9111-14

This document is scheduled to be published in the
Federal Register on 2026-09-02 and available online at
https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2026-17926, and on
https://govinfo.gov

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

19 CFR Parts 141, 142, 143 and 163

[Docket No. USCBP-2026-1058]

RIN 1685-AA47

Heightened Import Disclosures for Supply Chain Visibility

AGENCIES: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is considering amending its regulations to give CBP greater visibility into the supply chains of goods imported into the United States. CBP is seeking comments on new requirements enhancing visibility into the parties involved in the importation of goods; integrating innovative technical solutions for the tracing of supply chains of those goods; and collecting foreign export documentation that foreign exporters are required to submit to the foreign customs authority prior to the exportation of those goods to the United States. With these proposals, CBP seeks to more effectively detect and interdict illicit importations, especially those that are illegally transshipped to evade compliance with U.S. customs and trade laws.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before [INSERT DATE 90 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*].

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number, through the Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments via docket number **USCBP-2026-1058**.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the "Public Participation" heading of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents and submitted comments, go to http://www.regulations.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions regarding the identification of parties involved with imported goods and the collection of foreign export documentation, contact Brandon Lord, Executive Director, Trade Programs, Office of Trade, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Salvatore Ingrassia, Acting Executive Director, Cargo and Conveyance Security, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection at (202) 325-4369 or by email at supplychainvisibility@cbp.dhs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Public Participation

Interested persons are invited to participate in this potential rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments on all aspects of this advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM). *See* **ADDRESSES** above for information on how to submit comments. The most useful comments would be those that address the specific questions outlined in sections III and IV below.

II. Background

On June 3, 2026, the President signed Executive Order (E.O.) 14411 entitled "Strengthening Customs Enforcement."[1] Section 1 of the E.O. emphasizes the importance of customs enforcement for purposes of national security, foreign policy, and the economy of the United States. The E.O. further underscores that effective customs enforcement prevents the

---

[1] 91 FR 35125 (June 10, 2026). A Fact Sheet accompanying the Executive Order, issued the same day, emphasizes the goal of comprehensive customs reform through various actions to be taken by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and CBP to strengthen the enforcement of U.S. customs laws and promote economic strength and national security by combatting customs fraud. *See* https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2026/06/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-strengthens-customs-enforcement/.

importation of unlawful and dangerous goods, ensures importers of record (IORs) are correctly identified and accountable for duties owed, and guarantees compliance by various parties involved in the importation of goods with numerous Federal laws, including laws governing forced labor, rules of origin, origin marking, intellectual property, revenue collection, and product safety.

The E.O. calls for customs reform to remedy systemic inefficiencies, loopholes, insufficient enforcement mechanisms, and outdated processes that have created opportunities for malign actors to evade Federal law. Section 3 of the E.O. directs the establishment of heightened import disclosure requirements. In particular, Section 3(a) of the E.O. instructs the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary) to take steps to require the disclosure of certain foreign tax and global business identifiers, and detailed information about the supply chain and production methods of goods imported into the United States. Moreover, Section 3(b) of the E.O. directs the Secretary to take steps to mandate the submission of "any documentation or information that the foreign exporter was required to submit to the foreign customs administration prior to exporting to the United States." The E.O. also directs CBP to leverage the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (CTPAT) program in a variety of ways to strengthen customs enforcement.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) component responsible for enforcing compliance with U.S. customs and trade laws. Customs enforcement is essential to the national security of the United States. Ensuring compliance with U.S. customs and trade laws protects Americans from dangerous products and reinforces the strength of the American economy. In addition to more specific statutory authority described below, related to, among other things, entry, manifest, and recordkeeping, the Secretary,[2] through the Commissioner of CBP has the broad authority under 19 U.S.C. 1624 to

[2] The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the filing or transmission of the entry documentation. *See* 19 U.S.C. 1484(a)(2)(A). The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (HSA) generally transferred the functions of the U.S. Customs Service from the Treasury Department to the Secretary of Homeland Security. *See* Pub. L. 107–296, 116 Stat. 2142; 6 U.S.C. 203 ("there shall be transferred to the Secretary [of Homeland Security] the functions . . . of (1) the United States Customs Service of the Department of the Treasury,

"make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of [the Tariff Act of 1930]."

