

blacklisted manufacturers. A likewise orders desks, office chairs, typewriters, and office supplies from non-blacklisted manufacturers.

Because they are customarily incorporated into or permanently affixed as a functional part of an office building, the wallboard, office partitions, and lighting fixtures are for A's own use, and A may select non-blacklisted suppliers of these goods in order to comply with Y's import laws. Because they are not customarily incorporated into or permanently affixed to the project, the desks, office chairs, typewriters, and office supplies are not for A's own use, and A may not make boycott-based selections of the suppliers of these goods.

(vii) A, a U.S. company engaged in the business of selling automobiles, is a bona fide resident of boycotting country Y. In ordering automobiles from time to time for purposes of stocking its inventory, A purchases from U.S. manufacturer B, but not U.S. manufacturer C, because C is blacklisted. Retail sales are subsequently made from this inventory.

A's import of automobiles from B is not an import for A's own use, because the importation of items for general inventory in a retail sales operation is not an importation for one's own use.

(viii) A, a U.S. company engaged in the manufacture of pharmaceutical products, is a bona fide resident of boycotting country Y. In importing chemicals for incorporation into the pharmaceutical products, A purchases from U.S. supplier B, but not U.S. supplier C, because C is blacklisted.

A may import chemicals from B rather than C, because the importation of specifically identifiable items for incorporation into another product is an importation for one's own use.

(ix) A, a U.S. management company which is a bona fide resident of boycotting country Y, has a contract with the Ministry of Education in Y to purchase supplies for Y's school system. From time to time, A purchases goods from abroad for delivery to various schools in Y.

A's purchase of goods for Y's school system does not constitute an importation of goods for A's own use, because A is acting as a procurement agent for another. A, therefore, cannot make boycott-based selections of suppliers of such school supplies.

(x) A, a U.S. company which is a bona fide resident of boycotting country Y, has a contract to make purchases for Y in connection with a construction project in Y. A is not engaged in the construction of, or in any other activity in connection with, the project. A's role is merely to purchase goods for Y and arrange for their delivery to Y.

A is not purchasing goods for its own use, because A is acting as a procurement agent

for Y. A, therefore, cannot make boycott selections of suppliers of such goods.

(xi) A, a U.S. company which is a bona fide resident of boycotting country Y, imports specifically identifiable goods into Y for exhibit by A at a trade fair in Y. In selecting goods for exhibit, A excludes items made by blacklisted firms.

A's import of goods for its exhibit at a trade fair constitutes an import for A's own use. However, A may not sell in Y those goods it imported for exhibit.

(xii) A is a bona fide resident of boycotting countries Y and Z. In compliance with Y's boycott laws, A chooses specifically identifiable goods for its oil drilling operations in Y and Z by excluding blacklisted suppliers. The goods are first imported into Y. Those purchased for A's use in Z are then transshipped to Z.

In selecting those goods for importation into Y, A is making an import selection for its own use, even though A may use some of the imported goods in Z. Further, the subsequent shipment from Y to Z of those goods purchased for use in Z is an import into Z for A's own use.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34946, June 1, 2000; 73 FR 68327, Nov. 18, 2008]

§ 760.4 Evasion.

(a) No United States person may engage in any transaction or take any other action, either independently or through any other person, with intent to evade the provisions of this part. Nor may any United States person assist another United States person to violate or evade the provisions of this part.

(b) The exceptions set forth in § 760.3(a) through (i) do not permit activities or agreements (express or implied by a course of conduct, including a pattern of responses) which are otherwise prohibited by this part and which are not within the intent of such exceptions. However, activities within the coverage and intent of the exceptions set forth in this part do not constitute evasion regardless of how often such exceptions are utilized.

(c) Use of any artifice, device or scheme which is intended to place a person at a commercial disadvantage or impose on him special burdens because he is blacklisted or otherwise restricted for boycott reasons from having a business relationship with or in a boycotting country will be regarded as evasion for purposes of this part.

(d) Unless permitted under one of the exceptions, use of risk of loss provisions that expressly impose a financial risk on another because of the import laws of a boycotting country may constitute evasion. If they are introduced after January 18, 1978, their use will be presumed to constitute evasion. This presumption may be rebutted by a showing that such a provision is in customary usage without distinction between boycotting and non-boycotting countries and that there is a legitimate non-boycott reason for its use. On the other hand, use of such a provision by a United States person subsequent to January 18, 1978 is presumed not to constitute evasion if the provision had been customarily used by that person prior to January 18, 1978.

(e) Use of dummy corporations or other devices to mask prohibited activity will also be regarded as evasion. Similarly, it is evasion under this part to divert specific boycotting country orders from a United States parent to a foreign subsidiary for purposes of complying with prohibited boycott requirements. However, alteration of a person's structure or method of doing business will not constitute evasion so long as the alteration is based on legitimate business considerations and is not undertaken solely to avoid the application of the prohibitions of this part. The facts and circumstances of an arrangement or transaction will be carefully scrutinized to see whether appearances conform to reality.

EXAMPLES

The following examples are intended to give guidance to persons in determining circumstances in which this section will apply. They are illustrative, not comprehensive.

