

rise to the inquiry. If the shipment is in U.S. foreign or domestic commerce, as defined by the regulations, then the Department regards the furnishing to be related to an activity in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations, whether or not the furnishing itself is in U.S. commerce.

In some circumstances, the Department may regard a furnishing of information as related to a broader category of present and prospective transactions. For example, if a controlled-in-fact foreign subsidiary of a U.S. company is requested to furnish information about its commercial dealings and it appears that failure to respond will result in its blacklisting, any responsive furnishing of information will be regarded by the Department as relating to all of the subsidiary's present and anticipated business activities with the inquiring boycotting country. Accordingly, if any of these present or anticipated business activities are in U.S. commerce, the Department will regard the furnishing as related to an activity in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations.

In deciding whether anticipated business activities will be in U.S. commerce, the Department will consider all of the surrounding circumstances. Particular attention will be given to the history of the U.S. person's business activities with the boycotting country and others, the nature of any activities occurring after a furnishing of information occurs and any relevant economic or commercial factors which may affect these activities.

For example, if a U.S. person has no activities with the boycotting country at present but all of its other international activities are in U.S. commerce, as defined by the Regulations, then the Department is likely to regard any furnishing of information by that person for the purpose of securing entry into the boycotting country's market as relating to anticipated activities in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations. Similarly, if subsequent to the furnishing of information to the boycotting country for the purpose of securing entry into its markets, the U.S. person engages in transactions with that country which are in U.S. commerce, the Department is likely to regard the furnishing as related to an activity in U.S. commerce and subject to the antiboycott regulations.

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

SUPPLEMENT NO. 15 TO PART 760—
INTERPRETATION

Section 760.2 (c), (d), and (e) of this part prohibits United States persons from furnishing certain types of information with intent to comply with, further, or support an

unsanctioned foreign boycott against a country friendly to the United States. The Department has been asked whether prohibited information may be transmitted—that is, passed to others by a United States person who has not directly or indirectly authored the information—without such transmission constituting a furnishing of information in violation of §760.2 (c), (d), and (e) of this part. Throughout this interpretation, “transmission” is defined as the passing on by one person of information initially authored by another. The Department believes that there is no distinction in the EAR between transmitting (as defined above) and furnishing prohibited information under the EAR and that the transmission of prohibited information with the requisite boycott intent is a furnishing of information violative of the EAR. At the same time, however, the circumstances relating to the transmitting party's involvement will be carefully considered in determining whether that party intended to comply with, further, or support an unsanctioned foreign boycott.

The EAR does not deal specifically with the relationship between transmitting and furnishing. However, the restrictions in the EAR on responses to boycott-related conditions, both by direct and indirect actions and whether by primary parties or intermediaries, indicate that U.S. persons who simply transmit prohibited information are to be treated the same under the EAR as those who both author and furnish prohibited information. This has been the Department's position in enforcement actions it has brought.

The few references in the EAR to the transmission of information by third parties are consistent with this position. Two examples, both relating to the prohibition against the furnishing of information about U.S. persons' race, religion, sex, or national origin (§760.2(c) of this part), deal explicitly with transmitting information. These examples (§760.2(c) of this part, example (v), and §760.3(f) of this part, example (vi)) show that, in certain cases, when furnishing certain information is permissible, either because it is not within a prohibition or is excepted from a prohibition, transmitting it is also permissible. These examples concern information that may be furnished by individuals about themselves or their families. The examples show that employers may transmit to a boycotting country visa applications or forms containing information about an employee's race, religion, sex, or national origin if that employee is the source of the information and authorizes its transmission. In other words, within the limits of ministerial action set forth in these examples, employees' actions in transmitting information are protected by the exception available to the employee. The distinction between permissible

and prohibited behavior rests not on the definitional distinction between furnishing and transmitting, but on the excepted nature of the information furnished by the employee. The information originating from the employee does not lose its excepted character because it is transmitted by the employer.

The Department's position regarding the furnishing and transmission of certificates of one's own blacklist status rests on a similar basis and does not support the contention that third parties may transmit prohibited information authored by another. Such self-certifications do not violate any prohibitions in the EAR (see Supplement Nos. 1(I)(B), 2, and 5(A)(2); §760.2(f), example (xiv)). It is the Department's position that it is not prohibited for U.S. persons to transmit such self-certifications completed by others. Once again, because furnishing the self-certification is not prohibited, third parties who transmit the self-certifications offend no prohibition. On the other hand, if a third party authored information about another's blacklist status, the act of transmitting that information would be prohibited.

A third example in the EAR (§760.5, example (xiv) of this part), which also concerns a permissible transmission of boycott-related information, does not support the theory that one may transmit prohibited information authored by another. This example deals with the reporting requirements in §760.5 of this part—not the prohibitions—and merely illustrates that a person who receives and transmits a self-certification has not received a reportable request.

It is also the Department's position that a U.S. person violates the prohibitions against furnishing information by transmitting prohibited information even if that person has received no reportable request in the transaction. For example, where documents accompanying a letter of credit contain prohibited information, a negotiating bank that transmits the documents, with the requisite boycott intent, to an issuing bank has not received a reportable request, but has furnished prohibited information.

While the Department does not regard the suggested distinction between transmitting and furnishing information as meaningful, the facts relating to the third party's involvement may be important in determining whether that party furnished information with the required intent to comply with, further, or support an unsanctioned foreign boycott. For example, if it is a standard business practice for one participant in a transaction to obtain and pass on, without examination, documents prepared by another party, it might be difficult to maintain that the first participant intended to comply with a boycott by passing on information contained in the unexamined documents. Resolution of such intent questions, however, depends upon an analysis of the individual

facts and circumstances of the transaction and the Department will continue to engage in such analysis on a case-by-case basis.

This interpretation, like all others issued by the Department discussing applications of the antiboycott provisions of the EAR, should be read narrowly. Circumstances that differ in any material way from those discussed in this interpretation will be considered under the applicable provisions of the Regulations.

SUPPLEMENT NO. 16 TO PART 760— INTERPRETATION

Pursuant to Articles 5, 7, and 26 of the Treaty of Peace between the State of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and implementing legislation enacted by Jordan, Jordan's participation in the Arab economic boycott of Israel was formally terminated on August 16, 1995.

On the basis of this action, it is the Department's position that certain requests for information, action or agreement from Jordan which were considered boycott-related by implication now cannot be presumed boycott-related and thus would not be prohibited or reportable under the regulations. For example, a request that an exporter certify that the vessel on which it is shipping its goods is eligible to enter Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan ports has been considered a boycott-related request that the exporter could not comply with because Jordan has had a boycott in force against Israel. Such a request from Jordan after August 16, 1995 would not be presumed boycott-related because the underlying boycott requirement/basis for the certification has been eliminated. Similarly, a U.S. company would not be prohibited from complying with a request received from Jordanian government officials to furnish the place of birth of employees the company is seeking to take to Jordan because there is no underlying boycott law or policy that would give rise to a presumption that the request was boycott-related.

U.S. persons are reminded that requests that are on their face boycott-related or that are for action obviously in furtherance or support of an unsanctioned foreign boycott are subject to the regulations, irrespective of the country of origin. For example, requests containing references to "blacklisted companies", "Israel boycott list", "non-Israeli goods" or other phrases or words indicating boycott purpose would be subject to the appropriate provisions of the Department's antiboycott regulations.

PART 762—RECORDKEEPING

Sec.

762.1 Scope.

762.2 Records to be retained.