referrals and that all house bills have been submitted to ACAS. ii. Accept the shipment and, per company policy, ACAS protocols, and (perhaps) contractual agreement with the self-filing forwarder, assume the responsibility for resolution of unresolved data referrals or resolved/unresolved screening referrals per the ACAS SOPs. b. It may recognize the ACAS self-filer for purposes of data transmission only (note, this also applies when a self-filer has chosen to take “no action” on ACAS referrals). The carrier will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Transmit individual FHL messages or a list-FHL message (possible only if the forwarder has already provided ACAS with the MAWB link) to ACAS and perform verification per company protocol that there are no data or screening referrals and that all house bills have been submitted to ACAS. ii. Accept the shipment and, per company policy, ACAS protocols, and (perhaps) contractual agreement with the self-filing forwarder, assume the responsibility for resolution of unresolved data referrals or resolved/unresolved screening referrals per the ACAS SOPs. c. It may recognize the ACAS self-filer for purposes of data referral resolution. The carrier will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Transmit individual FHL messages or a list-FHL message (possible only if the forwarder has already provided ACAS with the MAWB link) to ACAS and perform verification per company protocol that there are no unresolved data referrals and that all house bills have been submitted to ACAS. ii. If there are unresolved data referrals, the carrier may: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refuse to accept the shipment until all data referrals have been resolved by the self-filing forwarder. 2. Accept the shipment and, per company policy, ACAS protocols, and (perhaps) contractual agreement with the self-filing forwarder, assume the responsibility for resolution of unresolved data referrals or resolved/unresolved screening referrals per the ACAS SOPs. d. It may recognize the ACAS self-filer for purposes of both data and screening referral resolution. The carrier will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Transmit individual FHL messages or a list-FHL message (possible only if the forwarder has already provided ACAS with the MAWB link) to ACAS and perform verification per company protocol that there are no data or screening referrals and that all house bills have been submitted to ACAS. ii. If there are unresolved data or screening referrals, the carrier may: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refuse to accept the shipment until all holds have been resolved by the self-filing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the self-filer tenders cargo to the carrier, the MAWB document and/or electronic message should include the ACAS-AMS self-filer agent number in the appropriate field (to be determined). 2. Upon accepting a shipment from an ACAS-AMS self-filer, the carrier may choose to “recognize” the forwarder’s self-filing status in one or more of the following ways: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It may recognize the ACAS self-filing as per the “ACAS-only Self Filer Model” parts 2a-c to the left. b. It may recognize the Air AMS self-filing as is done today, by including the agent number provided by the self-filer in the carrier MAWB AMS transmission and not transmitting the self-filer’s HAWBs to ACAS. c. It may recognize both the ACAS and the Air AMS self-filing. d. It may recognize neither the ACAS nor the Air AMS self-filing, in which case the carrier will <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Follow the steps in the “ACAS-only Self Filer Model” part 2a, to the left ii. Not include the self-filer agent code in its MAWB AMS transmission, and transmit all HAWBs to Air AMS.

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

	<p>forwarder.</p> <p>2. Accept the shipment and, per company policy, ACAS protocols, and (perhaps) contractual agreement with the self-filing forwarder, assume the responsibility for resolution of unresolved data or screening referrals per the ACAS SOPs.</p>	
--	--	--

	ACAS-only Self-Filer Model	ACAS - Air AMS Combined Self-Filer Model
Compliance Regime	<p>1. The compliance regime applicable to ACAS-only self-filer forwarders should be limited in scope and not overly-burdensome.</p> <p>2. It is recommended that the compliance regime be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fraud / deliberate submission of false information Gross negligence in data submissions Failure to comply with ACAS DNL protocols. <p>Rationale: Because the success of ACAS for the conventional carrier / freight forwarder model is dependent upon the robust self-filing participation of forwarders, and similar to the pre-requisites to file section above, the ACAS compliance regime should not be so burdensome so as to discourage forwarders from participation – particularly considering that many of these forwarders will have had no prior experience or interaction with CBP or US Government systems.</p>	<p>1. An ACAS-Air AMS self-filer should be subject to the same penalty regime as carrier filers.</p> <p>Rationale: Because the forwarder will be fulfilling the equivalent role played by a carrier under the regulations, it should be subject to the identical compliance regime.</p>
Additional Elements		<p>The system should provide a freight forwarder ACAS-Air AMS Combined Filer with the ability to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submit a particular bill either to ACAS but not AMS, or vice versa to AMS but not ACAS, with the appropriate indication of this to the accepting air carrier, thus replicating existing Air AMS functionality. This may require some revision to the agent number schema to achieve. Indicate either at a global level or a case-by-case level that an ACAS self-filing submission should also count as the Air AMS self-filing submission, thus eliminating unnecessary, duplicative messaging.

This is a pre decisional document created by the Air Cargo Advance Screening (ACAS) Working Group for submission to the COAC Global Supply Chain Subcommittee for consideration. These documents reflect input from industry that helped foster discussions within subject matter experts and government representatives.

c. Recommendations

- i. Recognize the Freight Forwarder – Conventional Carrier business model as warranting its own ACAS filing model, distinct from that of other models (such as Integrated Carrier), due to its specificities in commercial practices, operational characteristics and technological capacities.
- ii. Recognize ACAS as an advance data regime distinct from Air AMS, warranting a self-filing regime that differs from Air AMS.
- iii. Establish an ACAS-filer category for freight forwarders, independent of Air AMS, that is designed to promote robust freight forwarder participation. In particular, recognizing that ultimate responsibility lies with air carriers who have a significant interest in ACAS transmission and verification:
 1. Ensure that pre-requisites for ACAS participation are less stringent than those for AMS and are narrowly tailored to meet CBP’s interest in ensuring the security of the ACAS system and its ability to effectively address fraud or grossly negligent behavior on the part of the self-filer.
 2. Design a compliance regime applicable to ACAS self-filing freight forwarders that is limited in scope to fraud and gross negligence, and not so burdensome as to discourage participation, recognizing that freight forwarder ACAS filers will be new to CBP interaction and unfamiliar with CBP processes, making them more likely to be daunted by compliance-related concerns.
- iv. Allow Air AMS filers to “opt-in” to ACAS participation with no additional requirements, and to elect to have their ACAS submissions also fulfill Air AMS requirements on either a global or shipment-by-shipment level, thus mirroring Air AMS functionality and reducing duplicate transmissions of data for parties whose IT systems and business practices allow.
- v. Establish self-filing regime identifiers, similar to Air AMS agent numbers, to clearly classify self-filers as ACAS, Air AMS, or both, and to allow carriers to identify self-filed shipments for proper handling.