(i) A, a U.S. insurance company, receives a request from boycotting country Y asking whether it does business in boycotted country X. Because furnishing such information is prohibited, A declines to answer and as a result is placed on Y's blacklist. The following year, A's annual report contains new information about A's worldwide operations, including a list of all countries in which A does business. A then mails a copy of its annual report, which has never before contained such information, to officials of the government of country Y.

Absent some business justification unrelated to the boycott for changing the annual report in this fashion, A's action constitutes evasion of this part.

(ii) A, a U.S. construction firm resident in boycotting country Y, orders lumber from U.S. company B. A unilaterally selects B in part because U.S. lumber producer C is blacklisted by Y and C's products are therefore not importable. In placing its order with B, A requests that B stamp its name or logo on the lumber so that A "can be certain that it is, in fact, receiving B's products." B does not normally so stamp its lumber, and A's purpose in making the request is to appear to fit within the unilateral selection exception of this part.

Absent additional facts justifying A's action, A's action constitutes evasion of this part.

(iii) A, a U.S. company, has been selling sewing machines to boycotting country Y for a number of years. A receives a request for a negative certificate of origin from a new customer. A is aware that furnishing such certificates are prohibited; therefore, A arranges to have all future shipments run through a foreign corporation in a third country which will affix the necessary negative certificate before forwarding the machines on to Y.

A's action constitutes evasion of this part, because it is a device to mask prohibited activity carried out on A's behalf.

(iv) A, a U.S. company, has been selling calculators to distributor B in country C for a number of years and routinely supplies positive certificates of origin. A receives an order from country Y which requires negative certificates of origin. A arranges to make all future sales to distributor B in country C. A knows B will step in and make the sales to Y which A would otherwise have made directly. B will make the necessary negative certifications. A's warranty, which it will continue to honor, runs to the purchaser in Y.

A's action constitutes evasion, because the diverting of orders to B is a device to mask prohibited activity carried out on A's behalf.

(v) A, a U.S. company, is negotiating a long-term contract with boycotting country Y to meet all Y's medical supply needs. Y informs A that before such a contract can be concluded, A must complete Y's boycott questionnaire. A knows that it is prohibited from answering the questionnaire so it arranges for a local agent in Y to supply the necessary information.

A's action constitutes evasion of this part, because it is a device to mask prohibited activity carried out on A's behalf.

(vi) A, a U.S. contractor which has not previously dealt with boycotting country Y, is awarded a construction contract by Y. Because it is customary in the construction industry for a contractor to establish an on-site facility for the duration of the project, A establishes such an office, which satisfies the

requirements for bona fide residency. Thereafter, A's office in Y takes a number of actions permitted under the compliance with local law exception.

A's actions do not constitute evasion, because A's facility in Y was established for legitimate business reasons.

(vii) A, a controlled foreign subsidiary of U.S. company B, is located in non-boycotting country M. A and B both make machine tools for sale in their respective marketing regions. B's marketing region includes boycotting country Y. After assessing the requirements of this part, B decides that it can no longer make machines for sale in Y. Instead, A decides to expand its facilities in M in order to service the Y market.

The actions of A and B do not constitute evasion, because there is a legitimate business reason for their actions. It is irrelevant that the effect may be to place sales which would otherwise have been subject to this part beyond the reach of this part.

(viii) A, a U.S. manufacturer, from time to time receives purchase orders from boycotting country Y which A fills from its plant in the United States. A knows that it is about to receive an order from Y which contains a request for a certification which A is prohibited from furnishing under this part. In order to permit the certification to be made, A diverts the purchase order to its foreign subsidiary.

A's diversion of the purchase order constitutes evasion of this part, because it is a device to mask prohibited activity carried out on A's behalf.

(ix) A, a U.S. company, is engaged in assembling drilling rigs for shipment to boycotting country Y. Because of potential difficulties in securing entry into Y of materials supplied by blacklisted firms, A insists that blacklisted firms take a 15 percent discount on all materials which they supply to A. As a result, no blacklisted firms are willing to transact with A.

A's insistence on the discount for materials supplied by blacklisted firms constitutes evasion of this part, because it is a device or scheme which is intended to place a special burden on blacklisted firms because of Y's boycott.

(x) Same as (ix), except that shortly after January 18, 1978, A, a U.S. company, insists that its suppliers sign contracts which provide that even after title passes from the supplier to A, the supplier will bear the risk of loss and indemnify A if goods which the supplier has furnished are denied entry into Y for boycott reasons.

A's action constitutes evasion of this part, because it is a device or scheme which is intended to place a special burden on blacklisted persons because of Y's boycott.

(xi) Same as (x), except that A customarily insisted on such an arrangement with its supplier prior to January 18, 1978.

A's action is presumed not to constitute evasion, because use of this contractual arrangement was customary for A prior to January 18, 1978.

(xii) A, a U.S. company, has a contract to supply automobile sub-assembly units to boycotting country Y. Shortly after January 18, 1978, A insists that its suppliers sign contracts which provide that even after title passes to A, the supplier will bear the risk of loss and indemnify A if goods which the supplier has furnished are denied entry into boycotting country Y for any reason.

