

with that nation's cultural and religious beliefs. On this basis, we do not interpret the term to be boycott related. See §760.2(a)(5) and §760.5(a)(5)(v) of this part.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34949, June 1, 2000]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 7 TO PART 760—
INTERPRETATION

Prohibited Refusal To Do Business

When a boycotting country rejects for boycott-related reasons a shipment of goods sold by a United States person, the United States person selling the goods may return them to its inventory or may re-ship them to other markets (the United States person may not return them to the original supplier and demand restitution). The U.S. person may then make a non-boycott based selection of another supplier and provide the goods necessary to meet its obligations to the boycotting customer in that particular transaction without violating §760.2(a) of this part. If the United States person receives another order from the same boycotting country for similar goods, the Department has determined that a boycott-based refusal by a United States person to ship goods from the supplier whose goods were previously rejected would constitute a prohibited refusal to do business under §760.2(a) of this part. The Department will presume that filling such an order with alternative goods is evidence of the person's refusal to deal with the original supplier.

The Department recognizes the limitations this places on future transactions with a boycotting country once a shipment of goods has been rejected. Because of this, the Department wishes to point out that, when faced with a boycotting country's refusal to permit entry of the particular goods, a United States person may state its obligation to abide by the requirements of United States law and indicate its readiness to comply with the unilateral and specific selection of goods by the boycotting country in accordance with §760.3(d). That section provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"A United States person may comply or agree to comply in the normal course of business with the unilateral and specific selection by a boycotting country * * * of * * * specific goods, * * * provided that * * * with respect to goods, the items, in the normal course of business, are identifiable as to their source or origin at the time of their entry into the boycotting country by (a) uniqueness of design or appearance or (b) trademark, trade name, or other identification normally on the items themselves, including their packaging."

The Department wishes to emphasize that the unilateral selection exception in §760.3(d) of this part will be construed narrowly, and

that all its requirements and conditions must be met, including the following:

- Discretion for the selection must be exercised by a boycotting country; or by a national or resident of a boycotting country;
- The selection must be stated in the affirmative specifying a particular supplier of goods;
- While a permissible selection may be boycott based, if the United States person knows or has reason to know that the purpose of the selection is to effect discrimination against any United States person on the basis of race, religion, sex, or national origin, the person may not comply under any circumstances.

The Department cautions United States persons confronted with the problem or concern over the boycott-based rejection of goods shipped to a boycotting country that the adoption of devices such as "risk of loss" clauses, or conditions that make the supplier financially liable if his or her goods are rejected by the boycotting country for boycott reasons are presumed by the Department to be evasion of the statute and regulations, and as such are prohibited by §760.4 of this part, unless adopted prior to January 18, 1978. See §760.4(d) of this part.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34949, June 1, 2000]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 8 TO PART 760—
INTERPRETATION

Definition of Interstate or Foreign Commerce of the United States

When United States persons (as defined by the antiboycott regulations) located within the United States purchase or sell goods or services located outside the United States, they have engaged in an activity within the foreign commerce of the United States. Although the goods or services may never physically come within the geographic boundaries of the several states or territories of the United States, legal ownership or title is transferred from a foreign nation to the United States person who is located in the United States. In the case of a purchase, subsequent resale would also be within United States commerce.

It is the Department's view that the terms "sale" and "purchase" as used in the regulations are not limited to those circumstances where the goods or services are physically transferred to the person who acquires title. The EAR define the activities that serve as the transactional basis for U.S. commerce as those involving the "sale, purchase, or transfer" of goods or services. In the Department's view, as used in the antiboycott regulations, "transfer" contemplates physical movement of the goods or services between the several states or territories and a foreign country,

while “sale” and “purchase” relate to the movement of ownership or title.

This interpretation applies only to those circumstances in which the person located within the United States buys or sells goods or services for its own account. Where the United States person is engaged in the brokerage of foreign goods, i.e., bringing foreign buyers and sellers together and assisting in the transfer of the goods, the sale or purchase itself would not ordinarily be considered to be within U.S. commerce. The brokerage service, however, would be a service provided from the United States to the parties and thus an activity within U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott laws. See §760.1(d)(3).

The Department cautions that United States persons who alter their normal pattern of dealing to eliminate the passage of ownership of the goods or services to or from the several states or territories of the United States in order to avoid the application of the antiboycott regulations would be in violation of §760.4 of this part.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34950, June 1, 2000]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 9 TO PART 760— INTERPRETATION

Activities Exclusively Within a Boycotting Country—Furnishing Information

§760.3(h) of this part provides that a United States person who is a bona fide resident of a boycotting country may comply with the laws of that country with respect to his or her activities exclusively within the boycotting country. Among the types of conduct permitted by this exception is “furnishing information within the host country” §760.3(h)(1)(v) of this part. For purposes of the discussion which follows, the Department is assuming that the person in question is a bona fide resident of the boycotting country as defined in §760.3(g), and that the information to be provided is required by the laws or regulations of the boycotting country, as also defined in §760.3(g) of this part. The only issue this interpretation addresses is under what circumstances the provision of information is “an activity exclusively within the boycotting country.”

The activity of “furnishing information” consists of two parts, the acquisition of the information and its subsequent transmittal. Under the terms of this exception, the information may not be acquired outside the country for the purpose of responding to the requirement for information imposed by the boycotting country. Thus, if an American company which is a bona fide resident of a boycotting country is required to provide information about its dealings with other U.S. firms, the company may not ask its parent corporation in the United States for that in-

formation, or make any other inquiry outside the boundaries of the boycotting country. The information must be provided to the boycotting country authorities based on information or knowledge available to the company and its personnel located within the boycotting country at the time the inquiry is received. See §760.3, (h) of this part, examples (iii), (iv), and (v). Much of the information in the company’s possession (transaction and corporate records) may have actually originated outside the boycotting country, and much of the information known to the employees may have been acquired outside the boycotting country. This will not cause the information to fall outside the coverage of this exception, if the information was sent to the boycotting country or acquired by the individuals in normal commercial context prior to and unrelated to a boycott inquiry or purpose. It should be noted that if prohibited information (about business relations with a boycotted country, for example) has been forwarded to the affiliate in the boycotting country in anticipation of a possible boycott inquiry from the boycotting country government, the Department will not regard this as information within the knowledge of the bona fide resident under the terms of the exception. However, if the bona fide resident possesses the information prior to receipt of a boycott-related inquiry and obtained it in a normal commercial context, the information can be provided pursuant to this exception notwithstanding the fact that, at some point, the information came into the boycotting country from the outside.

The second part of the analysis of “furnishing information” deals with the limitation on the transmittal of the information. It can only be provided within the boundaries of the boycotting country. The bona fide resident may only provide the information to the party that the boycotting country law requires (directly or through an agent or representative within the country) so long as that party is located within the boycotting country. This application of the exception is somewhat easier, since it is relatively simple to determine if the information is to be given to somebody within the country.

Note that in discussing what constitutes furnishing information “exclusively within” the boycotting country, the Department does not address the nature of the transaction or activity that the information relates to. It is the Department’s position that the nature of the transaction, including the inception or completion of the transaction, is not material in analyzing the availability of this exception.

For example, if a shipment of goods imported into a boycotting country is held up at the time of entry, and information from the bona fide resident within that country is