A. Entry of Merchandise

All merchandise imported into the customs territory of the United States is subject to entry and clearance procedures, unless excepted. 19 CFR 141.4. These procedures ensure the proper appraisement, valuation, and tariff classification of the merchandise for the purpose of collecting the lawful amount of duties owed, as well as compliance with all other laws and regulations administered and enforced by CBP, including health and safety requirements imposed by other government agencies. Different types of entry procedures are used for the entry and clearance of merchandise depending upon its value and other relevant criteria.

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1484 and 1485, CBP has broad authority to require documentation and information necessary to determine whether the merchandise can be released from CBP custody, assess duties, collect accurate statistics, and determine whether any other applicable requirement of law has been met. 19 U.S.C. 1484(a)(1). Further, under 19 U.S.C. 1484(a)(2)(A), CBP has authority to prescribe by regulation the time period and manner for filing such documentation and information. Informal entry procedures are authorized by 19 U.S.C. 1498(a)(1)(A) for shipments of merchandise valued at $2,500 or less, and may incorporate formal entry procedures appearing in 19 U.S.C. 1484 and 1485. 19 U.S.C. 1498(b). Generally, informal entry procedures are less burdensome and complex than formal entry procedures. CBP has established entry procedures in 19 CFR parts 141, 142, and 143. In particular, 19 CFR 141.5

---

including the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury relating thereto"). Nevertheless, pursuant to Section 412 of the HSA, the Treasury Department retained authority related to various customs revenue functions, including those functions found in the Tariff Act of 1930 [Pub. L. 71-361, 46 Stat. 590, as amended (codified at 19 U.S.C. 1202 *et seq.*). 6 U.S.C. 212(a)(1), (2). But the Secretary of the Treasury may delegate any such retained authority at the Treasury Secretary's discretion. 6 U.S.C. 212(a)(1). Consistent with this delegation authority, the Secretary of the Treasury issued Treasury Order 100-20 (available at https://home.treasury.gov/about/general-information/orders-and-directives/treasury-order-100-20), delegating the authorities contained in 6 U.S.C. 212 and 215 to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

requires that entry be filed within 15 calendar days after landing from a vessel, aircraft or vehicle, or after arrival at the port of destination in the case of merchandise transported in bond.[3]

B. Import Manifest Information

In addition to these entry requirements imposed on the importer of merchandise, under 19 U.S.C. 1431, CBP has imposed requirements on carriers of merchandise. Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1431(b), carriers are required to submit a manifest to CBP that contains information concerning cargo they are transporting to the United States. Under 19 U.S.C. 1431(d), among other things, CBP is authorized to specify by regulation the form for, and the information and data required in, a manifest.

C. Recordkeeping and Audit Procedures

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1508, all parties who file an entry or declaration, transport or store merchandise carried or held under bond, file drawback claims, or knowingly cause an importation, or transportation or storage of merchandise carried or held under bond are subject to customs recordkeeping requirements.[4] Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1509, CBP is authorized to examine and summons records, including by conducting an audit, for the following purposes: ascertaining the correctness of any entry; determining the liability of any person for duty, fees, or taxes due, or which may be due the United States; determining liability for fines and penalties; or ensuring compliance with the laws of the United States administered by CBP. Under section 1509(b), specific procedures are set forth for conducting a formal audit authorized under the statute. The CBP regulations regarding recordkeeping requirements and audits are found in 19

[3] Participants in the Entry Type 86 test, previously available for filers claiming the *de minimis* exemption, were required to file prior to or upon arrival of the cargo into the United States. *See* 89 FR 2630 (Jan. 16, 2024).