A's insistence on this arrangement is presumed to constitute evasion, because it is a device which is intended to place a special burden on blacklisted firms because of Y's boycott. The presumption may be rebutted by competent evidence showing that use of such an arrangement is customary without regard to the boycotting or non-boycotting character of the country to which it relates and that there is a legitimate non-boycott business reason for its use.

(xiii) Same as (vii), except that A requires that all suppliers make in-country delivery.

A's action does not constitute evasion, because it is an ordinary commercial practice to require in-country delivery of goods.

(xiv) Same as (xii), except that A requires that title remain with the supplier until delivery in Y has been made.

A's action does not constitute evasion, because it is ordinary commercial practice to require that title remain with the supplier until delivery has been made. This example is distinguishable from example (xii), because in example (xii) A had insisted on an extraordinary arrangement designed to require that the risk of loss remain with the supplier even after title had passed to A.

(xv) U.S. bank A is contacted by U.S. company B to finance B's transaction with boycotting country Y. Payment will be effected through a letter of credit in favor of B at its U.S. address. A knows that the letter of credit will contain restrictive boycott conditions which would bar its implementation by A if the beneficiary were a U.S. person. A advises B of the boycott condition and suggests to B that the beneficiary should be changed to C, a shell corporation in non-boycotting country M. The beneficiary is changed accordingly.

The actions of both A and B constitute evasion of this part, because the arrangement is a device to mask prohibited activities.

(xvi) Same as (xv), except that U.S. company B, the beneficiary of the letter of credit, arranges to change the beneficiary to B's foreign subsidiary so that A can implement the letter of credit. A knows that this has been done.

A's implementation of the letter of credit in the face of its knowledge of B's action constitutes evasion of this part, because A's

§ 760.5

action is part of a device to mask prohibited activity by both parties.

(xvii) U.S. bank A, located in the United States, is contacted by foreign company B to finance B's transaction with boycotting country Y. B is a controlled subsidiary of a U.S. company. The transaction which is to be financed with a letter of credit payable to B at its foreign address, requires B to certify that none of its board members are of a particular religious faith. Since B cannot legally furnish the certificate, it asks A to convey the necessary information to Y through A's bank branch in Y. Such information would be furnished wholly outside the letter of credit transaction.

A's action constitutes evasion of this part, because it is undertaken to assist B's violation of this part.

(xviii) U.S. bank A is asked by foreign corporation B to implement a letter of credit in favor of B so that B might perform under its long-term contract with boycotting country Y. Under the terms of the letter of credit, B is required to certify that none of its suppliers is blacklisted. A knows that it cannot implement a letter of credit with this condition, so it tells B to negotiate the elimination of this requirement from the letter of credit and instead supply the certification to Y directly.

A's suggestion to B that it provide the negative certification to Y directly constitutes evasion of this part, because A is taking an action through another person to mask prohibited activity on A's part.

[61 FR 12862, Mar. 25, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 34947, June 1, 2000]

§ 760.5 Reporting requirements.

(a) *Scope of reporting requirements.* (1) A United States person who receives a request to take any action which has the effect of furthering or supporting a restrictive trade practice or boycott fostered or imposed by a foreign country against a country friendly to the United States or against any United States person must report such request to the Department of Commerce in accordance with the requirements of this section. Such a request may be either written or oral and may include a request to furnish information or enter into or implement an agreement. It may also include a solicitation, directive, legend or instruction that asks for information or that asks that a United States person take or refrain from taking a particular action. Such a request shall be reported regardless of whether the action requested is prohibited or permissible under this part, ex-

15 CFR Ch. VII (1-1-11 Edition)

cept as otherwise provided by this section.

(2) For purposes of this section, a request received by a United States person is reportable if he knows or has reason to know that the purpose of the request is to enforce, implement, or otherwise further, support, or secure compliance with an unsanctioned foreign boycott or restrictive trade practice.

(i) A request received by a United States person located in the United States is reportable if it is received in connection with a transaction or activity in the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States, as determined under § 760.1(d)(1) through (5) and (18) of this part.

(ii) A request received by a United States person located outside the United States (that is, a foreign subsidiary, partnership, affiliate, branch, office, or other permanent foreign establishment which is controlled in fact by any domestic concern, as determined under § 760.1(c) of this part) is reportable if it is received in connection with a transaction or activity in the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States, as determined under § 760.1(d)(6) through (17) and (19) of this part.

(iii) A request such as a boycott questionnaire, unrelated to a particular transaction or activity, received by any United States person is reportable when such person has or anticipates a business relationship with or in a boycotting country involving the sale, purchase or transfer of goods or services (including information) in the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States, as determined under § 760.1(d) of this part.

(3) These reporting requirements apply to all United States persons. They apply whether the United States person receiving the request is an exporter, bank or other financial institution, insurer, freight forwarder, manufacturer, or any other United States person subject to this part.

(4) The acquisition of information about a boycotting country's boycott requirements through the receipt or review of books, pamphlets, legal texts,