

AI System Soft presents



Container Inspection & Digital Assessment Industry Questionnaire

Professional Discovery • Standards • Workflow • Evidence • AI Readiness

Purpose: To understand existing container inspection practices, applicable requirements, photographic evidence, operational challenges, technology readiness, and opportunities for improving the inspection and assessment workflow. BuoySpot is intentionally introduced only after the independent discovery sections to reduce response bias.

Version 2.0 | AI System Soft LLC (AISS) | Estimated completion: 20-25 minutes, excluding test cases

A. PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Your professional role

☐ Container Inspector ☐ Depot Estimator ☐ Surveyor ☐ M&R Specialist ☐ Depot Manager ☐ Shipping Line/Operator ☐ Lessor ☐ Other

2. Years of relevant experience

☐ <2 ☐ 2-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-20 ☐ 20+

3. Approximately how many containers do you inspect/assess per month?

☐ <100 ☐ 100-500 ☐ 501-1,000 ☐ 1,001-5,000 ☐ 5,000+

4. Which equipment do you regularly assess?

☐ Dry ☐ High Cube ☐ Reefer ☐ Tank ☐ Open Top ☐ Flat Rack ☐ Chassis ☐ Other

5. What professional training, certification or qualifications are relevant to your work?

B. AUTHORITIES, RULES & STANDARDS

6. Which rules, standards, manuals or customer requirements govern your inspections?

☐ CSC ☐ Applicable ISO standards ☐ IICL criteria/manuals ☐ IMDG where applicable ☐ Owner/lessor criteria ☐ Shipping-line requirements ☐ Depot procedures ☐ Port/terminal requirements ☐ Government/regulatory requirements ☐ Insurance/claims requirements ☐ Other

7. Which of these are mandatory for your work, and which are customer/company requirements?

8. Does the applicable inspection requirement change according to container type, intended use, cargo, owner or jurisdiction?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes

9. Who has final authority to determine whether a damaged container is acceptable, repairable, restricted, or requires further inspection?

10. Are there situations where physical inspection is legally, contractually or professionally required regardless of photographic evidence?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

C. EXISTING WORKFLOW - AS-IS

11. Describe the actual inspection process from container arrival to final decision/report.

12. Who normally initiates the inspection?

13. Who takes the photographs?

☐ Inspector ☐ Depot estimator ☐ Gate staff ☐ Driver ☐ Surveyor ☐ Other

14. Who identifies/classifies damage?

15. Who determines whether measurement is necessary?

16. Who prepares the repair estimate?

17. Who approves/rejects the estimate or repair?

18. How are inspection findings transferred between people/systems?

☐ Paper ☐ Email ☐ Spreadsheet ☐ EDI ☐ Depot software ☐ Mobile application ☐ API ☐ Other

19. Average physical inspection time per container

20. Average reporting/administrative time

21. Where are the greatest delays in the process?

D. PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

22. Are photographs required?

☐ Always ☐ Usually ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

23. What minimum photographs are normally required?

24. Are prescribed camera angles used?

☐ Yes ☐ Sometimes ☐ No

25. What commonly makes a photograph unusable?

☐ Poor focus ☐ Insufficient resolution ☐ Poor lighting ☐ Incorrect distance ☐ Incorrect angle ☐ Damage location unclear ☐ Container identity unclear ☐ No measurement reference ☐ Missing metadata ☐ Obstruction ☐ Other

26. Should different types of damage require different photo sets?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Depends

27. Would guided photography improve inspection consistency (front view -> 45° view -> close-up -> measurement reference)?

☐ Significantly ☐ Somewhat ☐ No ☐ Unsure

E. IDENTIFICATION, TRACEABILITY & EVIDENCE

28. How is each photograph connected to the container?

☐ Container number ☐ Timestamp ☐ Location ☐ Inspector ID ☐ Work order ☐ Estimate number ☐ Other

29. Is the original photograph retained after it enters your system?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

30. How long are photographs retained?

31. Can you establish who captured a photograph, when and where?

☐ Always ☐ Usually ☐ Sometimes ☐ No

32. Are photographs connected to individual repair-estimate line items?

☐ Yes ☐ Sometimes ☐ No

33. How important are photographs when resolving disputes?

☐ Critical ☐ Important ☐ Useful ☐ Minor ☐ Not used

F. DAMAGE DETECTION, MEASUREMENT & PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

34. Which damage types can normally be identified reliably from photographs alone?

35. Which cannot?

36. Can photographs alone establish whether deformation exceeds allowable tolerances?

☐ Usually ☐ Sometimes ☐ Only with measurement reference ☐ Physical measurement normally required ☐ No

37. When should additional photographs automatically be requested?

38. When must a physical measurement be taken?

39. When must the container be physically inspected by a qualified person?

40. What decisions should NEVER be made solely from AI/image analysis?

G. PAIN POINTS

41. Rank your five largest operational problems.

☐ Inspection time ☐ Inspector availability ☐ Labor cost ☐ Lifting/equipment cost ☐ Inconsistent assessments ☐ Poor photographs ☐ Missing photographs ☐ Report preparation ☐ Estimate preparation ☐ Approval delays ☐ Disputes ☐ File management ☐ Customer communication ☐ Lack of integration ☐ Training ☐ Other