[4] The Customs Modernization Act ("Mod Act"), Title VI of Public Law 103-182, 107 Stat. 2057, 2170 (1993) enshrined the concepts of informed compliance and shared responsibility into the Tariff Act of 1930. The Mod Act amended various provisions of the customs laws to grant to the then-Customs Service (CBP's predecessor) the authority not to require the presentation of certain documentation or information at time of entry; in exchange, and in order to not jeopardize the ability of Customs to obtain those records at a later date, the Mod Act amended 19 U.S.C. 1509 to authorize Customs to examine, or to require the production of, among other things, any records which are required by law for the entry of merchandise, whether or not Customs required their presentation at the time of entry.

CFR part 163, including the (a)(1)(A) list of records required to be maintained for CBP inspection.

D. Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (CTPAT) Program

The Security and Accountability for Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 (Pub. L. 109-347, 120 Stat. 1884, 1909 (2006), 6 U.S.C. 961 *et seq*.) authorizes the Secretary of DHS, acting through the Commissioner of CBP, to establish a voluntary program, known as CTPAT, to build cooperative relationships between the private sector and the government that strengthen and improve overall security of the international supply chain and the U.S. border, and to facilitate the movement of secure cargo through the international supply chain by providing benefits to participants meeting or exceeding the program requirements. *See* 6 U.S.C. 962, 964 and 965. The CTPAT program plays a crucial role in safeguarding the economic and national security of the United States by acting as a vital component of CBP's multi-layered security strategy. By securing international supply chains, the program proactively identifies and prevents risks such as terrorism, smuggling, and other illicit activities in supply chains, thereby mitigating threats to national security. The CTPAT program contributes to the nation's economic prosperity by strengthening the free and fair flow of legitimate trade, preventing costly disruptions, and fostering a secure trade environment. The program's commitment to customs and trade enforcement provides an essential platform to combat trade fraud and protect American consumers and industries.

CBP encourages participation in this program by providing benefits to participants meeting or exceeding the CTPAT program requirements. An individual or company[5] that wishes to participate in the CTPAT program must demonstrate that it meets the applicable minimum

[5] *See* 6 U.S.C. 962. Businesses eligible to apply for CTPAT partnership include U.S. importers of record; non-resident Canadian importers; U.S./Canada highway carriers; U.S./Mexico highway carriers; air, rail and sea carriers; licensed U.S. customs brokers; U.S. marine port authority/terminal operators; third-party logistics providers; U.S. freight consolidators; ocean transportation intermediaries and non-vessel operating common carriers (NVOCCs); Mexican and Canadian manufacturers; and Mexican long-haul highway carriers.

security criteria (MSC).[6] Upon becoming a participant in the CTPAT program, an individual or company receives a variety of benefits, which may be found on CBP's website at https://www.cbp.gov/border-security/ports-entry/cargo-security/ctpat.[7] CTPAT participation provides a range of advantages designed to streamline trade operations for a diverse array of partners—including importers of record; licensed customs brokers; air, land, sea, and rail carriers; consolidators; manufacturers; third-party logistics providers; exporters; and marine port authority and terminal operators—with small businesses comprising approximately 70% of the membership, underscoring their significant role in securing global supply chains.

III. Proposals for Bolstering Supply Chain Visibility

In the sections below, CBP has laid out proposals for implementing Section 3 of the E.O. These proposals are followed by questions as to which CBP is seeking more information. The comments received in response to this ANPRM will be used, potentially, to draft a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), which would propose regulations to implement these proposals, or other suggested proposals received in response to this ANPRM. All comments are welcome, and the most useful comments are those that answer not only the specific questions posed in this notice, but also provide reasons and data in support of any views provided by the commenter, describe current practices and technology in use to address issues of supply chain visibility, and address how the proposals outlined in this ANPRM would affect them, their company, and their clientele. For each of these proposals, consider whether the new requirements should be phased in by entry type, commodity (including whether special consideration is warranted for critical medical products and their key inputs), country, or mode of transportation; whether different implementation timelines should apply to small entities, foreign importers, CTPAT participants, or high-volume filers; whether any of the proposals are suited to voluntary test programs; and what implementation period would be necessary for affected parties to comply with the proposal.

---

[6] *See* 6 U.S.C. 963. *See also* https://www.cbp.gov/border-security/ports-entry/cargo-security/ctpat-customs-trade-partnership-against-terrorism/apply/security-criteria.
[7] This list may change as benefits are updated to improve the program.

CBP is also interested in receiving comments that describe what respondents believe the effect the proposals would have on compliance with existing legal and regulatory requirements for importation. In addition, CBP is interested in the potential costs and benefits related to these proposals. For all numerical and quantitative responses, please provide CBP with sufficient information to recreate those calculations. Finally, in your comments, please refer to the specific question number(s) that you are addressing within the various portions of your submission.

A. Foreign Export Documentation for Imported Goods

As noted above, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1484, CBP is authorized to require documentation necessary to determine admissibility, assess duties, collect accurate statistics, and "determine whether any other applicable requirement of law (other than a requirement relating to release from customs custody) is met." 19 U.S.C. 1484(a)(1). The E.O. directs CBP to establish requirements mandating submission of foreign export documentation, and CBP is considering whether foreign export documentation may be helpful to CBP in verifying and reconciling entry and entry summary information, and in detecting discrepancies that could indicate violations of U.S. customs and trade laws, such as dual-invoicing. Such foreign export documentation may include that submitted to a foreign customs authority by the entity responsible for filing the export declaration (e.g., a trading company, distributor, consolidator, or third-party logistics provider) for goods destined to the United States. Foreign export documentation may include:

- Export Declarations made by the foreign exporter to the foreign customs authority. This may show declared value, classification, and quantity.
- Commercial Invoices showing the transaction value declared to the foreign customs authority.
- Packing Lists to verify the contents, weight, and packaging of the shipment.
- Certificates of Origin submitted to the foreign customs authority substantiating the origin of the goods.
- Export Licenses or Permits required for the export of controlled, restricted, or

dual-use goods.

- Transport Documents (*e.g.*, Bill of Lading, Air Waybill) that were required as part of the export manifest filing with the foreign customs authority.

CBP is seeking information on the full breadth of such documentation as well as when and how it should be required for submission.

1. Scope of Requirement for Foreign Export Documentation; Transmission and Retention of Foreign Export Documentation

Q1. Should CBP require the importer of record to submit foreign export documentation for all goods imported into the United States? If so, what are the benefits for customs enforcement?

Q2. Under 19 U.S.C. 1508, importers are responsible for maintaining records related to their activities involving importation of goods. Should foreign export documentation be required to be transmitted to CBP as part of an entry or entry summary filing, or should foreign export documentation be a recordkeeping requirement?

Q3. Should CBP randomize requiring the submission of foreign export documentation, both to ensure compliance with any general records retention requirement and to assess the extent of non-compliance with other U.S. law? If so, how should randomization work?

Q4. Should the importer of record be the entity that is responsible for retaining and, when requested, furnishing these records to CBP? If it is not the importer of record, then who should it be?

Q5. If the importer of record is required to submit the records to CBP, is the duty of reasonable care an appropriate standard for the importer to assess and ensure the accuracy of the documentation before submitting it to CBP?

Q6. If there were a general requirement for importers of record to retain any documentation submitted to foreign customs or export authorities, are there certain exemptions that should be made to this general rule and what factors might CBP assess in a benefit-cost analysis?

Q7. What are the challenges for importers of record associated with obtaining and retaining of any documentation submitted to foreign customs or export authorities? Do importers already retain such documentation, and if so, for what purpose?