42. What task consumes the most inspector/estimator time?

43. What causes the greatest number of disputes?

44. What information do you repeatedly have to request because it wasn't captured correctly the first time?

45. If you could eliminate ONE inefficiency tomorrow, what would it be?

H. TECHNOLOGY & AI READINESS

46. Do you currently use software to assist container condition assessment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

47. Would automatic image-quality checking be useful before photographs are submitted?

☐ Very useful ☐ Useful ☐ Limited value ☐ No

48. Would automatic container/component identification be useful?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No

49. Would AI-assisted visible-damage detection be useful if professionally validated?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No

50. Would automatic requests for additional photographs/angles improve the process?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No

51. Would automatic identification of cases requiring measurement or human escalation be useful?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No

52. What accuracy/reliability evidence would you require before trusting such a system?

53. How many professionally validated container assessments would give you meaningful confidence in system performance?

☐ <100 ☐ 100-250 ☐ 251-500 ☐ 501-1,000 ☐ >1,000

I. IDEAL FUTURE WORKFLOW - TO-BE

54. In an ideal inspection process, what should happen automatically?

55. What must remain under human professional control?

56. Would this workflow be useful: container identification -> guided photography -> automatic image-quality check -> damage detection -> location/classification -> measurement request where required -> professional review -> report/estimate linkage -> audit trail?

☐ Very useful ☐ Useful with modifications ☐ Limited value ☐ Not useful

57. What would you change?

J. BUOYSPOT - AFTER INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY

58. Based on the BuoySpot demonstration/test, which problems you identified earlier could it potentially address?

59. Which problems does it NOT currently address?

60. Did BuoySpot correctly identify the visible damage in the test case?

☐ Completely ☐ Mostly ☐ Partially ☐ No ☐ Cannot determine

61. Did it correctly identify the location/component?

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

62. Was the damage classification appropriate?

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

63. Was the available photographic evidence sufficient to determine severity?

☐ Yes ☐ Additional angle needed ☐ Measurement needed ☐ Physical inspection needed

64. Did BuoySpot produce any false positive?

☐ Yes ☐ No

65. Did BuoySpot miss any material visible condition?

☐ Yes ☐ No

K. ADOPTION & COMMERCIAL VALUE

66. Who in your organization would normally approve purchase/use of a system like this?

67. Who would actually use it?

68. What would be the strongest reason to adopt it?

☐ Time savings ☐ Lower cost ☐ Better photographs ☐ Consistency ☐ Documentation ☐ Claims/evidence ☐ Remote assessment ☐ Quality control ☐ Faster approvals ☐ Other

69. What would be the strongest reason NOT to adopt it?

☐ Accuracy ☐ Liability ☐ Regulation ☐ Cost ☐ Integration ☐ Training ☐ Customer acceptance ☐ Data/security ☐ Other

70. Preferred commercial model

☐ Per assessment ☐ Volume credits ☐ Monthly subscription ☐ Per depot/location ☐ Enterprise agreement ☐ Combination

71. What measurable result would justify paying for the service?

L. PROFESSIONAL CONCLUSION

72. Should AISS continue professional validation of BuoySpot?

☐ Yes ☐ Yes, subject to changes ☐ More evidence required ☐ No

73. What are the THREE most important improvements required?

74. Would you participate in a structured multi-container validation study?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No

75. Would your organization potentially consider a controlled pilot after successful validation?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe ☐ No ☐ Not authorized to answer

76. Additional professional observations

REPEATABLE TEST CASE EVALUATION SHEET

Test Case ID: _____

Container ID / Type: _____

Date / Location: _____

Inspector / Reviewer: _____

Photo set complete? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially: _____

Validation dimension	Professional finding	BuoySpot finding	Result
Image sufficiency			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Damage detection			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Location			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Classification			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Severity			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Measurement required			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Additional images required			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Physical inspection required			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
Recommended action			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A
False positive / missed condition			☐ Agree ☐ Partial ☐ Disagree ☐ N/A

Reviewer comments / evidence limitations:

PROFESSIONAL DECLARATION

I confirm that my responses and test-case evaluations represent my independent professional observations and opinions.
I understand that BuoySpot is under professional validation and that references to industry organizations, standards or

source materials do not constitute endorsement, certification or approval of AI System Soft, LLC, Tensorminds, inc., or BuoySpot including their owners, employees and related personnels.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Location: _____

RESEARCH BASIS

This questionnaire is informed by the February 2026 Container Owners Association (COA) Photograph Standard webinar and the February 2026 FLETEC presentation on AI readiness and photo standards. The broader AISS discovery framework also considers applicable governmental, international, regulatory, technical and professional sources, including The Nautical Institute where relevant.

Important: These references inform research design only. No endorsement, certification, compliance determination or approval of AISS or Tensorminds or BuoySpot is implied.