Q8. To maximize revenue collection and protect U.S. national security while minimizing compliance burdens (to the extent practicable), for how long should the retention of all documentation given to foreign customs or export authorities be required?

Q9. Do any foreign governments have agencies that perform export functions that are not formal customs authorities? If so, should information from those foreign government entities also be subject to a requirement for foreign export documentation?

Q10. If there are any conceptual discrepancies between the nature of the price reported to a foreign customs authority for a good upon export and the nature of the price relevant to CBP's assessment of duties on that good upon its importation into the United States, for customs and trade enforcement purposes, how could or should CBP interpret and potentially reconcile these differences?

Q11. What internal controls and reconciliation processes should importers implement to identify discrepancies between the information on foreign export documentation and the entry or entry summary filed with CBP? If discrepancies are identified, what documentation or evidence should the importer provide to justify the difference? For example, if the foreign export declaration lists a different value, quantity, or classification from that on the entry summary filed with CBP, how could the importer reconcile these differences?

Q12. How can the importer ensure that the foreign export documentation provided to CBP is the exact document submitted to the foreign customs administration, and has not been modified?

Q13. Should CBP seek to verify the authenticity of the foreign export data submitted to CBP with customs administrations in foreign countries?

Q14. Should there be different documentation requirements for importers who are CTPAT-validated?

Q15. What specific types of foreign export documentation (*e.g.*, export declarations, export permits or licenses, export certifications, commercial invoices, certificates of origin) are most readily available and provide the most accurate data for verification purposes?

Q16. What is the current lead time required for importers to obtain foreign export documentation from their foreign suppliers?

Q17. How should CBP address foreign export documentation that is not in English? For example, should CBP also require data fields for specific information to be submitted in English, in addition to providing the accompanying underlying documentation in the foreign language?

Q18. What costs would be incurred if foreign export documentation had to be provided to CBP as part of entry or included as a recordkeeping requirement?

2. National Security Considerations

Q19. What are the challenges for importers if the Secretary (potentially in consultation with other U.S. government officials) is granted the authority to designate certain categories of imports as posing an unusually high or grave risk to the national security of the United States and, in such cases, require the submission of such foreign export documentation by the importer of record as a condition of entry?

Q20. For categories of imports posing an unusually high or grave risk to the national security of the United States, should CBP randomize the submission requirement or require it across the board for all imports designated as posing a grave risk to national security?

Q21. Are there certain categories of exports (at the product and/or country level) that, if imported, pose an exceptionally high or grave risk to the national security of the United States?

Q22. If the Secretary (or other relevant U.S. government officials) designates a certain product or set of products as posing an unusually high or grave risk to the national security of the United States, aside from information given to foreign customs or export authorities, what other information might help the Secretary identify and address the national security risks posed by the importation of these products?

Q23. Are there existing U.S. government lists or designations that the Secretary (or other relevant U.S. government officials) should or could cross-reference in identifying products that pose an unusually high or grave risk to the national security of the United States?

B. Parties Involved in the Manufacture, Production, Movement, and/or Exportation of Goods Imported into the United States

1. Manufacturer Identification Code (MID)

Importers of record provide the data element known as the manufacturer or shipper identification code (MID) at the time of filing entry summary. *See, generally,* 19 CFR part 142; CBP Form 7501. The MID is derived from the name and address of the manufacturer or shipper, as specified on the commercial invoice, by applying a code constructed pursuant to instructions specified by CBP. *See* Customs Directive No. 3550-055, dated November 24, 1986 (available online at https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/assets/documents/2020-Feb/3550-055_3_0.pdf). Although use of the MID is longstanding, it provides limited identifying information and does not always identify the actual party that may be of interest to CBP for enforcement purposes and is not always available to CBP early enough in the entry process to be useful. Moreover, the MID is not always a consistent or unique number. For example, the MID is based upon the manufacturer or shipper name, address, and country of origin, and this data can change over time and/or result in the same MID for multiple entities. CBP is interested in proposals to redefine or replace the MID.

Q24. Do importers or other parties use the MID for any business purposes? If so, what are they and how could the MID be enhanced to better serve those purposes?

Q25. Instead of a single MID, should CBP collect other information to identify the manufacturer, shipper, and exporter for each shipment of goods imported into the United States? If so, what alternate information should CBP collect? How would this benefit CBP and what benefits could also exist for importers as a result of providing this information? Would the submission of alternate information result in any costs for manufacturers, shippers, and exporters, and if so, what are the costs?

Q26. If CBP collects information to identify the manufacturer, shipper, and exporter, how should each of these parties be defined?

Q27. Should CBP collect information on the "producer," rather than the manufacturer, to align with the definitions of producer/production found in 19 CFR part 102 and in trade agreements?

Q28. Should CBP continue to use the current formula for identification of the MID, or should actual identifying data, such as full company name and physical address or other business identifier, be provided to CBP with each shipment of imported goods?

Q29. When should the MID or other identifier be provided to CBP? Should CBP require that the MID be provided at both entry and entry summary? Should CBP require the MID to be included on the manifest?

Q30. What should be the consequences for importers who do not provide accurate MID data and/or data to identify the manufacturer, shipper, and exporter for each shipment of imported goods?

Q31. What parties are best positioned to identify the manufacturer, shipper, and exporter to CBP? Should other parties in the supply chain be permitted to provide such data directly to CBP?

Q32. Are there concerns related to confidentiality for MID data as it is collected today and/or if CBP were to collect data for the manufacturer, shipper, and exporter for each shipment of imported goods in the future? If so, what are those concerns and how should those concerns be addressed?

Q33. In addition to the manufacturer, shipper, and exporter, are there other parties or indicators that should be declared to CBP? For example, if an online marketplace facilitated the sale of the imported merchandise to a party in the United States, should that marketplace be identified and why?

Q34. Should CBP require the identification of the party to which the merchandise is ultimately intended to be delivered, who may not be the initial recipient or the consignee taking custody of the goods upon arrival in the United States?

Q35. Beyond identifying the parties in a transaction (manufacturer, shipper, etc.), what specific software platforms or service providers (e.g., vessel sharing agreements, LOGINK, or other booking platforms) do you or your supply chain partners use to transmit shipping instructions, book freight, or manage logistics data? Please specify at what stage of the shipping process these platforms are used.

Q36. For any logistics platforms used, particularly those required by an overseas supplier, carrier, or freight forwarder, what visibility do you have into the platform's data privacy and security practices? Are you able to verify that your data is not being altered, shared with, or stored by unauthorized entities?

2. Global Business Identifiers

In recognition of the challenges associated with the MID, as discussed above, in 2022, CBP established a voluntary National Customs Automation Program Test[8] of Global Business Identifiers (GBIs), to evaluate the potential for a GBI to supplement or replace the MID. (87 FR 74157, December 2, 2022.) A GBI is a unique identifier issued by the private sector to help companies map and trace their supply chains. As initially conceptualized, the GBI test allowed importers of record and licensed customs brokers to transmit GBIs identifying the manufacturer, shipper, or seller with their entry. For purposes of the test, CBP defined these parties as follows:

- Manufacturer (or supplier)—The party that last manufactures, assembles, produces, or grows the goods or the party supplying the finished goods in the country from which the goods are leaving for the United States.

[8] The National Customs Automation Program (NCAP) was established by the Mod Act, Subtitle B of Title VI (Pub. L. 103-182, 107 Stat. 2057, 2170, December 8, 1993) (19 U.S.C. 1411).

- Shipper—The party that enters into a contract for carriage with, and arranges for delivery of the goods to, a carrier or transport intermediary for transportation to the United States.
- Seller—The last known party by whom the goods are sold or agreed to be sold. If the goods are to be imported otherwise than in pursuance of a purchase, the owner of the goods must be provided.

Test participants could also elect to transmit GBIs identifying the exporter, distributor, or packager.

The ongoing GBI test is intended to determine whether GBIs offer more pertinent information regarding the entities with which they are associated and their supply chains (*e.g.*, legal ownership of businesses, specific business and global locations, and supply chain roles and functions. (*See* 90 FR 38479, August 8, 2025.) CBP is seeking input on the GBI test in its current form and whether it should be modified.

Q37. The GBI test currently permits the transmission of four entity identifiers - the Data Universal Numbering System (D-U-N-S®), Global Location Number (GLN), Legal Entity Identifier (LEI), and Altana ID – with the entry data found on the electronic entry. Should GBIs be collected at entry or entry summary, or both?

Q38. How do businesses use GBIs in their operations? Which GBIs are best suited to supply chain visibility? Are there other entity identifiers that should be included in the GBI test?

Q39. How challenging is it for businesses to obtain and maintain a GBI? Which parties in the supply chain are likely to have a GBI, and which are unlikely to have a GBI?

Q40. Is it feasible for CBP to require the provision of a GBI to identify the manufacturer, shipper, and/or seller at entry? Why or why not?

Q41. Is it feasible for importers and/or their customs brokers to obtain and disclose to CBP entity-level foreign tax and global business identifiers for the manufacturer, shipper, and/or seller? If feasible, should these be disclosed to CBP prior to arrival, at entry, or both?

Q42. Rather than an entity-level identifier, is it more or less feasible for importers to obtain and disclose to CBP a single product-level identifier for each shipment that provides detailed information about the imported good's supply chain and production methods, such as the manufacturer's product identifier (*e.g.*, model or style number) or key specifications (*e.g.*, composition, grade, or size)?

Q43. Would requiring entry to be filed sooner benefit CBP in reviewing supply chain documentation, and determining the admissibility of merchandise sooner? How would an earlier filing deadline affect data availability or data accuracy? How would an earlier filing deadline affect broker and carrier operations? What costs would result from an earlier filing deadline for affected parties?

Q44. Should CBP verify the accuracy of the GBI data submitted by an importer against other data submitted to CBP by other parties (if applicable)? What measures could or should CBP take in the event that GBI data submitted by an importer does not comport with data submitted to CBP by other parties?

Q45. Would the identification of parties using GBI data enhance the integration of technical solutions for supply chain traceability, as discussed further below?

C. Innovative Technical Approaches for Supply Chain Tracing

Illegal transshipment, the practice of routing goods through a third country to obscure or misrepresent their true country of origin, deprives the U.S. government of lawful revenue and threatens U.S. economic security. To combat such evasion, CBP has intensified its enforcement efforts, including evaluating artificial intelligence (AI)-driven solutions for pinpointing illegal transshipment risk. CBP seeks to leverage supply chain traceability solutions (which are widely employed by the private sector today) to make rapid and resource-efficient decisions about illegal transshipment before goods arrive at, or are released from, the U.S. border. It is also essential for CBP to encourage the private sector to incorporate awareness of national security issues and geopolitical risk into their supply chain decision-making.

1. Novel Supply Chain Tracing Solutions

Q46. What technologies does the private sector use to obtain visibility into supply chains and the production methods of goods imported into the United States? How does the private sector verify the accuracy of the supply chain data generated by these tools? How do these technologies protect proprietary business information?

Q47. To what extent should importers be responsible for using technological tools to provide CBP with visibility into supply chains and the production methods of goods imported into the United States? What are the costs associated with using technological tools for large and small businesses?

Q48. What is the role of AI in driving these technologies?

Q49. How can these technologies be integrated with existing trade data systems, including the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) and relevant Partner Government Agency data exchanges?

Q50. What technology is available to verify the origin of raw materials, and bridge the "visibility gap" between suppliers and raw material sources?

Q51. Are the available technologies scalable to suit both small businesses and large multinational corporations?

Q52. What kind of operational efficiencies would importers and other actors who provide supply chain data to CBP hope to achieve, and how?

Q53. What technologies currently exist to assign unique entity identifiers and tamper-proof credentials documenting the movement of goods? Are these technologies currently used by the private sector? How common is it for larger companies to use these technologies? How common is it for smaller companies to use these technologies?

Q54. Could technology be used to properly certify required entry data elements, such as the country of origin of imported goods?

Q55. What are the vulnerabilities associated with the use of data provided based on protocols pursuant to global interoperability standards? How can the vulnerabilities be detected and managed?

2. Expanding CTPAT Program Requirements and Benefits

As noted above, CTPAT is a voluntary program designed to build cooperative relationships between government and business to strengthen and improve the security of the international supply chain. CBP is interested in innovative supply chain tracing technologies that CTPAT partners can use to demonstrate the integrity of their supply chains, and their continuous execution of the MSC.

Q56. What supply chain traceability solutions do CTPAT trade partners use today to manage their supply chains?

Q57. Should all CTPAT partners be required to use enhanced supply chain tracing technologies? If this requirement should only apply to certain CTPAT Tiers, what criteria should be used to determine which ones?

Q58. Should CTPAT partners be required to make their supply chain tracing technology visible to CBP?

Q59. What benefits could be afforded to CTPAT partners who use supply chain tracing technology? What benefits could be afforded to CTPAT partners who share their supply chain visibility with CBP?

Q60. Should the CTPAT minimum security criteria be expanded to include requirements for cybersecurity and data integrity, including a prohibition on the use of covered logistics platforms identified as a security risk? What benefits could be afforded to CTPAT partners who demonstrate they exclusively use trusted data chain partners for their logistics operations?

Q61. If the CTPAT minimum security criteria were updated to restrict or prohibit the use of 'covered logistics platforms' (e.g., LOGINK or other foreign-controlled systems identified as national security risks) by the CTPAT applicant or supply chain partners, what specific administrative, operational, or software-transition costs would your organization incur to achieve compliance? Please provide detailed estimates regarding capital expenditures, training, system integration, and any potential supply chain delays associated with migrating to certified secure alternatives.

IV. Economic Impacts of Enhanced Supply Chain Visibility for Imported Goods

Executive Orders 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review) and 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review) direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This ANPRM is a "significant regulatory action," under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, and has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the specific requirements of that order.

Q62. To better evaluate the proposals in this ANPRM, CBP invites comments specific to the costs and benefits of the proposals. In particular, CBP invites comments on the costs and benefits for small businesses, potential effects on the availability and continuity of critical goods (including medical products), and proposals for ways to mitigate such costs and supply disruptions.

Q63. Are there any additional qualitative costs, monetary costs, or time expenditures related to the proposals in this ANPRM that you would like to provide?

Q64. Are there any additional qualitative benefits, monetary cost savings, or time savings related to the proposals in this ANPRM that you would like to provide?

V. Signing Authority

In accordance with Treasury Order 100-20, the Secretary of the Treasury delegated to the Secretary of Homeland Security the authority related to the customs revenue functions vested in the Secretary of the Treasury as set forth in 6 U.S.C. 212 and 215, subject to certain exceptions.

This ANPRM is being issued in accordance with DHS Delegation 07010.3, Revision 03.2, which delegates to the Commissioner of CBP the authority to prescribe and approve regulations related to customs revenue functions.

Rodney S. Scott, Commissioner, having reviewed and approved this document, has delegated the authority to electronically sign this document to Susan S. Thomas, Executive Assistant Commissioner, Office of Trade, for purposes of publication in the *Federal Register*.

Susan S. Thomas,
Executive Assistant Commissioner,
Office of Trade,
U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

[FR Doc. 2026-17926 Filed: 9/1/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 9/2/2026]